

A
TRIUMPH OF TRUTH

BEING
AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF
Satya Dharm Vichar.
OR
A DISCUSSION UPON TRUE RELIGION.

AMONG
Maharshi SWAMI DAYANAND Saraswati,
Rev. G. T. SCOT, Maulvie MAHOMED KARAN, &
other Christian & Mahomedan Priests at Chandapur.

with
The AUTOBIOGRAPHY & TRAVELS OF

OUR SWAMI;

BY
DURGA PRASAD

Author of *Dogmas of Christianity &c.*

LAHORE

VIRAJANAND PRESS,

1889

229.....
2-307A.....
212183.....
311-7 92.....
570.....

*"Every inquiry which regards religion,"
is of the utmost importance."*—

D. Hume.

*"Activity in the cause of truth, is a
duty which every man owes to his God and
to his country, to himself and to posterity,"*

S. Drew.

CONTENTS.

MEMOIRS

| | |
|---|-------|
| Preface | v |
| Introduction to autobiography— | 1-3 |
| Autobiography | 1-3 |
| " " | 13-15 |
| The Swamiji reads with Swami Vrajshankar Dandi at Mathura | 22-27 |
| The Swamiji goes to Jeypore | 28-27 |
| His different plans for Sanserit | 27-30 |
| His discussion with Benares Pandita from the Christian Intelligencer of March, 1870 | 28-33 |
| His notice at Benares | 34-38 |
| The Swamiji at Calcutta and his debate with Pt. Tara Charan, Priest of Maharaja of Benares | 35-41 |
| He visits Chapra | 42-44 |
| " Lucknow | 44-49 |
| " Allahabad | 50-57 |
| His physique and learning | 58-64 |
| He joins in the discussion at Chandigarh | 64-69 |
| He explains the transmigration to Rev. T. G. Scott and other missionaries there | 70-77 |

| | |
|--|---------|
| His visit to Lahore, his debates with Pandits, and the cause of Mr. Shiv Narayan Agnihotri's antipathy against him (p. 75) | 70-79 |
| He visits Meerut | 78-80 |
| " Mooltan | 81-82 |
| " Roorkee, and a learned Mahomedan's opinion of him | 82-88 |
| He visits Ajmere and holds discussion with missionaries, &c. | 88-96 |
| He founds the Arya Samaj. | 97-102 |
| The Pandits of India hold a grand meeting to refute his revival of the Vedas, and Lala Sain Das' Ek Arya in refutation of it | 102-110 |
| He founds the Go-rakshini Sabha to prevent cruelty to animals | 110-112 |
| His commentary on the Vedas, and reply to Mr. Hume's objections | 112-116 |
| He visits Odeypore, founds the Paropakari Sabha, a philanthropic association, and makes his will | 116-122 |
| He visits Jodhpur, his sickness and death | 122-125 |
| General grief felt for him in India by all the Societies, and opinions of the Press | 126-130 |
| His Works. | 130-135 |
| Beliefs | 135-148 |
| Reflections on his mission | 148-155 |
| DISCUSSION | |
| Introduction to discussion | 157-158 |

| | |
|--|---------|
| Questions to be discussed, and commencement of debate between Monsieur Mahomed Kasim and Rev. Scot, Noble, &c. | 159-167 |
| Discussion on 1st Question | 167-191 |
| " " 5th " | 191-208 |

APPENDIX

| | |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Introduction to appendix | 211-218 |
| Quintessence of God | 214-224 |
| God's Mercy and Justice | 225-232 |
| Revelation | 233-260 |
| A Christian's objection | 260-267 |
| A reply to him | 268-280 |
| Metempsychosis or rebirth | 281-318 |
| God's Incarnation | 314-324 |
| Trinity | 328-331 |

PREFACE.

Though this book is full of all kinds of mistakes, yet, as its object is not to present to the reader a specimen of linguistic skill, but to lay before him a few arguments in favor of some disputed points of Aryan Theology in the garb of the English language, he will not find it hard to bestow his indulgence upon

LARORE,

1st April 1889.

} THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION.

" Lives of great men all remind us,
We may make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

With this view, peruse, O Brother,
Saint Dayanand Swami's life,
Who was Monotheistic Teacher,
In this world with idols rife.

Swami was the truly great man
Of enlightened modern time ;
He kept no distinction of clan,
Creed, and caste of any clime.

Truth he taught, and truth he followed,
Giving up the worldly ease ;
Seed of monotheism true he sowed,
Made men Nature's votaries.

' All the vices, prejudices,
Vanities and wicked rites,
Whereto sin our mind sutices,
Leave,' he charged his proselytes.

Day and night he worked for our good,
 Both with head and hand in life,
 Boldly dread and despair withstood,
 And o'ercame in vulgars' strife.

He combined with lore and piety,
 Reason, moral courage, zeal,
 Virtue, strength, the sense of duty,
 And the love of general weal.

He was sure a good example
 Of the ancient sages great,
 And a model imitable ;
 Let us, then, him imitate.

So that we may be as righteous,
 Content, learned, just, and strong ;
 Useful to our brethren make us ;
 And save them from wretch of wrong.

DURGA PRASAD

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF SWAMI DAYANAND SARASWATI.



It was in a Brahmin family of the Oodichya caste, in a town belonging to the Rájáh of Morwee, in the province of Kattiawar, that in the year of Samvat, 1881, I, now known as Dayánand Saraswati, was born. If I have from the first refrained from giving the names of my father and of the town in which my family resides, it is because I have been prevented from doing so by my duty. Had any of my relatives heard again of me, they would have sought me out. And then, once more face to face with them, it would have become incumbent upon me to follow them home. I would have to touch money again,* serve them, and attend to their wants. And thus the holy work of the Reform, to which I have wedded my whole life, would have irretrievably suffered through my forced withdrawal from it.

I was hardly five years of age when I began to study the Devanagari characters, and my parents and all the elders commenced training me in the ways and practices of my caste and family ; making me learn by rote the long series of religious hymns, mantras, stanzas and commentaries. And I was but eight when I was invested with the sacred Brahminical cord (triple thread), and taught Gáyatri Sandhya with its practices, and Yajúr Veda Sanhita preceded by the study of the

* No Swami or Sanyási touches money, or personally transacts any monetary business.

*Rudrādhyāya.** As my family belonged to the Shiva sect, their greatest aim was to get me initiated into its religious mysteries; and thus I was early taught to worship the uncouth piece of clay representing Shiva's emblem, known as the *Pārthiva Lingam*. But as there is a good deal of fasting and various hardships connected with this worship, and I had the habit of taking early meals, my mother, fearing for my health, opposed my idly practicing of it. But my father sternly insisted upon its necessity, and this question finally became a source of everlasting quarrels between them. Meanwhile, I studied the Sanskrit grammar, learned the Vedas by heart, and accompanied my father to the shrines, temples, and places of Shiva worship. His conversation ran invariably upon one topic; the highest devotion and reverence must be paid to Shiva, his worship being the most divine of all religions. It went on thus till I had reached my fourteenth year, when, having learned by heart the whole of the Yajur Veda Sāhita, parts of other Vedas, of the Shabda Rūpāvali and the grammar, my studies were completed.

As my father's was a banking house and he held, moreover, the office—hereditary in my family—of a Jamādār,† we were far from being poor, and things, so far, had gone very pleasantly. Whenever there was a Shiva Purān to be read and explained, there my father was sure to take me along with him; and finally, unmindful of my mother's

* *Rudrādhyāya* is a chapter about Rudra (a name of Shiva).

† The office of "Jamādār" answers to that of a town Revenue Collector, combining that of a Magistrate at the same time.

remonstrances, he imperatively demanded that I should begin practicing *Pārthīva Pūja*.^{*} When the great day of gloom and fasting—called *Shiva-rátree*—had arrived, this day following on the 13th of *Vadya* of *Mágh*, † my father, regardless of the protest that my strength might fail, commanded me to fast, adding that I had to be initiated on that night into the sacred legend, and participate in that night's long vigil in the temple of *Shiva*. Accordingly, I followed him, along with other young men, who accompanied their parents. This vigil is divided into four parts, called *prakaras*, consisting of three hours each. Having completed my task, namely, having sat up for the first two *prakaras* till the hour of midnight, I remarked that the *Pujáris*, or temple disservants, and some of the lay devotees, after having left the inner temple, had fallen asleep outside. Having been taught for years that by sleeping on that particular night, the worshipper lost all the good effect of his devotion, I tried to refrain from drowsiness by bathing my eyes now and then with cold water. But my father was less fortunate. Unable to resist fatigue, he was the first to fall asleep, leaving me to watch alone.

Thoughts upon thoughts crowded upon me, and one question arose after the other in my disturbed mind. Is it possible,—I asked myself,—that this semblance of man, the idol of a personal God that I see bestriding his bull before me, and who according to all religious accounts, walks about, eats,

^{*} *Pārthīva Pūja* is the ceremony connected with the worship of a *lingam* of clay—the emblem of *Shiva*.

† The eleventh month of the *Hindu* year.

sleeps, and drinks; who can hold a trident in his hand, beat upon his *dumroo* (drum), and pronounce curses upon men,—is it possible that he can be the Mahádeva, the great Deity, the same that is invoked as the Lord of Kailásh,* the Supreme Being and the Divine hero of all the stories we read of him in his Puránás (Scriptures)? Unable to resist such thoughts any longer, I awoke my father, abruptly asking him to enlighten me to tell me whether this hideous emblem of Shiva in the temple was identical with the Mahádeva (great god) of the Scriptures, or something else. "Why do you ask it?" said my father. "Because," I answered, "I feel it impossible to reconcile the idea of an Omnipotent, living God, with this idol, which allows the mice to run over its body, and thus suffers its image to be polluted without the slightest protest." Then my father tried to explain to me that this stone representation of the Mahádeva of Kailásh, having been consecrated by the holy Bráhmíns, became, in consequence, *the god himself*; and is worshipped as such; adding that as Shiva cannot be perceived personally in this Kali-Yug—the age of mental darkness,—we hence have the idol in which the Mahádeva of Kailásh is worshipped by his votaries; this kind of worship is pleasing to the great Deity as much as if, instead of the emblem, he were there himself. But the explanation fell short of satisfying me. I could not, young as I was, help suspecting misinterpretation and sophistry in all this. Feeling faint with hunger and fatigue, I begged to be allowed

* A mountain peak of the Himaláys,—where Shiva's heaven is believed to be situated.

to go home. My father consented to it, and sent me away with a Sepoy, only reiterating once more his command that I should not eat. But when, once home, I had told my mother of my hunger, she fed me with sweetmeats, and I fell into a profound sleep.

In the morning, when my father had returned and learned that I had broken my fast, he felt very angry. He tried to impress me with the enormity of my sin ; but do what he could, I could not bring myself to believe that that idol and Mahadeva were one and the same God, and, therefore, could not comprehend why I should be made to fast for and worship the former. I had, however, to conceal my lack of faith, and bring forward as an excuse for abstaining from regular worship my ordinary study, which really left me little or rather no time for any thing else. In this I was strongly supported by my mother, and even by my uncle, who pleaded my cause so well that my father had to yield at last and allow me to devote my whole attention to my studies. In consequence of this, I extended them to "Nighantu,"* "Nirukta"† "Purvamimánsa,"‡ and other Shástras, as well as to "Karmakáud" or the Rítual.

There were besides myself in the family two younger sisters and two brothers, the youngest of whom was born when I was already sixteen. On one memorable night, as we were attending a

* A Vedic vocabulary.

† Another treatise on the Vedic terminology.

‡ One of the six systems of philosophy by Jaimini, explanatory of Vedic doctrines.

*ghatka** festival at the house of a friend, a servant was despatched after us from home, with the terrible news that my sister, a girl of fourteen, had been just taken ill with a mortal disease. Notwithstanding every medical assistance, my poor sister expired within four *ghatkas*† after we had returned. It was my first bereavement, and the shock my heart received was great. While friends and relatives were sobbing and lamenting around me, I stood like one petrified, and plunged in a profound reverie. It resulted in a series of long and sad meditations upon the instability of human life. 'Not one of the beings that ever lived in this world could escape the cold hand of death'—I thought; I, too, may be snatched away at any time, and die. Whither, then, shall I turn for an expedient to alleviate this human misery, connected with our deathbed; where shall I find the assurance of, and means of attaining Muktee, the final bliss? It was there and then, that I came to the determination that I must find it, cost whatever it may, and thus save myself from the untold miseries of the dying moments of an unbeliever. The ultimate result of such meditations was to make me violently break, and for ever, with the mummeries of external mortification and penances, and the more to appreciate the inward efforts of the soul. But I kept my determination secret, and allowed no one to fathom my innermost thoughts. I was just eighteen then. Soon after, an uncle, a very learned man and full of divine qualities,—one who had shown for me the greatest tenderness, and whose favorite I had been

* Singing and dancing by professional woman.

† About half an hour.

from my birth, expired also ; his death leaving me in a state of utter dejection, and with a still profounder convictions settled in my mind, that there was nothing stable, in this world, nothing worth living for or caring for in a worldly life.

Although I had never allowed my parents to perceive what was the real state of my mind, yet I had been imprudent enough to confess to friends how repulsive seemed to me even the idea of a married life. This was reported to my parents, and they immediately determined that I should be betrothed at once, and the marriage solemnity performed as soon as I should be twenty.

Having discovered their intention, I did my utmost to thwart their plans. I caused my friends to intercede on my behalf, and pleaded my cause so earnestly with my father, that he promised to postpone my betrothal till the end of that year. I then began entreating him to send me to Benares, where I might complete my knowledge of Sanskrit grammar, and study astronomy and physics, until I had attained a full proficiency in these difficult sciences. But this time, it was my mother who violently opposed my wishes. She declared that I should not go to Benares, as whatever I might feel inclined to study, could be learned at home as well as abroad ; that I knew enough as it was, and had to be married anyhow before the coming year ; as young people through an excess of learning were apt to become too liberal and free sometimes in their ideas. I had no better success in that matter with my father. For, on the contrary, no sooner had I reiterated the favour I begged of him, and asked that

my betrothal should be postponed until I had returned from Benares a scholar, proficient in arts and sciences, than my mother declared that in such a case she would not consent even to wait till the end of the year, but would see that my marriage was celebrated immediately. Perceiving, at last, that my persistence only made things worse, I desisted, and declared myself satisfied with being allowed to pursue my studies at home, provided I was allowed to go to an old friend, a learned pundit, who resided about six miles from our town in a village belonging to our Jamádáree. Thither then, with my parent's sanction, I proceeded, and placing myself under his tuition, continued for some time quietly with my study. But while there, I was again forced into a confession of the insurmountable aversion I had for marriage. This went home again. I was summoned back at once, and found upon returning that everything had been prepared for my marriage ceremony. I had entered upon my twenty-first year, and so had no more excuses to offer. I now fully realized that I would neither be allowed to pursue my studies, any longer nor would my parents ever make themselves consenting parties to my celibacy. It was when driven to the last extremity that I resolved to place an eternal barrier between myself and marriage.

On an evening of the year Samvat 1903, without letting any one this time into my confidence, I secretly left my home, as I hoped, for ever. Passing the first night in the vicinity of a village about eight miles from my home, I arose three hours before dawn, and before night had again set in I had walked over thirty miles, carefully avoiding

the public thoroughfare, villages, and localities, in which I might have been recognized. These precautions proved useful to me, as on the third day after I had absconded, I learned from a Government officer that a large party of men, including many horsemen, were diligently roving about in search of a young man from the town of—who had fled from his home. I hastened further on to meet with other adventures. A party of begging Bráhmíns had kindly relieved me of all the money I had with me, and made me part even with my gold and silver ornaments, rings, bracelets, and other jewels, on the plea that the more I gave away in charities, the more my self-denial would benefit me in the after-life. Thus, having parted with all I had, I hastened on to the place of residence of a learned scholar, a man named Lála Bhagat, of whom I had much heard on my way from wandering Sanyásis and Bairágees (religious mendicants). He lived in the town of Sayale, where I met with a Brahmachári who advised me to join at once their holy order, which I did.

After initiating me into his order and conferring upon me the name of Shuddah Chaitanya, he made me exchange my clothes for the dress worn by them—a reddish-yellow garment. From thence, and in this new attire, I proceeded to the small principality of Koutugángad situated near Ahmedabad, where, to my misfortune, I met with a Bairági, a resident of a village in the vicinity of my native town, and who was well acquainted with my family. His astonishment was as great as my perplexity. Having naturally enquired how I came to be there, and in such an attire, he learned

of my desire to travel and see the world, he ridiculed my dress and blamed me for leaving my home for such an object. In my embarrassments he succeeded in getting himself informed of my future intentions. I told him of my desire to join in the Mella* of Kártik, which was to be held that year at Siddhpore, and that I was on my way to it. Having parted with him, I proceeded immediately to that place, and took my abode in the temple of Mahádeva at Neelkantha, where Dandi Swami and other Brahmacháris already resided. For a time, I enjoyed their society unmolested, visiting a number of learned scholars and professors of divinity who had come to the Mella, and associating with a number of holy men.

Meanwhile, the Bairági, whom I had met at Kout'ingánga, had proved treacherous. He had despatched a letter to my family, informing them of my intentions and pointing to my whereabouts. In consequence of this, my father had come down to Siddhpore with his Sepoys, traced me step by step in the Mella, learning something of me wherever I had sat among the learned pandits, and finally one fine morning appeared suddenly before me. His wrath was terrible to behold. He reproached me violently, accusing me of bringing an eternal disgrace upon his family. No sooner had I met his glance though, knowing well that there would be no use in trying to resist him, I suddenly made up my mind how to act. Falling at his feet with joined hands, I entreated him in supplicating tones to appease his anger. I had left the home through bad advice, I said ; I

* Mella is generally a religious gathering.

felt miserable, and was just on the point of returning home, when he had providentially arrived; and now I was willing to follow him home again. Notwithstanding such humility, in a fit of rage he tore my yellow robe into shreds, snatched at my *tumbá*,* and, wrenching it violently from my hand, flung it far away; pouring upon my head at the same time a volley of bitter reproaches, and going so far as to call me a matricide. Regardless of my promises to follow him, he gave me in the charge of his Sepoys, commanding them to watch me night and day, and never leave me out of their sight for a moment.

But my determination was as firm as his own. I was bent on my purpose and closely watched for my opportunity of escaping. I found it on the same night. It was three in the morning, and the Sepoy, whose turn it was to watch me, believing me asleep, fell asleep in his turn. All was still; and so, softly rising and taking along with me a *tumba* full of water, I crept out, and must have run over a mile before my absence was noticed. On my way, I espied a large tree, whose branches were overhanging the roof of a pagoda; on it I eagerly climbed, and, hiding myself among its thick foliage upon the dome, awaited what fate had in store for me. About 4 in the morning, I heard and saw through the apertures of the dome, the Sepoys enquiring after me, and making a diligent search for me inside as well as outside the temple. I held my breath and remained motionless, until, finally believing they were on the wrong track, my pursuers reluctantly

* A dried gourd to hold water.

retired. Fearing a new encounter, I remained concealed on the dome the whole day, and it was not till darkness had again set in that, alighting, I fled in an opposite direction. More than ever I avoided the public thoroughfares, asking my way of people as rarely as I could, until I had again reached Ahmedabad, whence I at once proceeded to Baroda. There I settled for some time; and at Chetan Math (temple) I held several discourses with Brahmānand and a number of Brahmachāris and Sanyāsis upon the Vedānta philosophy. It was Brahmānand and other holy men who established to my entire satisfaction that Brahm, the Deity, was no other than my own Self—my *Ego*, I am Brahm, a portion of Brahm; *Jiv* (Soul) and Brahm, the Deity, being one and the same. Formerly, while studying Vedānta, I had come to this opinion to a certain extent, but now the important problem was solved, and I gained the certainty that I was Brahm.*

At Baroda learning from a Benares woman that a meeting of the most learned scholars was to be held at a certain locality, I repaired thither at once; visiting a personage known as Satchidānand Paramhansa, with whom I was permitted to discuss upon various scientific and metaphysical subjects. From him I learned also, that there were a number of great Sanyāsis and Brahmachāris who resided at Chānoda Kanyāli. In consequence of this, I repaired to that place of sanctity on the banks of the Nurbuda, and there at last

* On the second thought the Swami perceived the absurdity of this doctrine and wrote a book, called *Vedant Dhwant Niraran* in refutation of Vedant.

met for the first time with real *Dikshets*, or initiated Yogis, and such Sanyasis as Chidashrama and several other Brahmacharis. After some discussion, I was placed under the tuition of one Parmānand Parāmhansa, and for several months studied "Vedāntar," "Arya Harimide Totak," "Vedānt Paribhasha," and other philosophical treatises. During this time, as a Brahmachari I had to prepare my own meals, which proved a great impediment to my studies. To get rid of it, I therefore concluded to enter, if possible, into the 4th Order of the Sanyasis.* Fearing, moreover, to be known under my own name, on account of my family's pride, and well aware that once received in this order I was safe, I begged of a Dekkani pandit, a friend of mine, to intercede on my

**Sanyas*. There are different conditions and orders prescribed in the Shastras. (1) *Brahmachari*—one who leads simply a life of celibacy, maintaining himself by begging while prosecuting his studies; (2) *Grohanthashrama*—one who leads a married but a holy life; (3) *Vanaprastha*—who lives the life of a hermit; (4) *Sanyas* or *Chaturthashrama*—this is the highest of the four; into which the members of either of the other three may enter, the necessary conditions for it being the renunciation of all worldly considerations. Following are the four different successive stages of this life: (A) *Kutechaka*;—living in a hut, or in a desolate place, and wearing a red-ochre coloured garment, carrying a three-knotted bamboo rod, and wearing the hair in the centre of the crown of the head, having the sacred thread, and devoting oneself to the contemplation of *Parabrahma*; (B) *Bahudaka*—one who lives quite apart from his family and the world, maintains himself on alms collected at seven houses, and wears the same kind of reddish garment; (C) *Hansa*—the same as in the preceding case, except the carrying of only a one-knotted bamboo; (D) *Parāmhansa*—the same as the others; but the sacred wears the sacred thread, and his hair and beard are quite long. This is the highest of all these orders. A *Parāmhansa* who shows himself worthy, is one the very threshold of becoming a *Dekshet*.

behalf with a *Diksheet*—the most learned among them, that I might be initiated into that order at once. He refused, however, point blank to initiate me, urging my extreme youth. But I did not despair. Several months later, two holy men, a Swami and a Bráhmachari, came from the Dekkan, and took up their abode in a solitary, ruined building, in the midst of a jungle, near Chanoda and about two miles distant from us. Profoundly versed in the Vedant philosophy, my friend, the Dekkani pandit, went to visit them, taking me along with him. A metaphysical discussion following, brought them to recognize in each other *Diksheets* of a vast learning. They informed us that they had arrived from "Shrungiree Math," the principal convent of Shankaracharya, in the south, and were on their way to Dwarka. To one of them Purnanand Saraswati, I got my Dekkani friend to recommend me particularly, and state, at the same time, the object I was so desirous to attain and my difficulties. He told him that I was a young Bráhmachari, who was very desirous to pursue his study in metaphysics unimpeded ; that I was quite free from any vice or bad habits for which fact he vouchsafed ; and that, therefore, he believed me worthy of being accepted in this highest probationary degree, and initiated into the 4th order of the Sanyásis ; adding that thus I might be materially helped to free myself from all worldly obligations, and proceed untrammelled in the course of my metaphysical studies. But this Swami also declined at first. I was too young, he said. Besides, he was himself a Maháráshtra, and so he advised me to appeal to a Gujrátí Swami. It was only when fervently urged

on by my friend, who reminded him that Dekkani Sanyāsīs can initiate even Gowdas, and that there could exist no such objection in my case, as I had been already accepted, and was one of the five *Dravida*, that he consented. And on the third day following he consecrated me into the order, delivering unto me a *Dand* * and naming me Dayānand Saraswati. By the order of my initiator though, and my proper desire, I had to lay aside the emblematical bamboo—the *Dand*, renouncing it for a while, as the ceremonial performances connected with it, would only interfere with unimpeded progress of my studies.

After the ceremony of initiation was over, they left us, and proceeded to Dwārka. For some time, I lived at Chānoda Kanyāli as a simple Sanyāsī. But upon hearing that at Vyāsishram there lived a Swami whom they called *Yoganand*, a man thoroughly versed in Yog, to him I addressed myself as an humble student, and began learning from him the theory as well as some of the practical modes of the science of Yog (or *Yoga Vidya*). When my preliminary tuition was completed, I proceeded to Ohbinour, as on the outskirts of this town lived Krishna Shastree, under whose guidance I perfected myself in the Sanskrit grammar, and again returned to Chānoda where I remained for some time longer. Meeting there two Yogis—Jwālānand Pooree and Shivānand Gires, I practiced Yog with them also, and we all three held together many a dissertation upon the exalted science of Yoga; until

* The three and seven knotted bamboo of the Sanyāsīs given to them as a sign of power after their initiation.

finally, by their advice, a month after their departure, I went to meet them in the temple of Doodheshwar, near Ahmedabad, at which place they had promised to impart to me the final secrets and modes of attaining Yoga Vidya. They kept their promise, and it is to them that I am indebted for the acquirement of the practical portion of that great science. Still later, it was divulged to me that there were many far higher and more learned Yogis than those I had hitherto met—yet not the highest still—who resided on the peaks of the mountain of Aboo, in Rajputana. Thither then I travelled again, to visit such noted places of sanctity as the *Alvada Bhawanee* and others; encountering, at last, those whom I so eagerly sought for, on the peak of Bhawanee Giree, and learning from them various other systems and modes of Yoga. It was in the year of Samvat 1911, that I first joined in the Kambhat Mella at Hardwar, where so many sages and divine philosophers meet, often unperceived, together. So long as the Mella congregation of pilgrims lasted, I kept practicing that science in the solitude of the jungle of Chandee; and after the pilgrims had separated, I transferred myself to Rishkeesh, where, sometimes in the company of good and pure Yogis and Sanyasis, oftener alone, I continued in the study and practice of Yoga.

After passing a certain time in solitude, on the Rishkeesh, a Brahminachari and two mountain ascetics joined me, and we all three went to Tehri. The place was full of ascetics and *Raj* (Royal) pandits—so called on account of their great learning. One of them invited me to come and have dinner with him at his house. At the

appointed hour he sent a man to conduct me safely to his place, and both the Brahmachari and myself followed the messenger. But what was our dismay upon entering the house, to first see a Brahmin preparing and cutting meat, and then, proceeding further into the interior apartments, to find a large company of pandits seated with a pyramid of flesh, rump-steaks, and dressed-up heads of animals before them ! The master of the house cordially invited me in ; but, with a few brief words—begging them to proceed with their good work and not to disturb themselves on my account, I left the house and returned to my own quarters. A few minutes later, the beef-eating pandit was at my side, praying me to return, and trying to excuse himself by saying that it was on my account that the sumptuous viands had been prepared ! I then firmly declared to him that it was all useless. They were carnivorous, flesh-eating men, and myself a strict vegetarian, who felt sickened at the very sight of meat. If he would insist upon providing me with food, he might do so by sending me a few provisions of grain and vegetables which my Brāhmachari would prepare for me. This he promised to do, and then, very much confused, retired.

Staying at Tehri for some time, I inquired of the same pandit about some books and learned treatises I wanted to get for my instruction ; what books and manuscripts could be procured at that place, and where. He mentioned some works on Sanskrit grammar, classics, lexicographies, books on astrology, and the *Tantras*—or ritualistics. Finding that the latter were the only ones unknown

to me, I asked him to procure the same for me. Thereupon the learned man brought to me several works upon this subject. But no sooner had I opened them, than my eye fell upon such an amount of incredible obscurities, mistranslations, misinterpretations of text, and absurdity, that I felt perfectly horrified. In this Ritual, I found that incest was permitted with mothers, daughters, and sisters (of the shoemaker's caste), as well as among the *Pariahs* or the outcastes,—and worship was performed in a perfectly nude state. Spirituous liquors, fish, and all kinds of animal food, and *Moodra* (exhibition of indecent images) were allowed, from Brahmin down to *Mung*. And it was explicitly stated that all those five things of which the name commences with the nasal *nyas* for instance, *Madya* (intoxicating liquor), *Māsen* (fish), *Maons* (fish), *Moodra*, and *Maitheon* (coition) were so many means for reaching *mokshas* (salvation) ! By actually reading the whole contents of the *Tantras* I fully assured myself of the craft and viciousness of the authors of this disgusting literature which is regarded as RELIGIOUS ! I left the place and went to Shreengar.

Taking up my quarters at a temple on Kedar Ghat, I used these *Tantras* as weapons against the local pandits, whenever there was an opportunity for discussion. While there, I became acquainted with a Sadhu, named Ganga Giri, who by day never left his mountain where he resided in a jungle. Our acquaintance resulted in friendship as I soon learned how entirely worthy he was of respect. While together, we discussed Yoga

and other sacred subjects, and through close questioning and answering became fully and mutually satisfied that we were fit for each other. So attractive was his society for me, that I stayed over two months with him. It was only at the expiration of this time, and when autumn was setting in, that I, with my companions, the Brahmachari and the two ascetics, left Kedar Ghat for other places. We visited Rudra Prayag and other cities, until we reached the shrine of Agasta Muneo. Further to the north, there is a mountain peak known as the Shivpooree (town of Shiva) where I spent the four months of the cold season; when, finally parting from the Brahmachari and the two ascetics, I proceeded back to Kedar, this time alone and unimpeded in my intentions, and reached *Gupta Kashee*.

I stayed but few days there, and went thence to the *Triyugee* Narayan shrine, visiting on my way Gowree Koond tank and the cave of Bhaemgoopha. Returning in a few days to Kedar, my favorite place of residence, I there finally rested, a number of ascetic Brahmin worshippers—called *pandas*, and the devotees of the Temple of Kedar of the Jangam sect,—keeping me company until my previous companions, the Brahmachari with his two ascetics, returned. I closely watched their ceremonies and doings, and observed all that was going on with a determined object of learning all that was to be known about these sects. But once that my object was fulfilled, I felt a strong desire to visit the surrounding mountains, with their eternal ice and glaciers, in quest of those true ascetics I had heard of, but as yet had

never met them. I was determined, come what might, to ascertain whether some of them did or did not live there as rumoured. But the tremendous difficulties of this mountainous journey and the excessive cold forced me, unhappily, to first make inquiries among the hill tribes and learn what they knew of such men. Everywhere I encountered either a profound ignorance upon the subject or a ridiculous superstition. Having wandered in vain for about twenty days, disheartened I retraced my steps, as lonely as before, my companions who had at first accompanied me, having left me two days after we had started through dread of the great cold. I then descended the Tunganah Peak. There, I found a temple full of idols and officiating priests, and hastened to descend the peak on the same day. Before me were two paths, one leading west and the other south-west. I chose at random that which led towards the jungle, and ascended it. Soon after, the path led me into a dense jungle, with rugged rocks and dried-up, waterless brooks. The path stopped abruptly there. Seeing myself thus arrested, I had to make my choice to either climb up still higher or descend. Reflecting what a height there was to the summit, the tremendous difficulties of climbing that rough and steep hill, and that the night would come before I could ascend it, I concluded that to reach the summit that night was an impossibility. With much difficulty, however, catching at the grass and the bushes, I succeeded in attaining the higher bank of the Nálá (the dry brook), and standing on a rock, surveyed the environs. I saw nothing but tormented hillocks

highland, and a dense pathless jungle covering the whole, where no man could pass. Meanwhile the sun was rapidly descending towards the horizon. Darkness would soon set in, and then—without water or any means for kindling a fire, what would be my position in the dreary solitude of that jungle!

By dint of tremendous exertions though, and after an acute suffering from thorns, which tore my clothes to shreds, wounded my whole body, and lamed my feet, I managed to cross the jungle, and at last reached the foot of the hill and found myself on the highway. All was darkness around and over me, and I had to pick my way at random, trying only to keep to the road. Finally I reached a cluster of huts, and learning from the people that that road led to Okhee Math, I directed my steps towards that place, and passed the night there. *In the morning, feeling sufficiently res'ed* I returned to the *Gupta Kashee* from whence I started on my northward journey. But that journey attracted me, and soon again I repaired to Okhee Math, under the pretext of examining that hermitage and observing the way of living of its inmates. There I had time to examine at leisure the doings of that famous and rich monastery, so full of pious pretences and a show of asceticism. The high priest (or Chief Hermit), called *Mahant*, tried hard to induce me to remain and live there with him, becoming his disciple. He even held before me the prospect, which he thought quite dazzling, of inheriting some day his hoards of rupees, his splendour and power, and finally succeeding him in his *Mahantship* or

supreme rank. I frankly answered him that had I ever craved any such riches or glory, I would not have secretly left the house of my father, which was not less sumptuous or attractive than his monastery, with all its riches. The object, which induced me to do away with all these worldly blessings, I added, "I find you neither strive for, nor possess the knowledge of." He then enquired what was that object for which I so strived. "That object," I answered, "is the secret knowledge, the Vidya, or true erudition of a genuine Yog ; the *Mooktes*, which is reached only by the purity of one's soul, and certain attainments unattainable without it ; in the meanwhile, the performance of all the duties of man towards his fellow-men, and the elevation of humanity thereby."

The *Mahant* remarked that it was very good, and asked me to remain with him for some time at least. But I kept silent and returned no reply : I had not yet found what I sought. Rising on the following morning very early, I left this rich dwelling and went to Jeshu Math. There, in the company of Dakshaneer or Maharashtra Shastrees and Sannyasis, the true ascetics of the 4th Order, I rested for a while. "

He then started for the plains, and in 1916 A. V. went to Mathura to read and revise his study with Swami Virjanand, who was an accomplished Vedic scholar of his times. His Vedic knowledge was so great and perfect that, it is said, he saw all knowledge centered in the Vedas. It was his firm belief that the Indian schools of philosophy and logic, systems of law and polity, moral and natural sciences can all be derived from

them. He was thoroughly at home in the *Asht-
adhyayi*, Panini's Vedic and Sanscrit grammar. Patanjali's famous commentary on it, called the *Mahabhashya*, voluminous as it is, was on his tip of tongue. Whatever book he taught, he taught from his memory. Nature seems to have given him an uncommon lot of this faculty in compensation for his want of sight. The vulgar opinion of the incompatibility of memory and understanding met with radical refutation in him. His power of intellect was as considerable and extraordinary as his marvellous and astonishing retention of memory. The interpretation of the holy Vedas after the ancient sages of India, which encountered so much opposition from the representatives of modern Sanscrit learning on account of its apparent novelty in the present oblivion of older times, traced its origin from the wonderful literary genius of this sightless saint. His strict and constant adherence to the sense of the Vedic precepts in practice made him discard the toleration of idolatry. It is said that happening to meet with the *Saligram*, an idol worshipped by the Hindus, he threw it away into the street to the great astonishment of the spectators, declaring that the *Saligram* never meant that piece of stone. The profundity of his learning prevented such an open disregard of popular superstition in the cradle of idolatry from calling forth the resentment of the people. The merit of his matchless mind was ever held in high estimation by the inhabitants of Mathura, who paid equal reverence to him with the priests of paganism. Though averse to their present practice, the Brahmins sent their youths to him for instruction. His curriculum of studies

consisted of Sanscrit books of remote antiquity. The mediæval literature of Sanscrit, fascinating and prevalent as it is, was not only excluded from the course of instruction, but no pupil was to have its book by him while receiving education from him. His penetration detected many mistakes in epic, dramatic, ecclesiastic and neo-Vedantic writing. The effeminate writing of Kalidas was rejected by him as void of sense and full of mistakes. The *Siddhant Koumudi*, the present popular grammar of Sanscrit, was repudiated as erroneous. A long list of its blunders, Pt. Yogal Kishore one of his pupils informed me, was once sent to a very famous Sanscrit scholar on his visit to Mathura through the pundit himself with a request to see and to stop the spreading of them any long. The Acharya at first gave no heed to what Pandit Yogal Kishore, then a boy, read to him. But when the next time the same was again pressed upon him, he examined the list and found that the *Siddhant Koumudi* really contained blunders or deviations from the proper idiom of Sanscrit, and consequently it gave no help in rendering the Vedas. He was so much impressed by his learning, that the next day he went to see the Swami with a present of sweetmeat. In the interview he expressed his inability to do any thing towards it. The Swami, in his early life, lived some time at the court of the Raja of Alwar ; but the luxury of court soon made him sick of the company of aristocracy and he retired to Mathura for good and all. There are several pupils of his living at present. But long wait of time an-

अज्ञानान्तराले प्रोक्तं
 तत्र
 दयानन्द महिला मा

1671

his name both in gratitude and in memory at the conclusion of each chapter of his commentary on the Vedas. Our Swamiji once remarked at Prayag that, had the saint been living then, he would have done a world of good to the people at large, as he had the whole circle of Indian knowledge at his fingers' end, so to speak, which circumstance, when known to the people, would have brought them at once to their senses.

The death of the saint was something very wonderful. He predicted his death some days before, and was slightly sick for a short time. When he was to die, he told his attendant pupils to take him to his usual seat of teaching. He sat there against a bolster as he used to do when instructing the pupils. When seated, he composed himself for trance. But shortly after a slight fall of his hand indicated to his anxiously watching pupils that the spirit passed away gently into the heaven. When the news of his death was heard by the people of Mathura, a great gloom of sorrow was cast on them. But they soon recovered as they found that it was useless to lament for the departed spirit. They made a grand preparation for the conveyance of his corpse for funeral, which was attended by thousands of people. This occasion well illustrated that his vast learning commanded the respect even of his enemies. Such was the man with whom our Swami went to read. When our Swami requested the saint to teach him, he told him to draw all the modern books which he had in the Jamna, on which he was situated. This appeared to him a

saint meant it seriously and made it a *sine qua non*, he obeyed him with alacrity to the letter, and consigned his learned load to the dull and unconscious stream of the Janna. He then commenced the *Ashtadhyayi* of Panini and the *Mahabhashya*. When he had finished these, he read other books after the manner of ancient sages as taught by Saint Virjanand. After his course of study was over, he took leave of the saint who gave him his last advice, which was pregnant with the good and greatness of India. It was that he should in his life try his best to revive the study of Panini and Patanjali's commentary on it, called the *Mahabhashya*, which were the key, as it were, to the true interpretation of the Vedas. He was fully confident that no sooner the true sense of the Vedas dawned upon the mind of people, than they would cast off the slough of superstition and ignorance, which harass and infest and corrode the heart of the Indian world. Swami Dayahand himself knew the importance of the saint's golden advice. And none can doubt that no spiritual father was ever obeyed more faithfully than Swami Virjanand by Dayanand Saraswati, who devoted his whole life in carrying out the wishes of the saint and sacrificed his ease and comfort for the accomplishment of this noble object; for, it was the panacea for all the present evils of India. The advice contained the seed of the Arya Samaj which is explained elsewhere.

He afterwards visited Jeypore and other towns in Rajputana and North-West Provinces. At Agra he stayed some years and used to preach the Vedic religion to the people who flocked round him,

At leisure he practised *Yoga* in the vicinity. It is said that he was so expert in rivetting his attention and holding his respiration in the meditation of God, that he could pass into trance for so long as full 18 hours ! It resulted ultimately in the extraordinary exaltation of his mental faculties.

Then he went to Hardwar and there gave away in alms whatever he had by him,—books, clothes, and the like. He then wandered along the banks of the Ganges between Hardwar and Benares. In that time and ever since he became the mirror of all the qualities of a Sannyasi which are mentioned in the *Gita*, i.e. the absence of pride, control over the senses, resignation of the self, perfection in knowledge, constant reverence, contemplation of God; and the like.

In those days he preached only in Sanscrit. His intention was that the pandits, who are generally Sanscrit scholars, might help him in propagating the religion of the Vedas. But when he saw that his preaching produced no result, he was unable to account for it. However, a good pandit told him that he was misinterpreted to the people by the designing pandits in Vernacular. Accordingly he went from place to place holding discussions with the pandits, whose ignorance of the ancient books such as the Vedas and the like rendered them quite incapable of maintaining their ground. Although they were convinced of their error, yet they still persisted in their old pernicious customs, and misled their lay clients. At last he gave up this course in despair.

He then thought of another plan. It was that through the agency of the rich a few schools should be opened in some towns for the instruction of good and intelligent pupils who might become missionaries to preach the religion of the Vedas and introduce among the people the ancient mode of study, as well as the right interpretation of the Vedas. Accordingly, 4 schools were established at Furruckabad, Mirzapur, Coshgung, Chhaparshwar, and the pandits on 30 or 40 Rs. a month were engaged to impart instruction therein. The rich people were induced to give food, clothing, and books *gratis* to the pupils. The object was that when the pupils of these schools turned out able and proficient, they might help to carry out the wishes of the Sage Virjanand, *viz.* to interpret the Vedas correctly, to exhort the people to study true Sanscrit books and to give up the study of mischievous^d new ones, which have, as it were, covered the whole land with mental darkness. He made rules for the management of these schools and himself inspected them, nay, he even stopped a month or two at each place to show them his method and eradicated the errors he noticed in them. But all this came to nothing, as the pandits were too superstitious and bigoted to promise any kind of improvement. Of these schools, none but that of Furruckabad exists at present.

The third plan he adopted was to make some books for circulation among the people and to lecture the assembled people in different towns on the old methods of the interpretation of the Vedas and the true meaning of the scriptures in

the time of the Rishies, so that the people might become alive to the degraded conditions of their religion, and with it of themselves, and might turn their attention to elevate their fallen state. With this view in mind, he visited great towns and lectured people, who attended by thousands. A brief account here of his visits to some of the large towns of India, it is hoped, will not meet with the disapproval of the reader.

The *Christian Intelligencer* of March, 1870, thus describes his visit to Benares:—

A HINDU REFORMER.—The fame of the reformer who lately put the whole city of Benares in commotion seems to have gone abroad. Some account, therefore, of him and his views and the public disputation held with him, from one who was present at the disputation, and met and conversed with the reformer several times before and after that event, will perhaps be not uninteresting to the readers of the *Intelligencer*.

The name of the reformer is Dayananda Saraswati Swami. He is a native of some village in Guzerat. He is a fine-looking man large and well proportioned, his face, especially, expressive of much intelligence. His outward appearance is that of a Sanyasi or religious beggar, almost entirely naked and besmeared with the sacred bhāsmā (ashes of cow-dung). He speaks Sanscrit fluently. He is a good reasoner and pretty fair in controversy, at least so far that he generally allows his opponent to state his case without interruption; but extremely authoritative in all his positions. His case and mind is made up, and believing his

acquaintance with the Vedas to be superior to that of any of his adversaries, he will listen with a kind of contemptuous courtesy to anything that they may have to bring forward, and often, especially in the case of inferior pandits, only answer by an authoritative assertions of the contrary. He is well versed in the Vedas. He devoted himself entirely to the study of the Vedas from his eleventh year, and thus he is more practically conversant with them than most if not all of the great pandits of Benares, who generally know them only second hand or even less. At any rate, and this is the most remarkable feature distinguishing him from other pandits, he is an independent student of the Vedas, and free from the trammels of traditional interpretation. The standard commentary, of the famous Sāyanāchārya is held of little account by him. It can be no wonder, therefore, that his Vedic studies conducted in that spirit, led him to the conviction, that almost the whole of the (comparatively) modern Hinduism is in entire and irreconcilable contradiction with the Vedas.

Being an active character, he determined not to keep his conviction to himself but to impart it to his countrymen and to try to effect an entire reform of Hindu society. Briefly, his object is to place Hindu society exactly into the same state as it was...when...none...existed...of the 18 Purānas, the source of modern Hinduism with its caste and idolatry, but when one God only was adored, and the Vedas only were studied, and the sacrifice of the homa only...was performed. He travels up and down the banks of the Ganges, and stops here and there in the large towns to disseminate his

views, but, as far as I could ascertain, he seems to have met nowhere with much success except in Farrukabad near Cawnpore, where, indeed, if report is to be trusted, his success has been complete. The Brahmins of that place are said to have declared for him and to have cleared the temples of all idols. It is certain that a very rich Mahájan of that place has become a convert to his views, and has established a school where the reformed Hinduism is taught.

The date of his arrival in Benares I do not know. It must have been in the beginning of October. I was then absent. I first saw him after my return in November. I went to see him in company with the Prince of Bharatpore and one or two pandits. The excitement was then at its height. The whole of the Brahmanic and educated population of Benares seemed to flock to him. In the verandah of a small house at the end of a large garden near the monkey-tank, he was holding daily levees, from early in the morning till late in the evening, for a continuous stream of people who came, eager to see and listen to, or dispute with the novel reformer. It does not appear, however, that the heads of the orthodox party or the pandits of the greatest repute ever visited him, unless they did it secretly. The intensity of the excitement at last induced the Raja of Benares in concert with his court pandits and other men of influence, to take some notice of the reformer, and to arrange a public disputation between him and the orthodox party, in order to allay the excitement by a defeat of the reformer. But I fear there was a determination from the

beginning that they would win the day by any means whether foul or fair. The disputation took place on the 17th of November, in the place where the reformer had taken up his abode ; it lasted from about 2 to 7 o'clock P. M. The Raja himself was present and presided...The discussion commenced by Dayananda asking Pandit Tara-charana, the Raja's court pandit, who had been appointed to defend the cause of orthodoxy, whether he admitted the Vedas as the authority. When this had been agreed to, he requested Tārācharana to produce passages from the Vedas sanctioning idolatry, *pāshāvadīpujana* (worship of stones, &c). Instead of doing this Tārācharana for some time tried to substitute proofs from the Purānas. At last Dayananda happening to say that he only admitted the Manusmriti, Shāriraksūtras, &c., as authoritative, because founded on the Vedas, Vishudhananda the great Vedāntist interfered, and quoting a Vedant Sutra from the Shāriraka Sūtras asked Dayananda to show that it was founded on the Vedas. After some hesitation Dayananda replied that he could do this only after referring to the Vedas, as he did not remember the whole of them. Vishudhānanda then tauntingly said if he could not do that, he should not set himself up as a teacher in Benares. Dayananda replied, that none of the pandits had the whole of the Vedas in his memory. Thereupon Vishudhananda and several others asserted that they knew the whole of the Vedas by heart. Then followed several questions...put by Dayananda to show that his opponents had asserted more than they could justify. They could answer none of his questions. At last some pandits took up the

thread of the discussion again by asking Dayananda whether the term *pratīma* (likeness) and *purāṇi* (fulness) occurring in the Vedas did not sanction idolatry. He answered that, rightly interpreted, they did not do so. As none of his opponents objected to his interpretation, it is plain, that they either perceived the correctness of it, or were too little acquainted with the Vedas to venture to contradict it. Then Mādhavāchārya, a pandit of no repute, produced two leaves of a Vedic MS., and, reading a passage* containing the word "Purāṇas," asked to what this term referred. Dayananda replied: it was there simply an adjective, meaning "ancient," and not the proper name. Vishudhananda, challenging this interpretation, some discussion followed as to its grammatical correctness; but, at last, all seemed to acquiesce in it. Then Mādhavāchārya again produced two other leaves of a Vedic MS. and read a passage† with this purport, that upon the completion of a *yajna* (sacrifice) the reading of the Purāṇs should be heard on the 10th day, and asked how the term "Purāṇas" could be there an adjective. Dayananda took the MS. in his hands and began to meditate what answer he should give. His opponents waited but two minutes, and as still no answer was forthcoming, they rose, jeering and calling out that he was unable to answer and was defeated, and went away. The answer, he afterwards published in his pamphlet.

* ब्राह्मणशास्त्रीविद्यायाः पुराणानि.

† यज्ञसमाप्तौ दशमं दिवसं पुराणानां पाठनं यजमाने.

As it (that passage) is out of a Brâhmana of the Sânaveda, which contains many modern additions, its value would after all be not much in the eyes of non-Hindus, and, I suspect, even of Dayananda; for he once admitted to me that the Brâhmanas did contain modern interpolated portions, and that any passage sanctioning idolatry, was to be considered as such, a spurious portion."

He went several times to Benares that the pundits might have no excuse left in preparing themselves for discussion with him. Though he had refuted their present religion in public lectures, yet they durst not confront him in defence of their creed. As it was a custom with him always to give notice to the people wherever he went, inviting them to discuss with him to ascertain the true religion, it would not be irrelevant to insert here a translation of his notice to the people of Benares on his seventh arrival there in 1936 A. V. The reticence of the Brahmins on so many splendid occasions for sifting the true from the false systems of religion, proves, in the mind of people in general, that the idolatry and superstition of the ignorant masses, which they so earnestly defend against the dictum of their own sacred books, meet with no support in the Holy Veda, the only book of universal religion, and the true Word of God. The notice runs as follows;—

It is hereby notified to the public that Swami Dayanand Saraswati has come down to Benares and put up in the garden of Anand Bag, of Maharajah Vijaynagar near Mahomed Gung. He

professes Vedic religion and rejects all others that are against the spirit of the Vedas. He refutes the doctrines of the worship of images, the power of remitting sins of a particular piece of land or water, the books called the *Brahmavivartak* and the like *Purans* spuriously ascribed to Vyas, the incarnation of God, the son of God and his power of mediation in behoof of his votaries and of procuring them salvation, the commission of prophets to preach religion, the uplifting of mountains, the raising of the dead, the splitting of the moon, the belief in the creation of the world without a cause, the unbelief of God or atheism, the self-assumed title of Brahma, the identity of soul and God, the telling on a rosary, the sandal badge on the forehead, the wearing of the chaplets of the berries of the *eleocarpus* round the neck, Shivism, Vishnuism, Ganesbism, and the similar forms of heathenism; which are all contrary to the nature of God, the teaching of the Vedas, the laws of nature, the evidence of logic, the judgement and conduct of the righteous, the dictates of reason, and the test of true knowledge. Those pandits and gentlemen, who are proficient in their scriptures and think the above statement to be untrue, may discuss with Dayanand Saraswati and, if possible, prove those doctrines to be true. In discussions the Vedas and the books composed from the time of Brahma down to that of Jaimini, such as *Aitareya* and *Purvamimansa*, which are in harmony with the Vedas, and which are written by the Rishis, will be regarded as authority for reference. The audience of such meetings for disputation should be impartial, learned, and free from prejudice.

Three writers will note down the questions and answers of disputants. These will be subscribed and confirmed by both the parties at the end of debate, when each of them as well as the president of the meeting shall receive a copy of the writing. It will be a great shame if the pundits of Benares do not now exert themselves to distinguish truth from falsehood, to accept the former and reject the latter; and not only this, but persuade others to do the same, so that all may enjoy the blessings of knowledge and happiness.

The above notice sufficiently proves that Swami Dayanand Saraswati zealously worked for the good of all people, inasmuch as he tried to eradicate their errors which are the root of pain and misery in the world. He was as much friend of the Christians and Mahomedans as of the Hindus, and nobody was more anxious and desirous than himself of the purity of their religion, of the prosperity of their sub-lunar career, and of the felicity of their spiritual life. He taught no sectarian religion beneficial to a particular race of humankind; but he held out the universal religion of the Vedas which is based on the economy of nature, the common mother of all the creatures. In his life he never rested and settled down in one place, but travelled thousands of miles to deliver the divine message of the Vedas to all the children of the Lord, so that none might be left unprofited from his labor and learning.

In 1829 A. V., or 1872 A. C., Swami Dayanand Saraswati went to Calcutta. As usual, lectures were delivered by him. When his doctrines were known by the people, they were quite startled.

But none came to discuss with him, as the knowledge of the Vedas which he preached was little to be found among the pandits. However, Pandit Tara Churan, a court pandit of the Maharajah of Benares, happening to be there, expressed his desire to Rajah Jogendra Mohan Tagore, with whom he was put up, to hold discussion with the Swamiji. But it is strange to say that though the people tried to bring on the intended debate, yet the pandit put it off from day to day, till they were tired of his unreadiness. To waste no further time in the botheration of the pandit, the Swamiji started for Nagli, where he lodged in the garden of Babu Brindaban Chandra Mandal. The respectable gentlemen of the place arranged for a lecture. Pt. Tara Churan was invited to say what he liked. But there also he disappointed the people, who began to entertain an unfavorable opinion of his learning. Upon this, Babu Brindaban Chandra and other gentlemen again requested him to a debate, as the Swamiji had showed in his lecture that their present faith was based upon the ignorance of their true religion, the Divine commandments delivered to the sages at creation. The pandit consented and came with a number of his followers. After the ceremony of reception, he was requested to select a subject and commence a discussion of it.

Pandit.—I shall prove the propriety of image worship.

Swamiji.—Very well; you may do whatever you like. But as idolatry is opposed to the teachings of the Vedas, I shall refute it.

P.—Is the debate to be conducted according to the laws of argumentation in calm and cool way, or is it to end in mere wrangling, paralogy, or war of tongue?

S.—The debate shall be strictly conducted according to the rules of reasoning laid down by Gotama, the famous founder of the Indian school of logic. Mere caviling and hair-splitting do not become the erudition of pandits.

P.—Quite so; proper discussion in the logical sense of the term should only be maintained.

N. B.—It was agreed to by both the parties that the four Vedas, six schools of philosophy, six scriptures or helps to the Vedas, should be recognized as the only authority in matters of dispute to the exclusion of all other books whatever.

P.—यत्तद्विद्मि ह्यस्य चित्तस्य आश्रयस्ते ह्यस्य आश्रयेति विद्वन् इति व्यासवचनम्—an aphorism of Patanjali's says that the mind is never stable without the check of some material object. Hence a material or sensible object is necessary in meditation, in other words, an image is required in worship. At least, so is said by Vyas.

S.—It is not an aphorism of Patanjali's; but what is found in his book is, चित्तव्यवस्थाय नमश्चः स्मृतिं चित्तव्यवस्थाय इति—any object can check the fickleness of mind. Hence Vyas in his commentary says नासुनिश्चये चित्तव्यवस्था इति—the attention should be fixed on the tip of the nose. The wrong citation and incorrect reading indicate your unacquaintance with the philosophy of yoga. The very assertion contradicts itself. In the

beginning you said that it was Patanjali's, and at the end you ascribed it to Vyasa. But it is to be met with in neither. Besides, if it is of Patanjali, it can not be at the same time of Vyasa, and *vice versa*.

P.—अक्षय द्वावाहनी मया चामीनः स च क्षुभ्रविषयत्वात्
 क्षय इत्यादि—what is seen by the eye, is impressed on or known by the mind. It follows, therefore, that, to be known by the mind, the object of adoration must be perceptible, a circumstance, which, consequently, establishes the worship of images.

S.—You agreed at the outset of the discussion to refer for authority to the Vedas and the other true books mentioned above. Why do you, then, quote the authority Vachaspati? Also, just consider that as long as man wakes, he sees all as material; but when he dreams at night, he sees things no material things, i.e. the things of dream cease to be material. Hence, according to your opinion, man should have no knowledge of things in dream,—in plain words, he should have no dream at all. But this is contrary to facts. Hence your argument falls to the ground. You promised not to indulge in useless controversy; but this assertion launched you upon the very ocean of interdiction. How can you maintain your cause by taking stand on such an untenable ground? It at best tries to prove that the mind can be fixed on a corporeal object only. But corporeal objects are trees, horses, stones, bricks, or the like. Which of these do you take for meditating on? Images are not the only corporeal objects, that you so much insist upon them.

P.—एदुक्तं भवता तेनेन प्रतिमापुत्रममेव विध्यतेत्याः
 स्वुक्तान्—your own assertion proves the worship
 of images ; for, they are material or corporeal
 things.

S.—Your repeating the word एव thrice shows
 your poverty of Sanscrit knowledge. How can you
 maintain the possibility of direct worship in
 this lower world of Vishnu, the quadrumanus,
 who lives in the higher region of paradise ? Also,
 how can an image or statue, made by an artificer
 of stone, metal, or clay, be Vishnu himself ?

P.—अथ च यदा पितृन् चावाहयति तेन पदलोकेन संपन्नो
 भवतिपते. This passage proves the possibility of
 worship of a being living in distant quarters.

S.—It has no connection with the subject
 under discussion ; for, it does not relate to
 worship. Its purport is that an adept *yogi*, who
 has acquired eight kinds of miraculous powers,
 can go to any place he likes. Thus, when he wants
 to go to the regions of the manes, he translates
 himself there and enjoys the pleasures found
 therein. But it does not support your proposi-
 tion, that he goes there after death or worships
 the manes in this world.

P.—तत्रच प्रतिमापि इतरे द्रव्येभ्योऽपि—the image
 is included in the material things, which are
 the objects of worship. You should bear in mind
 that we do not cavil or trifle away our time, but
 wish to discuss out the subject fairly.

S.—Your persistency in taking images for
 corporeal things, from there being one common
 quality of materiality in them both, contradicts

your former resolution, that you will not have recourse to elench or sophistry.

P.—प्रथमः अकारिः यत्.....

S.—Your Sanscrit is wrong, and it has no connection with the matter under discussion as well. It should be प्रथमवीर्यकारिणम्

P.—It is not necessary that all the points or qualities should be found in an example.

S.—When did I call for complete similarity in all points of an example to its proposition? Your assertion does not bear you out. Hence the proof and the assertion are both absurd.

P.—उपासना वापमेव अनसूयम्—all worship is false or deceitful.

S.—Hollo! You refute yourself. When you can not prove the worship of images or idolatry, you say that it is false. Hence, it is condemned out of your own mouth.

Thus Pandit Tara Charan himself confessed that idolatry was false or illusive. But he alone is not to blame in this matter. The whole community of pandits all over the country believes so in the heart. The dread of losing livelihood, which it derives from the superstition of the ignorant masses, keeps up the fares of idolatry among the Brahmins who are men of learning. Their flock is in dread of their anathemas in case of heretical opinions, while they are afraid of provoking the wrath of ignorance. Thus both the leader and the led, though enlightened by the beams of the Vedic dawn, continue consciously in the wrong path of hypocrisy and fetichism.

We here insert the account of his visit to Chuprah from a writer who saw him personally.

Early in the summer of 1873, Swami Dayanand Saraswati went to Chuprah, a town in the province of Belar. He was received by Rai Shéogolam, a wealthy zemindar of the place. This gentleman, who had ever been a zealous patron of such holy enterprises, gave a cordial welcome to the sage, in spite of the Brahminical intrigues which usually accompanied his travels. He was entertained in a spacious hall well furnished with every kind of accommodation. The love and respect which the honeyed words of the Swamiji gained for him from his host, excited the bitter jealousy of the Brahmins, and they quickly spread a rumour in the whole city that a powerful nastik (atheist) had encroached upon their dominions. A notice of his arrival and of his desire to discuss upon the Vedic ideas of God and Paracanic systems of theology was given to the public.

In the morning and evening men of every class and rank gathered from every quarter of the city. They would stare at the graceful figure of the Swamiji sitting in a silver chair upon a raised platform. They would be charmed by the fluency of his speech and surprised at the pusillanimity of their pandits, whom they so highly venerated as they poured forth their eloquence at home. The pen is too weak to describe the command which he exercised over the gazing multitude. He had a prominent forehead indicative of exceptional mental powers. His look was commanding and full of fire, his manner of speaking was at once serious and dignified, and, when his speech mounted

the climax, his voice resounded in the all arches of the mansion. His brown coloured toga, girtled up near above the chest and hanging loosely down to the ankle, reminded one of the classic Hishas and Satyag. Instead of shoes he had wooden sandals on. The air of gravity which his face excited marked awe and terror in the minds of his opponents. His fixed determination to achieve some higher end cast a melancholy grace upon his countenance. Thus he lived and thus he sat at Chuprah.

The numerical superiority of the Brahmins was no advantage to them. However, they soon formed themselves into a band of begging-friars, well equipped, if not with arguments, at least with their bludgeons; such was the hatred they bore him. They implored one day the mercy of Pandit Jagan Nath, a popular priest of the city, who would not grace the Sabha with his hallowed presence. He refused them his assistance, stating that if he went there he should be under the painful necessity of talking to a *nastik*, when his religion forbade him from seeing his face, and for which a severe penalty would be required of him. The band was then hopelessly to disperse without any result, when they got a piece of advice from the mercy of the sage himself. The Swamiji, kind even unto his enemies, showed them a way how it was possible that the adversary might avoid the penalty so incurred and still argue with him. He said that a screen might be hung before his face whose sight constituted a sin to the proud pandit. Even this proposal was reluctantly received; but caught into a dilemma he was obliged to come. Every one was anxiously

waiting for the pandit upon whom depended the fate of the day. The pandit at last came with his pupils and a screen was actually hung between them. The Swamiji first opened the proceedings by putting some *Sūtrā* questions to him in Sanskrit in which he always spoke. The answer of the pandit was full of grammatical mistakes and blunders about matters of fact, which the Swamiji pointed out to the audience on every occasion. Having made a perfect fool of him, he harangued the whole assembly for four hours together uninterruptedly. The friars clearly saw that they had lost the day and that their names would be covered with eternal shame. They at once abruptly got up exclaiming, "The Vedas are being blasphemed." They fled away, the more wicked of them threatening to stone the Swamiji to death if he met them on the highroad. He remained at Chuprah for a fortnight closely guarded by his kind host. One day when he went to visit the local school, every class stood up to do him honour. He then left for Dinapore all safe and sound.

When the Swamiji was at Lucknow, he thus answered the following questions of Lala Brij Lal, Rais of Lucknow :—

Q. What are the Brahmanas, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Sudras? When were they so divided? Who was it that classed them into four castes?

A. The four classes are made by the nature of men's occupation. For example, the teachers of the science of divinity are called the Brahmanas; the conductors of military affairs, the Kshatriyas;

the traders in commodities, the Vaishayas ; and menial servants, the Shudras.

He is not a Brahmana, who follows the profession of arms, and so forth with the rest.

Thus the classification of men into castes is based upon their callings, and not, as is now regarded, upon birth. Hereditary castes, irrespective of profession, have come into existence after the Great War.

Q. Are not the Brahmanas born from God's mouth and the Kshatriyas from his arms ?

A. The true meaning of the Vedic text, divested of the metaphor, which has given rise to such absurd notions is, that scientific-men hold the same position in the society of God's creatures that the head does in the structure of the body, that is to say, they are the foremost of all men in virtue of the excellence of knowledge. In like manner, the other classes may be explained away.

A. Why do the Brahmanas wear the sacred thread ?

A. It is the outward mark of their proficiency in knowledge.

Q. What kinds of works ought to be done ?

A. Virtuous acts alone ought to be done.

Q. What are they ?

A. They are veracity, beneficence, and the like acts of general good and welfare.

Q. What is veracity ?

A. It is to tell the truth, and never to tell lies. The tongue should express what is in the heart.

Q. What do you think of idolatry ?

A. It is bad. People should never worship images. The spread of mental darkness is due to the prevalence of idolatry.

Q. How can we contemplate God without an object or idol ?

A. We should meditate upon God just in the same way as we think or form notion of pleasure and pain. No images are not required in contemplation.

Q. What should be done in regard to devotion ?

A. The ceremony of telling matins and vespers, and the practice of truth and beneficence should always be duly observed.

Q. Should we perform devotion thrice a day ?

A. No. The morning and evening are the only times for devotion.

Q. Are the repetition of God's name and ritual formulae, and the performance of a cumbrous ceremonial, as done by the modern Brahmanas, proper ?

A. People should try to know God, and imitate him in their works. Repetitious and ceremonials are of no use.

Q. Has God any form or color ?

A. God has neither form nor color. He is incorporeal and immense.

Whatever is seen in the world, describes his greatness. The universe being made by him may be allegorically regarded as a means to allay the mental thirst of his sight.

Q. Why is God not seen in the world?

A. (1) Were God to make his appearance in the world, all the people would run up to him to ask the gratification of their desires and so confound the whole arrangement of the world. (2) By means of the elements the human body is composed of, the vision of God is impossible. (3) How can man see him who has created him?

Q. How can God be known when he is not seen?

A. Seen he is. All these things, viz., men, animals, trees, &c, seen upon the face of the earth, point out to their maker. This way he is seen through his works. And He can be distinguished as we discriminate pleasure and pain.

Q. Is Brahma or God in all of us or not?

A. He is in all. He is known to us just the same way as we feel pleasure and pain.

Q. Is he uniform everywhere, or is he more or less in different places?

A. He is everywhere alike, only that he exists in us in proportion to the glory of the divine intelligence in our mind, i.e. knowledge.

Q. What are the gods?

A. They are called gods who are learned and intelligent, i.e. true pandits.

Q. Is it a sin to see the *Ramleela* or *Rasleela* ?

A. Yes; it is a sin, equal to a thousand crimes. In the same manner, idolatry is sinful; for, no likeness can be taken without a form, but where there is no form, there can be no image. It is proper to take photos or other kinds of pictures of persons to put them before us for sight or remembrance. But it is improper to make pictures and images of God and to take his likenesses therefrom to his great distortion.

Q. How long has Sanscrit been in the world, and why is it called good ?

A. Sanscrit is from eternity, it is pure and correct, it has no match. For example, B in Persian is expressed or represented as Bay, and in English Bee; but B which does not contain either, ay or ee is only represented truly in Sanscrit.

Q. The Vedas contain the praise of God. Has he written his own praise ?

A. As the parents instruct their children to serve their parents and teachers and obey their orders, so God, by way of instruction, has given us the Vedas.

Q. When God has neither form nor body, how can he have a mouth to pronounce the Veda ?

A. God inspired them in the hearts of the four sages, viz. Agni, Vayu, Angira and Aditya.

Q. It is clear that these sages have written them; is it not ?

A. No. They are from God ; for, the sages then had no knowledge whatever.

Q. How did God come into their hearts to tell the Vedas ?

A. Out of his mercy and power he inspired that great knowledge into their hearts. As they were first at creation, they had no means of gaining knowledge, so God inspired them with it, and thus it is God's knowledge.

Q. Is the soul one or many ?

A. The soul is one in its nature, but its entities are many.

Q. Does the soul pass into other bodies and become great or small ?

A. As the water is colored according to the color mixed, so does the soul accommodate itself according to the size of body. But the souls of all are alike.

We here stop to give the reader a fragment of the Swamiji's autobiography which was abruptly cut off in page 22 of this book. This autobiography is a reprint of what appeared in the *Theosophist* Nos. 1, 3; 2 of Oct., Dec. 1879, and Nov. 1880, respectively. As this book claims no pretension to a regular biography of the Swamiji, and what we here aim is to collect detached notes on his life from persons who saw him, and books we come across in our daily intercourse, this rude intrusion on the reader's attention will, it is hoped, be readily forgiven in the interest of the subject.

"At Joshee Math I met many Yogis and learned ascetics and, in a series of discussions, learnt

more about Yog-Vidya, and parting with them, went to Badrinarayan. The learned Rawaljee was at that time the chief priest of that temple; and I lived with him a few days. We held discussions upon the Vedas, and the "Darshanas." Having enquired from him whether he knew of some genuine Yogi in the neighbourhood, I learnt, to my great regret, that there were none there at the time, but that he had heard that they were in the habit of visiting his temple at times. Then I resolved to make a thorough search for them throughout the country and especially in the hills.

One morning at day-break, I set out on my journey; when, following along the foot of the mountains, I at last reached the banks of the Alaknanda river. I had no desire of crossing it, as I saw on its opposite bank the large village called "Maan." Keeping, therefore, still to the foot of the hills, I directed my steps towards the jungle, following the river course. The hills and the road itself were thickly covered with snow, and, with the greatest difficulty, I succeeded in reaching that spot where the Alaknanda is said to take its rise. But once there, finding myself surrounded by lofty hills on all sides, and being a stranger in the country, my progress, from that moment, was greatly retarded. Very soon, the road ceased abruptly and I found no vestige of even a path. I was thus at a loss what to do next, but I determined finally to cross the river and enquire for my way. I was poorly and thinly clad, and the cold was intense and soon became intolerable. Feeling hungry and thirsty,

I tried to deceive my hunger by swallowing a piece of ice, but found no relief. I then began to ford the river. In some places it was very deep in others shallow—not deeper than a cubit—but from eight to ten cubits wide. The river-bed was covered with small and fragmentary bits of ice which wounded and cut my naked feet to blood. Very luckily, the cold had quite benumbed them, and even large bleeding cracks left me insensible for a while. Slipping on the ice more than once, I lost my footing and came nearly falling down and thus freezing to death on the spot. For, should I have found myself prostrated on the ice, I realized that, benumbed as I was all over, I would find it very difficult to rise again. However, with great exertions, and after a terrible struggle, I managed to get safe enough on the other bank. Once there—more dead than alive—I hastened to denude the whole upper part of my body, and, with all I had of clothes on me, to wrap my feet up to the knees; and then—exhausted, famished, unable to move—I stood waiting for help, and knowing not whence it would come. At last, throwing a last look around me, I espied two hill-men, who came up and having greeted me with their “Kashisamba” invited me to follow them to their home, where I would find food. Learning my trouble, they, moreover, promised to guide me to “Sadpat”—a very sacred place; but I refused their offers, for I could not walk. Notwithstanding their pressing invitation I remained firm and would not “take courage” and follow them as they wanted me; but, after telling them that I would rather die, refused even to listen to them. The idea had struck me that I had better

return and prosecute my studies. The two men then left me and soon disappeared among the hills. Having rested I proceeded on my way back. Stopping for a few minutes at Basudhara, a sacred bathing place, and passing by the neighbourhood of Mauagram, I reached Badrinarayan at 8 o'clock that evening. Upon seeing me, the Rawaljee and his companions were much astonished and enquired where I had been over since the early morning. I then sincerely related to them all that had happened to me. That night, after having restored my strength with a little food, I went to bed, but getting up early on the following morn, I took leave of the Rawaljee and set out on my journey back to Rampur. That evening, I reached the home of a hermit, a great ascetic, and passed the night at his place. That man had the reputation of one of the greatest sages living, and I had a long conversation with him upon religious subjects. More fortified than ever in my determination, I left him next morning, and after crossing hills and forests and having descended the Chilkiaghattee, I arrived, at last at Rampur where I took up my quarters at the house of the celebrated Rungiri, so famous for the holiness and purity of his life. I found him a man of extraordinary habits, though. He never slept, but used to pass whole nights in holding conversations—very loud sometimes—apparently with himself. Often, we heard a loud scream, then—weeping, though there was no one in his room with him. Extremely surprised, I questioned his disciples and pupils and learnt from them that such was his habit, though no one could tell me what it meant. Seeking an interview with him, I learnt some time

after, what it really was ; and thus I was enabled to get convinced that it was not true *Yoga* he practiced, but that he was only partially versed in it. It was not what I sought for.

Leaving him I went to Kasipur, and thence to Drona Sagar, where I passed the whole winter. Thence again to Sambal through Moradabad, when, after crossing Gurh Mukteshwar I found myself again on the banks of the Ganges. Besides other religious works, I had with me the "Sibsanda," "Hat-pradipika," "Yoga-Bij" and "Koberanda Sangata," which I used to study during my travels. Some of these books treated on the *Narichakras*, and *Narichakars* (nervous system) giving very exhaustive descriptions of the same, which I could never grasp, and which finally made me doubt as to the correctness of these works. I had been for some time trying to remove my doubts, but had found as yet no opportunity. One day, I chanced to meet a corpse floating down the river. There was the opportunity and it remained with me to satisfy myself as to the correctness of the statements contained in the books about anatomy and man's inner organs. Ridding myself of the books which I laid near by, and, taking off my clothes, I resolutely entered the river and soon brought the dead body out and laid it on the shore. I then proceeded to cut it open with a large knife in the best manner I could. I took out and examined the *kanal* (the heart) and cutting it from the navel to the ribs, and a portion of the head and neck, I carefully examined and compared them with the descriptions in the books. Finding they did not tally at all, I tore the books to pieces and

threw them into the river after the corpse. From that time gradually I came to the conclusion that with the exception of the Vedas, Upanishads, Patanjali and Sankhya, all other works upon science and Yoga were false. Having lingered for some time on the banks of the Ganges, I arrived next at Furrukabad; when, having passed Sreenjeeram I was just entering Cawnpur by the road east of the cantonment, the Samvat year of 1912 (1855 A. C.) was completed.

During the following five months, I visited many a place between Cawnpur and Allahabad. In the beginning of Bhadrapad, I arrived at Mirzapur where I stopped for a month or so near the shrine, of Vindichal Asoola-jee; and arriving at Benares in the early part of Ashwin, I took my quarters in the cave (at the confluence of the Buruna and the Ganges) which then belonged to Bhunanda Saraswati. There, I met first Kakaram, Rajarwar and other *Shaastres*, but stopped there only twelve days and renewed my travels after what I sought for. It was at the shrine of Durga-Koho in Chandalgurh, where I passed ten days. I left off eating rice altogether, and living but on milk I gave myself up entirely to the study of *Yoga* which I practiced night and day. Unfortunately, I got into the habit of using *bhang*, a strong narcotic leaf, and at times felt quite intoxicated with its effects. Once, leaving the temple, I came to a village near Chandalgurh where I met an attendant of mine of former days. On the other side of the village, and at some distance, stood a *Shivalaya* (a temple of Shiva) whither I proceeded to pass the night

under its walk. While there under the influence of *bhang*, I fell fast asleep and dreamt that night a dream. I thought I saw Mahadeo and his wife Parvati. They were conversing together and the subject of their talk was myself. Parvati was telling Mahadeo that I ought to get married, but the god did not agree with her. She pointed to the *bhang*. This dream annoyed me a good deal when I awoke. It was raining and I took shelter in the verandah opposite the chief entrance to the temple, where stood the huge statue of the Bull-god Nandi. Placing my clothes and books on its back I sat and meditated; when suddenly happening to throw a look inside the statue which was empty, I saw a man concealed inside. I extended my hand towards him, and must have terrified him, as, jumping out of his hiding-place, he took to his heels in the direction of the village. Then I crept into the statue in my turn and slept there for the rest of the night. In the morning an old woman came and worshipped the Bull-god with myself inside. Later on, she returned with offerings of "Gur" (molasses) and a pot of "Dahi" (curd milk) which, making puja to me (whom she evidently mistook for the god himself), she offered and desired me to accept and eat. I did not disabuse her, but, being hungry, ate it all. The curd being very sour proved a good antidote for the *bhang* and dispelled the signs of intoxication, which relieved me very much. I then continued my journey towards the hills and that place where the Nerbudda takes its rise. I never once asked my way, but went on travelling southward. Soon I found myself in a desolate spot covered

thickly with jungles, with isolated huts appearing now and then among the bushes at irregular distances. At one of such places I drank a little milk and proceeded onward. But about half a mile farther, I came to a dead stop. The road had abruptly disappeared and there remained but the choice of narrow paths leading I knew not where. I soon entered a dreary jungle of wild plum trees and very thick and huge grass with no signs of any path in it, when suddenly I was faced by a huge black bear. The beast growled ferociously, and, rising on its hind legs, opened wide its mouth to devour me. I stood motionless for some time and then slowly raised my thin cane over him, and the bear ran away terrified. So loud was its roaring, that the villagers whom I had just left, hearing it, ran to my assistance and soon appeared armed with large sticks and followed by their dogs. They tried hard to persuade me to return with them. If I proceeded any further, they said, I would have to encounter the greatest perils in the jungles which in those hills were the habitat of bears, buffaloes, elephants, tigers and other ferocious beasts. I asked them not to feel anxious for my safety, for I was protected. I was anxious to see the sources of the Narbudda and would not change my mind for fear of any peril. Then seeing that their warnings were useless, they left me after having made me accept a stick thicker than my own for "self-defence" they said, but which stick I immediately throw away.

On that day I travelled without stopping until it grew quite dusk. For many hours I had not

perceived the slightest trace of human habitation around me, no villages in the far off, not even a solitary hut, or a human being. But what my eyes met the most was a number of trees, twisted and broken, which had been uprooted by the wild elephants, and, felled by them to the ground, obstructed the already difficult passages. Still further on I found myself in a dense and impenetrable jungle of plum trees and other prickly shrubs from whence, at first, I saw no means of extricating myself. However, partly crawling on the belly, partly creeping on my knees, I conquered this new obstacle and after paying a heavy tribute with pieces of my clothes and even my own skin, bleeding and exhausted I got out of it. It had grown quite dark by that time, but even this—if it impeded—did not arrest my progress onward, and I still proceeded, until I found myself entirely hemmed in by lofty rocks and hills thickly grown over with a dense vegetation, but with evident signs of being inhabited. Soon I perceived a few huts, surrounded by heaps of cow-dung, a flock of goats grazing on the banks of a small stream of clear water, and a few welcome lights glimmering between the crevices of the walls. Resolving to pass the night there, and go no further till the next morning, I took shelter at the foot of a large tree which overshadowed one of the huts. Having washed my bleeding feet, my face and hands in the stream, I had barely sat to tell my prayers, when I was suddenly disturbed in my meditations by the loud sounds of a tom-tom. Shortly after, I saw a procession of men, women and children, followed by their cows and goats emerging from the huts and

preparing for a night religious festival. Upon perceiving a stranger, they all gathered around me, and an old man came enquiring from whence I had appeared. I told them I had come from Benares, and was on my pilgrimage to the Nerbudda sources, after which answer they all left me to my prayers and went further on. But in about half an hour, came one of their headmen accompanied by two hillmen and sat by my side. He came as a delegate to invite me to their huts. But, as before, I refused the offer (for they were idolators). He then ordered a large fire to be lit near me and appointed two men to watch over my safety the whole night. Learning that I used milk for all food, the kind headman asked for my "kamanilalu" (a bowl) and brought it back to me full of milk, of which I drank a little that night. He then retired, leaving me under the protection of my two guards. That night I soundly slept until dawn, when rising and having completed my devotions, I prepared myself for further events."

In the summer of 1874 Swami Dayanand Saraswati went to Allahabad and stopped in a garden outside the city. A notice was sent to the inhabitants through the local Post Office to the effect that whoever wished to hold discussion on any religious point, might go to him in the specified hours. Among many other gentlemen and pandits, who went to see him, the students and Sanscrit Professor, then Pandit Kushi Nath Shastri, of the Muir College were conspicuous.

A Christian Mahratta gentleman, named Nehemiah Neelkunt Ghosay, brought the Rig Veda

printed by Professor Max Muller to show that the word Agni meant only fire there, and was not applicable to God. To him the Swamiji replied that, if Professor Max Muller used that meaning alone in rendering the Vedic verses, it was no wonder; for, "being a staunch Christian, he was determined to spoil the sense of the Veda in order that the Indians might reject it in their ignorance and adopt the Bible in its stead. Hence, the partiality of the Professor destroyed his authority.

Then to expose the crude idea of God among the Christians before the Hindu Mahrattas who had foolishly made their apostate brother their religious spokesman, he hinted to the Biblical story of the Tower of Babel, by which some western race of ancients attempted to scale the heavens in the Christian mythology. At their boldness of plan the Christian God took alarm. In the height of panic his self-defence confounded the tongue of the builders of Babel, who, being then unable to understand one another, gave up the work, and God was saved from the rude insult of men.

En passant the Christian God's dread of men, his own creation, is curious and unexplainable indeed. Certainly they must be very ignorant, who thought the apparent vault of sky to be of measurable height and therefore approachable by human means. This shows that the Christians believe that God is not omnipresent; but, on the contrary, he is confined to a certain locality, the whereabouts of which they cannot exactly tell us.

However, when the Christian Mahratta gave no answer, his Hindu brethren said something, and especially Kashi Nath Shastri insultingly asked the Swamiji for what purpose he made a great fuss all over the country. He was told that the pandits had already made a great deal of humbug long before him, and that their sense was clogged with stones, so that they could not understand the statement of truth. The Shastri then became silent and departed with his friends.

On being asked, the Swamiji explained the meaning of the word "maleksh" as denoting the persons who spoke incorrect language. This signification some gentlemen confirmed by saying that Mr. Bopp gave the same meaning in his comparative grammar. The English word God, he derived from Sanscrit "gūh," meaning hidden. After answering a few more questions of the college students, who seemed to take great interest in him, he told Pandit Jwala Prasad, now B. A., the son of Raja Jay Kishen Das, C. S. I., to read out to the audience the "Sandhia" or the Aryan book of common prayer, then perhaps in manuscript.

Afterwards, Moulvie Nizam-ud-din, now B. A., who always obtruded his debating predilection, was asked by the Swamiji to tell what God was in the opinion of the Mahomedans. But the learned Moulvie, instead of quoting some Mahomedan authority, talked of the four attributes of God as explained in the beginning of the first volume of Sir, W. Hamilton's metaphysics. The Swamiji took it for the Mahomedan belief. I regret to say, by the way, that his unacquaintance with the foreign languages of India was always

imposed upon, and so the ambiguous matter of the fashionable creeds escaped an examination by a religious philosopher like the Swamiji.

When the learned Moulvie went to pray, the Swamiji remarked that the Mahomedans broke the small idols of others, but preferred to worship the gigantic idol of their own. This Mahomedan idol, to explain the reference, is the Divine Black Stone *hijrulaswad*, richly enshrined in the temple of Mecca, where the Mahomedans annually resort to pay adoration from all parts of the world. Such a pilgrimage is a means of salvation among the Muslims.

On the return from his prayers, the learned Moulvie as well as some of the Persianized and Anglicized Hindus mooted the subject of the transmigration of souls. They maintained that the soul was born once, and, in the blindness of confidence, went so far as to persuade the Swamiji to abandon the doctrine, saying that it was a mistake of the ancients of India to believe in it, and that no civilized people would admit it in modern times. But he gave cogent arguments in favor of it; one of which was that of instinct, which, they said, was a quality or power given by God to an animal to carry on work at the outset in the world.

After a long speech on the transmigration of souls, he was told by Paudit Jwala Prasad B. A. that it was nearly 8 P. M., which was a high time for his vesper. So he left the hall of assembly, and the people dispersed.

The next evening he delivered a lecture at the house of some Bengalee gentleman. Nearly a thousand men flocked to hear it. He described the ten qualities of virtue, which had no connection with the distinction of caste, and which upheld its indestructibility against man's attacks of any kind. He regretted at the wickedness of times which perpetuated the custom of secluding women, who, consequently, could not take advantage of public lectures to do away with their ignorance. Among other things he then mentioned was that Raja Nal used a car similar to the locomotive engine when he took the king of Ayudhia to Damayantee's choice of husband. Afterwards he started for Jabalpur, where also he delivered a lecture.

His stature was nearly 6ft. high. His body was plump and somewhat corpulent. He shaved all the hair. A scarf formed his upper garment. A sash passed round the waist and between the legs. He sat on the folds of a blanket. It appeared from the the long time he was engaged in conversation that he used no stimulant drugs like other ascetics. The color of his body was light swarthy tending to fair. His eyes were of middle size, calm, and penetrating. The expression of countenance was grave. He preferred to sit cross-legged upon the ground. The mouth was a little wide; the voice sonorous; pronunciation clear; accentuation well marked, enunciation loud, distinct, and slow; the modulation of tone very harmonious; the delivery of speech fluent, eloquent, and impressive; the didactic power highly persuasive; reasoning, convincing;

arguments sound, concise, and logical; and judgment quick and decisive. The recitation and quotation of long passages of poetry and prose without hitch or hesitation on the requirement of occasion, attested the wonderful retention of memory and readiness of knowledge. His answers were always to the point. The anger of opponents never disturbed and ruffled the placidity of mind and the gravity of features. Abusive epithets never called from him corresponding ill names either explicitly or suggestively. The sweetness of the language called forth the admiration of opposition. The profundity of Sanscrit learning was astounding to the Indian scholars. The acuteness of argumentation confounded even the Christians and Mahomedans. On all reformatory matters his decision was marked with deliberation and pregnant with universal good. All objections were silenced in anticipation. His language was easy, natural, and well adapted to the communication of his thoughts with intelligibility and in consonance with the capacity of hearers. His method of expressing things was so unique and uncommon and agreeable to the nature of mind, that however long his lecture might be, the audience listened to it with breathless attention. Though his comments sometimes produced smiles and laughers in the audience, yet no gust of pride ever flushed upon his cheek. Seriousness and earnestness were always displayed in the expression of thoughts, no interest however dear caused his deviation from truth. His undivided attention enabled him to grasp speedily and surely the import of speakers' statements. His affability induced the most taciturn to talk with him. Politeness was the chief

characteristic of his conduct. Perfect equanimity pervaded all his actions. Decency and decorum adorned his deportment. He had no ambition to shine in the world by the royal or popular favor. Being advised to learn English, he told the good intentioned counsellors that they should accomplish what was deficient in him. He said that he was like one of them, which proved that no pride of knowledge, great as it was, puffed him up so as to set up for a prophet, as was the case with some shallow pates. He further illustrated his satisfaction with Sanscrit alone, by relating what had happened at his interview with Babu Keshub Chunder Sen. The illustrious teacher of the Brahmo Samaj expressed his regret at the Swamiji's ignorance of the English tongue; for otherwise the Vedic scholar would have formed a very desirable companion in his visit to England. But as vanity did not gild the character of the luminary of ancient philosophy, he replied to the Indian orator, of English that he was equally sorry for the want of Sanscrit knowledge in the Brahmo leader, who professed to teach a civilized religion to the Indian people by the medium of a foreign language which they did not commonly understand. Such was the effect of the Swamiji's lecture on some of the Muir College pupils that they are members of the Arya Samaj in different parts of India unto this day.

In 1877 the Swamiji joined in a grand meeting of learned men held at the village, called Chandapur, of Munshi Piaray Lal Kayasth, a follower of Kabir. This rich and pious man, having obtained the permission of the local authorities to call

a meeting there, gave a public notice inviting theologians, philosophers, and other learned men of the country, whether Hindu, Aryan, Christian, or Mahomedan, to discuss the different systems of religion. All the comforts of hospitality and the safety of honor and person during the stay at the village was promised by the liberal host. The invitation was largely responded to by eminent men from various quarters of the North-Western Provinces. The space at our disposal does not allow the insertion of the names of persons who attended the congregation from Delhi, Lucknow, Cawnpore, Benares, and the like famous places of learning.

The date of discussion was fixed on the 19th and 20th of March, 1877. Rules for its guidance were formed by the most distinguished men of all religions. Its object was the ascertainment of true religion from among the prominent faiths prevalent in India, viz. the Hindu, the Christian, and the Mahomedan. The order of speakers was, 1st the missionaries, 2nd the Moulvies, or the Mahomedan priests, and 3rd the Aryans. Ten minutes were allowed for asking, and thirty for answering questions put by parties in the course of discussing the principal problems proposed by Munshi Piray Lal and agreed upon by all the persons concerned. These five questions given elsewhere formed the subject of discussion, which was to commence from 7-30 to 11 A.M. and from 1 to 4 P.M. every day. At the appointment of duration of debate the missionaries urged want of more time than two days. When this was announced to all the guests, the Swamiji said

that he came with the hope that the meeting would last four days at the least and eight days at the most ; for, in that time the real nature of all the current religions could be satisfactorily determined. The missionaries not agreeing to this reasonable proposal, all were obliged to accept two days only for discussion. Munshi Indermani told the Swamiji that, since it could not be helped, it did not matter much : true religion could be found out in a day only.

Then five men from the Christians, five from the Mahomedans, and two from the Hindus or Aryans were selected to conduct the debate. But the Christians and the Mahomedans insisted on five men being also selected from the Hindus. The Swamiji told them that they two alone, viz. Munshi Indermani and himself, were quite sufficient to express the views of the Hindus or Aryans. The Mahomedan doctors on their own authority strongly pressed two missionaries to enroll Pandit Luxman Shastri among debaters on the side of the Hindus. The Swamiji told them that they had right to nominate persons for their own religion but none for that of others. To avoid misunderstanding, he told the pandit aside that he was, perhaps, unaware, that those gentlemen desired to foment quarrel between them, and then to amuse themselves with and laugh at it in the sleeve. Still a moulvie, taking the pandit by the hand, would have him get his name entered among the debaters in spite of the opinions of others. The Swamiji then said that, if all the Aryans present there would give their consent, his name

could be put down in the programme of debate ; but their (Mahomedans') request alone would not suffice. A moulvie then got up and asked if all the Hindus agreed to the nomination of the Swamiji and Munshi Indermani to represent their party. The Swamiji told him that, as the Mahomedan debaters were not chosen by the Shiah and the like sects of the Moslems but by the Sunnis only, and as the missionaries were not appointed by the Roman Catholics and the like sects of the Christians but by the Protestants only ; so, in like manner, Munshi Indermani and himself were not the delegates of all the sects of the Hindus but of a few most enlightened of them. It was improper on the part of the Mahomedans to create disturbance in the Hindu party. Munshi Indermani then arose and said that all the Hindus acknowledged with the Swamiji the supreme authority of the Vedas and the other sacred scriptures in consonance with them ; but, if there was a Hindu in the assemblage who believed in a religion not based upon the injunctions of the Vedas and the like scriptures, he should come forward and name his religion, which would be considered as the fourth among them already represented, and given the choice of representation in the discussion. But as none came out, the matter of nomination of debaters was finally decided.

The motive of the moulvies in all this fuss, by the bye, was to set the Hindus together by the ear and enjoy the sight of angry passions of disputants. The Aryas did not think it proper to admit the pandit into the debate. Also, before discussion some of the Mahomedans and the

Hindus, came over-night to the Swamiji to advise him that they should unite together and refute the Christians. The Swamiji told them that the meeting was called, not to refute or defeat any one, but to enquire into the truth of religion; ergo all the three parties should impartially and amicably join to distinguish truth from falsehood. Victory or defeat formed no part of the subject under consideration.

As much discussion as took place in two days, is given at length in the body of this book. In the afternoon of the second, it was found from the progress, the discussion made in the three previous sessions, that it was impossible to go through all the five questions proposed for discussion. Hence it was agreed on all hands that, in the short time that was then left, the question of salvation only should be explained and discussed. The controversialists considered for some time as to who should begin the debate. The Swamiji said that the order of the previous day should be followed. But the Christians and Mahomedans declining to broach the subject, the Swamiji consented to open it. When the other parties raised some objections to his doctrine, he began to answer them; but while he was yet speaking, the clock struck four. The moulvies said that their time of prayer was come and therefore they could stay no longer. Rev. Scot, telling the Swamiji that he wanted to say something to him in the private, went away. Thus the proceedings of the day were abruptly brought to a close.

A moulvia and a missionary behaved themselves very improperly. When the people were yet not

quite dispersed and most of them were seated in their places, they mounted the table of the assembly with shoes on their feet, and began to harangue the people and preach their respective religions each on one end of the table. When the Swamiji saw disorder among the people, he asked the missionaries and the Aryas what the cause of the disturbance was. They replied that the discussion was over, and the meeting dissolved. The Swamiji said that it was very strange that the meeting was dissolved without the sanction of the members or the managers. When there was no possibility of debating, he was advised by some gentlemen to repair to his tent, where he most impressively discoursed upon truth.

At night Rev. Scot with two other missionaries came to the Swamiji, who received them cordially and gave them seats before him. After talking for some time with other missionaries, Rev. Scot asked the Swamiji if the transmigration was true in his opinion; and if so, what the proofs were in favor of it. The Swamiji replied that it was true. Some of the reasons which went to prove it were as follow :—

The soul receives the body at the hand of God in consideration of its merits. If it does good works, it obtains the human body, and, if wicked ones, that of the bird or the like lower animals. If a soul does better works, it is endowed with the body of a god, i. e. learned man or philosopher.

(1) See, a child begins to suck as soon as it is born, because it gained the knowledge of it in some anterior life.

(2) The different stations of life, happy and miserable, high and low, rich and poor, prove that they are the rewards and punishments of actions of previous existence, or else injustice would be charged to God, who is just and equitable.

(3) Merits or actions depend on the existence of the body for being done; and the existence of the body in some prior state proves the fact of transmigration.

(4) The soul is eternal; it has neither beginning nor end of its existence. The influence of the previous material frame revives with the soul. Hence men and animals are of diverse tempers and dispositions, which thus point to a state prior to their birth.

(5) In the same manner, there are many reasons for the belief of the transmigration. But there is none, even a plausible one, for man's one life of three score and ten years out of infinity. Had it been so, events in the world would take a different turn among mankind from what has been, above described. But we see that they do not so take place, i.e. uniformly, which is impossible.

(6) Moreover, the belief that as soon as a person dies, he is secured in custody to await the day of judgment for the settlement of his account of actions on the world, is totally absurd.

The missionaries made no answer but departed silently. We have described the subject at large at the end of the book.

A report of the Lahore Arya Samaj thus describes his visit to Lahore:—

Swami Dayanand Saraswati, when at Delhi in 1877 on the occasion of the Imperial Assemblage, was put up in the tent of the Maharaja of Indore. There he delivered lectures on religion, which were attended by thousands of people. As many gentlemen of Lahore were also present there, one of them Pandit Manfool, now deceased, together with some other gentlemen, requested the Swamiji to honor Lahore with his visit. In compliance with this request, the Swamiji came to Lahore on the 19th of April, 1877, visiting Ludhiana on the way, and delivering lectures there at the house of Lala Jeth Mal Cashier. On the railway station he was received by Pandit Manfool and Lala Harsukh Roy Proprietor of the *Koh-i-Noor Press*. At first, he was lodged in the garden of Diwan Katan Chand, where he delivered lectures on the superstition of the Hindus and the true religion of the Vedas. He delivered his first public lecture in the city on 25th April, 1877, at the place called *Baoli Sahab*. It was very largely attended by the people who flocked there from all parts of the city. The subject of the lecture was the Vedas and their religion. In his usual and inimitable way, he dwelled at large upon the advantages of the *Yajna* or the chemical purification of the air by burning many kinds of drugs. He also explained the passages of the Vedas which gave rise among the people to mythological fables of Ahillya and Gotam, and Brahma's cupidinous pursuit of his daughter. In the course of the lecture he said that the Vedas had four Upvedas and 1127 Shakhnas, which contained many systems of science and art succinctly told in the Vedas. He delivered his second lecture at the same place.

Both times the concourse of people who came to hear the lecture was immense.

He then delivered two lectures at the premises of the Brahmo Samaj, whose members thought that he would teach Brahmoism there. But they were sadly mistaken. In his second lecture he proved the truth and revelation of the Vedas and the transmigration of souls. This lecture was greatly disliked by the Brahmo Samaj, and so he delivered no more lectures there.

These lectures put the whole community of the Brahmins and the other Hindus of old fashion into great commotion. Their vitals were touched by his boldly laying bare their hypocrisy and selfishness, which fabricated myths to please the depraved, ignorant mind of the superstitious Hindus, and gave out that the fables thus invented had their origin in the Vedas. A pandit of some repute, called Sharda Ram of Philour, hastened to the relief of his tribesmen and delivered lectures on the propriety of idolatry, which had been condemned by the Swamiji as having no foundation in the religion of the Vedas and no countenance in the examples of the sages of antiquity. For a time they started up a society where pandit's delivered lectures in support of idolatrous and superstitious rites, already existing among the people. The lecturers took great care to pour forth volleys of invectives on the name of Swami Dayanand Saraswati to pander the vitiated passions of the ignorant. Their height of rage against the Swamiji might be judged from an article in the *Koh-i-Noor* of 19th May, 1877, which concluded in praying, Would God end

the excitement of the enraged populace in peace and quiet ! The Brahmins complained that the Swamiji was ruining their livelihood of whole life, although if they acted on his advice they would be respected in the enlightenment of modern times. They went to Diwan Bhagwan Das, the son of Diwan Ratan Chand, in whose garden the Swamiji was put up, and told him that the Swamiji disrespected the Brahmins and reprobated the worship of images. The Diwan was then displeased with the Swamiji. It was therefore thought necessary to remove his lodgings from the garden. Accordingly, he was located in the house of Dr. Rahim Khan who was very glad to offer it. There the Swamiji stopped a month and a half. Before he removed from the garden, Pandit Manfool told him to give up the refutation of the worship of images, as the people were all much offended with him, or rather become his enemies. On the other hand, if he did not condemn image-worship, not only the people but also the king of Cashmere would be much pleased with him. Had the Swamiji been a worldly man and wished to curry favor of the ignorant masses, he would have accepted the pandit's advice. But he said that he preferred to obey the commandments of God as revealed in the Vedas to the precarious pleasure of a prince of terrestrial power. He was several times in peril of his life ; but he never abandoned the true religion of the Vedas. Some Rajahs expressed their wish that he should not censure idolatry ; but he did not care for their assurance.

While at the house of Khan Bahadur Dr. Rahim Khan, it was his custom to deliver lectures

on alternate days, holding free debate in the interval. Many Hindus, Mahomedans, and Christians went to him with questions, and got answers to their satisfaction. One day Rev. Hooper went to him on the day of debate, and asked him two questions in Sanscrit. The one was, As the Vedas sanctioned *Ashwamedh* (horse-sacrifice) and *Gomedh* (cow-sacrifice), did not the people in ancient times kill horses and cows in sacrifices? The other was, How was the caste observed in the Vedas? The Swamiji replied that the *Ashwamedh* and *Gomedh* did not at all mean the sacrifice of the horse and of the cow in the Vedas. He then explained their true sense according to the comments on them in the *Viyakṣan* and the *Nirukt*, the Vedic grammar and vocabulary. It satisfied the reverend gentleman. In reply to the second question, he said that the caste depended on the personal qualities and actions of individuals. Upon this Rev. Hooper asked if he, having good qualities and actions, could be called a Brahmin. The Swamiji said that he would be so considered, if he fulfilled the condition.

A gentleman once mentioned to the Swamiji that he read the English and Bengali translation of the Vedas, and so came to doubt in their truth. As he took several mantras of the Vedas with him, the Swamiji told him to read one the most objectionable possible in his opinion. When he read one mantra, the Swamiji said that it was mistranslated. When he expounded its meaning according to the rules of the Vedic grammar and the Vedic dictionary, it perfectly satisfied the gentleman.

Once Bhai Dit Singh was discussing with the Swamiji on the teaching of the Vedant, when Pandit Sheo Narayan Agnihotri cried out in the course of the talk that the Swamiji could not reply to him, and was consequently defeated. The Swamiji asked him if he could tell him what he had said. The Agnihotri said something. The Swamiji asked the Bhai if he (the Swamiji) said it. The Bhai said that he did not; the Agnihotri did not hear it. The Swamiji again asked the Agnihotri what the Bhai said. He muttered something. The Swamiji asked the Bhai if he said it so. The Bhai said that he did not. Then the Swamiji told the Agnihotri that he should not pass remarks on matters he neither heard nor understood, which greatly displeased the Agnihotri.

On one occasion a Brahmin of Lahore read a *shloka* or Sanscrit couplet, and said that the Institute of Manu ordained the worship of images. The Swamiji enquired of him if he would give up the jingle, jangle of idolatrous ceremonial, should that verse not belong to Manu's Code. He then ordered the Manusmriti; but the pandit said that he did not recognise his copy as genuine; he would himself see it in his own copy at home. The Swamiji consenting to it, the pandit departed and returned after three days. The Swamiji asked him if he found out the passage; but the pandit's silence answered it in the negative.

On another day a Brahmin brought a *shloka* and said that the *Yogavashista* tolerated idolatry. The Swamiji replied that though he did not take the book as an authority, yet the verse under

consideration was not entirely of the book, its half being of the book and the other half the fabrication of somebody else. On referring it, it turned out to be true. Thus individual discussions went on every day from morning to evening except at the time of prayer. The result of all this discussing and lecturing was the establishment of an Arya Samaj at Lahore.

Once after the Samaj was established, a gentleman proposed and all the members agreed that the title of *Guru* (vice-gerent of God) should be conferred on the Swamiji. When the Swamiji came to know it, he said that it was the object of his mission to destroy the vice-gerency and not to become a *guru* himself and found a new sect of religion. He also said that the above kind of title might turn his head, or if he was not affected by it, his successors might be, and then new troubles would arise among them. Therefore it was useless to think of such things. Upon this the gentleman said that the members might call him *param sahaik* (supreme helper). The Swamiji asked, if that title they gave him, by what name they would call the Almighty Lord, who was really the supreme helper of all. At last he said that his name, undignified with titles, should be put down simply among the ordinary members or sympathisers of the Samaj.

His Sanscrit was so easy and fluent that when he delivered a lecture in it at the Samaj premises, it could be understood by persons having slight knowledge of Sanscrit.

Once a pandit said that since the mantras of the Sain Veda contained the names of such sages as Bharadwaj, it was evident that it was made by sages in later times. Then the Swamiji recited many mantras containing the name of Bharadwaj, and said that the word did not mean there any individual; but it was a significant word. He expounded the meanings of these mantras, and said that the sages were afterwards called by those words. Such mistakes were common occurrences, as the people took the apparent meaning upon secondary significations as prevalent among them.

Upon another occasion the members of the Brahmo Samaj with Pt. Bhanu Dat as their spokesman went to the Swamiji and said that the Vedas enjoined idolatry several places. They read a mantra, containing the names of the Ganges and the Jamna, which, they said, were the objects of adoration according to the Vedas. The Swamiji replied that had they read the whole of the context, they would not make such doubts and objections. He said that the words Ganges and Jamna meant nerves there. The passages referred to the exercise of Yoga. The words had nothing to do with those rivers. The epithets to those words plainly indicated that they did not mean those rivers.

He once said that the propagation of the Vedic religion was too great a work to be accomplished in his life time, seeing the obstinacy of millions of ignorant and sensual people. In his lecture on salvation, he said that the unlimited enjoyment of

happiness in reward of the limited works of a short earthly life was impossible and indicated injustice on the part of God.

When the Swamiji expressed his wish to leave Lahore for other places, a gentleman got up and spoke at length with great impressiveness and asked the Swamiji to stop some more days at Lahore. The Swamiji replied that he could not stick to one place ; other places as much required his presence as Lahore ; he liked to go abroad to preach the Vedic religion. So he left Lahore for his country.

The first time the Swamiji went to Meerut, he took up his lodgings at Sarajkund, where at evening many people went to hear his discourse on religion. His dress was like that of monks. After a few days' sojourn, he went away. On his next visit, Babu Chhedi Lal, Commissariat Gomastha, and others made arrangements for his accommodation in Pandit Jagan Nath's bungalow in Sadler Bazar. He delivered lectures for three days at Lal Ganeshi Lal's house in the cantonment and then at Lala Ram Saran Das Rait's in the city; many people went to him for discussion in the morning and evening. During the rest of day he used to prepare books, for which purpose he had two pandits as amanuenses, who worked in a separate room.

Lala Ram Saran Das Rait, Pandit Pali Ram Lal Ganeshi Lal, Babu Ram Saran Das the son of a Tebildar, Babu Anand Lal, Master Ajudhis Prasad, Pandit Umba Shunker, and other gentlemen used to go to him especially at evening. On one occasion the Swamiji told them that unless

a Samaj was established there, a set of rules for the guidance made, and a register for the admission of members opened, no improvement in the morals of people could ever be expected. The gentlemen consulted together and came to the resolution of opening a Samaj at Meerut. It was accordingly opened with Master Guindon Lal as President and Babu Anand Lal as Secretary. All the above-mentioned gentlemen and many others, who took interests in the welfare of the new Samaj established for the good of people, formed members. As usual for the convenience of employe's, the Samaj held its meetings on Sunday at the house of Lala Ram Saran Das Rais.

Whenever he paid a visit to Meerut, he always delivered lectures at the splendid residence of the deceased Rais both on Samaj and on other days.

The people were delighted at his novel use in vernacular of the word " pope " for the ignorant Brahmins.

After a year or so at his advice Lala Ram Saran Das Rais and others took the Brahminical sacrament of regeneration. The ceremony was performed amidst a crowd of people. The Vedic hymns were chanted at the offering of *homa*. The neophytes were initiated into the mysteries of Gayetry. These rites were conducted by the pandits with the Swamiji at the head of them.

The malignity of jealousy gave out that the members of the Arya Samaj ate sweet porridge spit over by the Swamiji. As the Hindus are forbidden from eating the refuse of food, such false reports spread by the Banias, made outcasts of the four gentlemen.

Once Lala Kishan Sahay Rais desired to bring about a discussion between the Swamiji and the pandits of the city. After a great deal of mutual correspondence, nothing came out, as the rules for discussion met the approval of no pandits.

In 1878 A. C. when the Swamiji was at Meerut, the Mahomedans were greatly agitated on hearing the refutation of their religion. One of the Moulvies or Mahomedan priests, named Mahomed Abdulla, wrote a letter on 7th September 1878 to the Swamiji, purporting to say that since he picked holes in Mahomedanism and challenged persons to hold discussion, he would like to discuss with him, should the following conditions meet his approval :—(1) Some gentleman should be appointed the umpire. (2) He himself should not go away till the discussion ended. (3) None should interfere with the speakers. (4) The discussion should proceed with perfect impartiality. If any party was defeated, it should acknowledge its defeat. (5) Some great noble should take the responsibility of maintaining order among people. (6) The discussion should be held from 6 A.M. to 4 P.M., and it should be oral and not written. The Swamiji replied to this letter that the writer should make preparation by the aid of the nobility of the city and the cantonment, and the discussion should be written, but not oral. The Moulvie again wrote that the discussion should be oral. The Swamiji replied that all the conditions of the Moulvie could be accepted; but the discussion must be written, as nobody could afterwards tell different tales about it. The Moulvie did not accept the condition, and the matter came to nothing.

In 1878 the members of Social Club assembled in the Government School at Mooltan to consider the advisability of inviting the Swamiji. Each member expressed his own views and related what he had heard of him. Thereupon, all agreed that subscription should be raised to meet the expenses of his visit. It was accordingly done, and he was requested to come to Mooltan.

He complied with their request and put up in the garden of Bogy by the city railway station. Here he stayed a month, lecturing people all the while. A guard of police was secured in foresight of a quarrel arising from the divergence of opinions. His lectures commonly lasted from 4 to 7 P. M. From morning to afternoon, after which the lectures commenced, people in general came to have their doubts solved about religious matters. But no Mooltan pundit ever came forward to a regular discussion with him. Several registered letters were sent to him, to which he invariably replied that the writers should personally come forth to discuss in public. Many modern Vedantists went to him to talk in private. * It is a custom of the people at Mooltan to cast a piece of thread with a little cotton into a fire in Saturnalia. Some men came to the Swamiji to say that the thread did not burn at all. On this he said that he would go to the spot either to see the experiment done in his own presence or to make it himself. But nobody ventured to agree to his proposal. Then he briefly explained the customs of Holi and Divali (festivals of vernal and autumnal equinoxes respectively), as they were observed in ancient times according to scriptures.

Afterwards an Arya Samaj was formed, there, of which many Brahmans too became members. But some of them objected to accept the principles of the Arya Samaj. They said they might be members, but they would not act upon the rules. Many meetings were held in the cantonment; but afterwards a house was bought in the city, where by the grace of God the Arya Samaj flourishes upto this day.

Thence the Swamiji went to Roorkee, where as usual with his visits, a great agitation was produced among the inhabitants. The Mahomedans made bold to try conclusions with the Swamiji. When some conditions of discussion were drawn up, such as the holding of discussion before the magistrate, the limiting of the audience to four hundred only, and the writing down of the arguments of both parties; the Mahomedan priest, Moulvie Mahomed Kasim, who was to lead the discussion, and who played an important part in the discussion of Chandapur, turned tail and left the Mahomedan community in the lurch.

Many times the Mahomedan priests attempted to defend their religion, but could never muster courage to come before the Swamiji to plead the cause of the Arabian religion, which so much charmed the lust and lucre of the Bedowins in the dark ages of the world. The truth is that it is very difficult to help a lame dog over a stile. But there were some gentlemen among the Mahomedans who confessed that the Swamiji's criticism was just and correct, and that the religion which he preached was pre-eminently superior to all others. We here translate a lecture of a very

learned Mahomedan nobleman, Siddiq Hussein by name, giving his opinion of the Swamiji and his religion.

"Learned, impartial and sensible gentlemen! I was once a follower of the Hindu religion, but abandoned it long since. I wish to express my views concerning the preaching of Dayanand Saraswati. If we lay aside prejudice which makes slaves of a great majority of our brethren, do justice which is the most precious of mental qualities, and commit no partiality which is an opposite of justice; it will, indeed, be as plain as day that he is such a man that we can confidently say, although as Moslems we have nothing to do with his religion, or rather our creed is apparently antagonistic to his, that he is the first class monotheist and acknowledges the unity of Parameshwar whom we call Allah. He believes in the God who is incorporeal, immutable, and most holy. How he has come to this stage of knowledge, I am at a loss to account for; it has rather thrown me overboard into the sea of wonder. I am sure he has learnt all this from his heart alone. He adores the one and non-dual God, in whose unity and eternal existence he has firm and unflinching belief. He has fully realized that the existence of the maker of this world is past all descriptions of doubt. He devotes the whole of his invaluable time to the holy work of convincing the persons, who believe in the plurality of gods, of the unity of Godhead. It is his intention to grace the head of everybody with a chaplet of the fragrant flowers of his transcendental doctrines. He

draws the attention of his followers especially, and of the public generally, to the most important fact of Divine unity. He does not like bowing the head to stones. He charges the worshippers of idols with the sin of idolatry. He looks upon all those books, which have been written and circulated among the people by the impudency of selfishness, as so many instances of pious fraud. He considers the study of the four Vedas, which have been accepted by all the philosophers of India in the light of the books of divinity or the word of God, as the means of salvation ; and what is against the Vedas as absurd and rejectable. He thinks the efficacy of Gangetic bath in the remission of sins as illusive as the path on the surface of water, or the power of mirage in quenching the thirst of travellers. He does not take the worship of the Brahmins as that of non-dual God. He repudiates with horror all lie and hypocrisy. In his heart, the avarice of worldliness has got no room. Verily, he is an ocean of the science of divinity. How can a person like him, free from prejudice, liberal in opinion, and calm in judgment, be deceitful ? No never, never. Had he been not sincere in his avowal that God is one, how could he have been consistent with himself, and firm and inflexible in his belief in his long career of preaching ? No ; never, never. How could the educated persons of modern times who are endowed with reason and learning, have taken his word on trust, had there been neither truth nor sincerity in his preaching ? No ; never, never. How could he have accomplished his purpose in these days when gross signorance walks rampant all over the country, had there

been no light of truth in it? No; never, never. Can a wall of sand stand the bill of rain? No; never, never. Can hundreds of thousands of men live in the house whose foundation is laid on water? No; never, never. In my opinion such a house would have fallen down long long ago and destroyed its inmates. But the cautious architect of this fabric of religion, Dayanand Saraswati, has laid its foundation deep deep into the heart of nature. It cannot topple down from the overflowing mountain rills of rainy season. Had he had no belief, firm as rock in the unity of the sovereign of the universe, he would have long lost his footing. As he is a really wise man, he cannot be scared away from his benevolent purpose by the jackal-like howlings of ignorance. The leading world recognises and subscribes to his wisdom and learning. That he destroys the Hindu religion, or looks to his own interests as the pandits have done, is entirely unworthy of credence. But on the contrary, he shows the way even to those who are led astray, and prevents the blind from falling into the ditch of ignorance. He acts on the precepts of the Vedas strictly. It is not his desire that persons may give him something, or allot his fee on the occasion of any important work among the Hindus. He does not want to impose a tax on everything like the pandits. But he is rather displeased with the Brahmins on account of these very habits. The wonder is that he himself is a Brahmin but not like his contemporaries. I weep over the sense of those who accuse him, enlightened and religious as he is, of falsehood and infidelity; who call bad names to so pious and holy a man as he is; who say that he is Christian at heart;

who say that he is in pay of Government to convert the Hindus to Christianity ; and who say that he dines with the English. Good God, all this talk is sheer calumny. This recalls to my mind an opposite saying of the Rishi—

عروجت نمائند جفا جوئی را بہوشاش درہم کشد روی را

i. e. when a bigot is unable to maintain his ground by argument, he flies to arms. And the fact is well known that of all the pandits of India none can dare open his mouth in argument with him. The man, who has been at his study half his life and acquired proficiency in learning, may, perhaps, merely understand the sense of his teaching ; much less he can confront him in reasoning. Those who have not seen the Vedic Vyas, should go to see Dayanand Saraswati. The knowledge of other sciences and arts than theology, and the delivery of speech of this matchless man are surpassing strange. Good heavens, whence can persons get such systematic argumentativeness and power of impressiveness to face him for discussion. If any one so hopes, it is all vain. Even some of his pupils are so learned that there would be no first class pandit of Benares equal to them. He is like the sun, in whose light the sight of bats disappear. How can any one come to him to argue? Can the lamp give light before the sun? Can the moon be covered by throwing dust at it? In like manner, how can any one, sunk upto nose in the quagmire of selfishness, self-interest, self-aggrandizement, and self-glorification stand before him?

Is it reasonable to think that bathing in the Ganges, worshipping the cow, giving alms to a nominal Brahmin can form the principles of a religion? The principle is that which is accepted by reason and holds good everywhere. Can the Mahomedans who bathe in the Ganges become Hindus? Can those Mohamedans who give charity to a Brahmin come within the pale of Hinduism? No; not at all, not at all. If any worshipper of the Brahmins says that they can, if they have faith. We ask, how can then a particular thing under heavens have any concern with it? The old adage is true, that faith looks upon the liquid of a pot as the water of the Ganges. When the salvation depends upon faith, any rivulet will be quite enough to give it. To be brief so as not to lose the object of our discourse, look, how have the Brahmins aggrandized themselves! Is God partial to one sect of people? It was their own tongue and pen, that have legalized the appropriation of all useful things to themselves. Knowledge which is the main means of knowing God, they have reserved to themselves alone and forbidden others from acquiring it. They have gone so far as to say that hearing the scriptures from the mouth of the Brahmins alone, is conducive to spiritual welfare. But whoever he may be, he can acquire merit, provided he put a couple of pices on the palm of a Brahmin. Behold the number of sacred places and the Brahminical management of them! See this see that; give pice, they chat. Gramery, thanks to Dayanand Saraswati, who has exposed the humbug of this tribe to his Hindu brethren. "Beware, beware" he says, as it were, to them, "of the cunning Reynards! They will plunder you

in open day in the forests of Bindrabun and the plains of Nimkhar near Ayudhia? O ye, doves! fly from the talons of these human birds of prey." Still many people do not desist from doing respect to the Brahmins, and do not follow the path shown by this apostle of truth. They will repent afterwards, if they lose this golden opportunity. I and persons of my opinions offer thousand thanks to Dayanand Saraswati, praise to those Hindus who are grateful to the noble efforts of such a philanthropic man as Dayanand Saraswati, and good will to all those who have thrown themselves heart and soul into the wake of his heavenly message.

In Nov. 1878 he visited Ajmere and delivered lectures on the Vedic religion. The first lecture was on the existence and nature of God; the second on the excellence of the Vedas. It was largely attended by the people of Ajmere. Rev. Grey and Dr. Husband, the most learned Christian gentlemen at Ajmere, were also present there. The Swamiji conclusively proved in his lectures that the only divine book on earth could be the Veda alone and no other. To dispose of the claims of the books of western religions, he read out a long list of errors of the New and Old Testaments and of the Koran. To avoid misapprehension, he said that it was not his object to offend the feelings of any people by publicly declaring their weak points; but he only meant that they should reflect on them and think themselves if such books could be at all called divine. Upon this, Rev. Row told the Swamiji that, if he sent the list to him, he would furnish an explanation. The Swamiji

replied that he wished it heartily that learned men like him should come to ascertain truth. The Rev. gentleman said that truth or error could then be found out when he forwarded the the list of errors to him, and he would reply to it. The Swamiji remarked that a written communication would take a long time, and the people in general would not be profited. It would be better if he took trouble to come there, when he would put him questions to answer. The Rev. gentleman said that the list should be first sent to him, and when he had considered it for two or three days, he would come and answer it. The Swamiji said that he could not give the whole list for fear of mishap, but would send a few questions out of it ; and when he had answered them, he would like to ask certain questions relative to them, and so forth. This being agreed the Rev. gentleman went away. The next day the Swamiji sent through Pandit Bhagram, the Extra Assistant Commissioner, some 60 questions on the Bible out of the list to the Rev. gentleman. After ten days when the lectures intended for Ajmere were come to an end, Rev. Row finished his consideration of the questions, and a day was appointed for their answers. As the notice of the meeting was given to the public, a great multitude of people came together to hear the answers of the missionaries. The respectable gentlemen of the city were Sirdar Bahadur Munshi Ami Chand Judge, Pt. Bhagram E. A. C., Sirdar Bhagat Singh Ex. Engineer, and other Rases and Bookers of the town. At the appointed time the Swamiji arrived with the four volumes of the Veda, and the missionaries came accompanied by Doctor

Husband. The Swamiji said that he had had discussions before with the Christian missionaries, but met with no disturbance, and he hoped that the similar calm temper would be maintained in that meeting. The Rev. gentleman agreed to keep order and control of passions throughout the discussion. The Rev. missionary said that the questions were many, and the time of two hour and a half at disposal was short; so only two or three questions and answers could be made on them. Then writers were employed to note down the questions and answers word by word as dictated by the parties.

Swamiji.—Genesis, Ch. I, Verse 2, says:—"The earth was without form and void." Now, God is omniscient. His knowledge is perfect. The work he has made by his knowledge, can not be imperfect or void and without form. Man's knowledge is limited, his works are therefore without any form or order. But such can never be said of the works of God.

Missionary.—The phrase without form does not mean imperfect, but it means uninhabited. As for instance, the book of Ayúb Ch. II. V. 24:—They shall have to wander in trackless wilderness. The word which signifies without form, here means wilderness there.

S.—In the verse previous to it, it is said that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." This passage shows that the word can not mean uninhabited; for it says, it was

void or uninhabited. If the phrase meant uninhabited, there was no necessity of using the word void or uninhabited again. If God alone created the world, could he not create it out of his knowledge from the beginning with some kind of form?

M.—All languages have synonymous words generally coming one after another; as, *bood-o-bakh* in Persian, which are all synonymous: in like manner, it is right to say in Urdu that the earth was barren and waste.

Observation.—The Swamiji was going to say something more; but the missionary said that only two questions and answers could be made on one point; or else the questions being many would not be finished that day. Upon this the Swamiji said that it was not necessary that all the questions should be disposed of in one day; some should be settled that day, and others in two, three, or as many days following as would take to go through them. The missionaries did not consent to more questions than two being made about their answers. The Swamiji tried much, saying that since many men were assembled there and were waiting to hear something, if nothing worth so much trouble occurred then, they would go home disappointed; but all was to no purpose. The missionaries would not yield a second more than before.

S.—Gen. I. 2.—“And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” The first verse tells us that God created heaven and earth; but the creation of water was not mentioned. Whence, then, did water come to exist? Is God

of the form of spirit, or is he corporeal like us? If he has a body, he can have no power to create the heaven and earth; for the atoms are more delicate than the limbs of the body, and, consequently, it is impossible for limbs to hold and unite them to create things. Also, he can not be omnipresent or all-pervading. When his spirit was swimming on the surface of the waters, where was his body?

M.—When he created the earth, water was included in it. God is spirit, and so is he called in the Bible from beginning to end.

S.—The account of God in the Old and the New Testament makes him corporeal in many places; for, his coming down to Eden for Adam; his descending on the Mt. Senai; his talking with Moses, Abraham, and his wife Sara; his going into their tent; his wrestling with Jacob; and the like adventures of his show that he must possess some or other kind of body, or he assumes it on such occasions.

M.—These things do not concern the verse, and are told from ignorance. Suffice it to say in reply to them, that the Jews, the Christians, and the Mahomedans, who accept the Bible, are all unanimous in declaring that God is spirit.

S.—Gen. I. 26.—“And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” This verse clearly proves that God is like Adam in form. He had body and soul like Adam according to this verse. How could he make Adam after his likeness, if he had no form?

M.—This verse has no mention of body. God created Adam holy, intelligent, and happy. He is holy, intelligent, and happy himself, and made Adam like himself. When Adam sinned, he fell from the likeness of God, as is manifest from the 24th and 30th questions of the First Catechism. Epistle to Corinthians III. 9 and 10:—Don't speak lies among you, for you have cast off the old Adam with his works, and put on a new life, which is like your creator's in knowledge. This shows that man was made like God in knowledge and holiness. We are made anew. Corinthians III. 17, 19,—God is spirit; God is spirit. Wherever the spirit of God is, there is peace. We distinctly see the glory of God, and change into his form from glory to glory by means of his spirit. This shows that the faithful or believers are changed into the likeness of God, *i. e.* in knowledge, holiness, and happiness; for, *being endowed with certain qualities, man's body is never changed.*

S.—The creation of Adam after the image of God proves the corporeality of God. Had God made Adam holy and happy, how could he have broken the command of God? If he broke the law, it is proved that he was not wise or had no knowledge. His account that when he tasted of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, his eyes were opened, proves that he got knowledge afterwards. If he had knowledge before his tasting of the fruit, it is improper to say that he also got knowledge after it. God at first blessed him with prosperity. But when he broke the divine law by eating the forbidden fruit, he became endowed with

knowledge, and knew that he was naked. He covered his body with the leaves of "goolar." Here think a little that if he was like God in knowledge and holiness, is it not strange that he could not know whether he was naked or covered? Was he so ignorant? If he was like God in knowledge, holiness, and happiness, he should have been omniscient and happy for ever, and should have got no pain whatever; for he was like God in the qualities above mentioned. He could not have fallen from his state. If he fell, he could not be like God; for, God never falls off from his knowledge and the like divine attributes. Since Adam, being like God in those three qualities, fell from them; the believers will suffer the same fate, unless they have more knowledge than Adam, and, consequently, God. If they have equal knowledge with Adam, they will fall, as he fell who was like God in those respects.

M.—The first answer will suffice most of the objections. As regards the disobedience of Adam, he was holy before, but became sinful after, he disobeyed God. It is incorrect to say that he acquired knowledge afterwards; because when he tasted of the fruit of the forbidden fruit, he simply came to know evil, which he did not know before. That his eyes were opened and he knew that he was naked, means that being sinful he became ashamed. As for the assertion, that had he been like God, he would not have fallen, I say that he was made after the image of God, but he was not equal to him. Had he been equal to God, he would not have fallen into sin. As

for the question, if the believers were more holy than Adam, I say that the question is not about more or less holiness, but about form or likeness, whether the image of God was material or not. If that image under discussion was material, the believers, when regenerated by the grace of God, would change their corporeal frame.

S.—Gen. II. 3 :—“And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.” God can get no fatigue in creating the world, being almighty, all pervading, truth intelligence, and happiness. Then, how can he have the necessity to rest on the seventh day? If he rested at all, he must have worked very hard in previous six days. If he blessed the seventh day, what did he do with the foregoing days? We cannot say that it takes God a moment to create the world, or that he is fatigued.

When this question was asked by the Swamiji, the missionaries said that the time was over, and that they could stay no longer. Also, it took long to dictate answers. They did not like to dictate when speaking. If more questions were to be asked, they should be sent to them for answers. Upon Dr. Husband's motion Sirdar Ami Chand said that the questions should be made in writing by means of letters. If they were to be dictated like that day, they would never come to an end even in six months. The Swamiji said that there would be a great botheration in not noting down the questions and answers; for persons could gainsay what they once affirmed. They could get them printed in any way they liked.

If the questions and answers were made by epistles, the public would not be benefited; whereas they now heard what passed before them. However, the missionaries did not agree to have the answers noted down the next day, and so the discussion was cut short, and the people dispersed to their respective homes. Afterwards the three papers were duly signed by the parties, confirmed by the president, and deposited with them separately.

We are unable to give all the discussions of the Swamiji with the most renowned priests and advocates of the various denominations of faith and superstition that prevail all over the world, and that are sufficiently represented in India. In his missionary life of over twenty years, not a single day passed without some or other kind of religious discussion. To refute the hypocrisy of all superstitions, he travelled thousands of miles in his missionary journeys from town to town and province to province in the vast and densely populated continent of India. We heartily regret to plead our inability and want of means in depriving the reader of some of the most charming scenes of the Swamiji's heroism and successful struggle against all danger and temptation. The Arya Samaj is making arrangement for the collection of his biographical remains. Suffice it to say that his stupendous efforts to bring the demon of superstition down to the ground, to apply axe to the root of hypocrisy, and to propagate the most beneficial doctrines of the Holy Vedas, were crowned with the most remarkable success, as was never achieved by the enthusiasm and self-sacrificing zeal of any religious

reformer. What contributed to his wonderful success was his indomitable alliance with the invincible force of truth. His victory over all kinds of paganism is marked all over the country by the establishment of a religious society called the Arya Samaj, which is, as it were, the monument of triumph, erected by the recognition of truth and the sense of public good in commemoration of his restoring the Vedic religion to the modern world. It will not be incompatible with the tenor of the subject in hand to offer a few remarks of our own on the Arya Samaj, with the view to explain it to those, who may have no opportunity to know or hear of it.

The Arya Samaj, as everybody is aware, is purely a philanthropic association, the fundamental object of which is the propagation of the most ancient religion of the world, revealed at the time of creation in the form of the Vedas for the righteous conduct of man upon earth. But as the things acquired from without, unlike those inherent in the human nature, are only retained with unremitting toil and sacrifice of worldly comforts,—a circumstance, which, for instance, is exemplified in the attainment of secular knowledge, which, but for constant practice and application, would soon escape from the hold of memory,—this extraneous communication of God's commandments was almost lost by the luxurious indolence of man in the long march of time. Man's attempt to supply its place did nothing but spoil the case, the ruinous consequences of which brought woe into the world in ten thousand hideous forms. The disappearance of true knowledge afforded ample opportunity to

the selfishness of designing men to frame laws for their own glorification and introduce them under the specious pretext, that the corruption of times justified the improving wisdom of God to annul his previous orders. The blindness of ignorance rallied round them. The strength of union was rewarded with worldly pleasures, which gagged the sceptical doubt in the enthusiastic breast. The success of one excited emulation in others, and then the sordid desires of love, fame and wealth came into full play, and produced a host of hypocrites as time rolled on. The natural result of all their laws was simply confusion and contention, which folly looks upon as so many addenda and corrigenda of the law of God.

Now, this diversity of religion throws the thoughtful mind into the vortex of an ocean of uncertainties, from which the soundness of philosophy alone can save it ; for, inasmuch as it is the science of causes in their effects, it gradually leads the mind from apparent variety to substantial unity. But as it is not in the power of average understanding, already distracted by the pressing necessity of stomachical servitude, to cultivate knowledge independently and reap the fruit of happiness therefrom, the universal good-will of Swami Dayanand Saraswati has established the Arya Samaj, where people in general can freely participate with the learned in the enjoyment of knowledge, which ultimately tends to the salvation of man ; for, it is a well-known maxim that there can be no salvation without knowledge, *ज्ञानं मोक्षमिति*: or as Sadi puts it, that none can know God without it. It is a great pity that such a rare

advantage of acquiring virtue, knowledge, lawful pleasures and happiness should be suffered to pass unheeded through engrossment of the fleeting sensual pleasures, the bewitching charms of which have overturned the natural order of things.

Though prejudice will never allow an impartial examination of its principles, yet the duty toward his country requires of every man, who can lisp or scribble, to point out its prominent features for the consideration of the general public. With this object in view, we here translate its principles for the kind consideration of the impartial reader.

ARYAN DECALOGUE.

1.—God is the original cause of all true knowledge and of the things made known by it.

2.—The Supreme Being is true, intelligent, holy, happy, unbeginning, almighty, just, merciful, unborn, infinite, unchangeable, eternal, incomparable, all-supporting, all-governing, all-pervading, omniscient, undecaying, immortal, fearless, incorporeal, and the maker of the universe. He alone is to be worshipped.

3.—The Vedas are the books of true knowledge. It is the duty of all the Aryas to read, teach, hear, and recite them.

4.—All ought to be ever ready to accept truth and reject untruth.

5.—All actions ought to be done conformably to virtue, i. e., after the thorough consideration of right and wrong.

6.—The principal object of the Arya Samaj is to do good to the world, i. e., to contribute to the physical, mental, and social improvement of all.

7.—All ought to be treated with love, justice, and due regard to their merits.

8.—Ignorance ought to be dispelled and knowledge diffused.

9.—No one ought to be contented with his own good alone; but every one ought to regard his prosperity as included in that of others.

10.—All ought to be subject to laws beneficial to the society at large; but in personal matters they may act with freedom.

The universality of the principles is co-extensive with the human race. They can be followed by all men from the equator to the poles. They ascribe the authorship of the Veda—*knowledge par excellence*—and Nature to the all-pervading Supreme Intellect and Impartial Judge of all, and ordain the acquisition and practice of knowledge as the sole duty of man on earth. They point to truth as our guiding star in the perilous path from life to eternity. They discard all mediums or mediators between man and his Maker. They inculcate the heavenly virtues of justice, benevolence, sincerity, mercy, and general peace with all creatures. Hence, their superiority over all other religions lies in the liberty of conscience, the immediate worship of the Deity, the unimpeded action of free-will, the equality of rights, the cultivation of mercy, the universality of friendship, the enjoyment of harmless pleasures,

the honest acquisition of wealth, the respect of learned men, the practice of virtue, and the tranquillity of mind.

This true cosmic religion which Swami Dayanand Saraswati had the honor to preach to the welfare of the whole world, is entirely free from national prejudices, racial partiality, human slavery, carnal pleasure, worldly vanity, especial providence, cruelty, oppression, plunder, debauchery, injustice, indolence, and ten thousand other vices, that are the foundation-stones, as it were, of other religions, now darkening the fair face of Nature. Therefore the Vedic religion, for such is its original name, is pre-eminently fit for all persons without regard to color or climate.

The impartial reader of the Vedas will notice that their religion is destined to overspread the enlightened world. And this is the cause why the institution of the Arya Samaj, which is the organ for the propagation of the Vedic religion, is becoming popular with the advancement of education in India. All the old religions, Hindu, Jaini, Christian and Mahomedan, which reigned supreme in the dark ages of ignorance, are shaken to the foundation by the preaching of Swami Dayanand Saraswati. They are tottering to fall and so look very terrible. Their advocates and professors make desperate attempts to maintain them; but their very efforts tend to expose their weakness and hasten their fall. Innumerable societies and assemblies are held to stop the progress of the Arya Samaj. But how can darkness resist the path of the rays of the sun? Ad

far as false learning of hypocrites can prove, and as far as the external power of millionaires can effect anything, the professors of these religions have left no stone unturned to nip in the bud the eternal dispensation of the Arya Samaj.

To give the reader an example of the numerous efforts made to frustrate the object of the Arya Samaj, an account of the proceedings of a grand assembly is here inserted. It will show the magnitude of the effect of the Swamiji's preaching by its gigantic preparations to thwart it. It is as follows :—

A great convocation of pandits from Gaunda, Navodipa, and Kashi was held on Saturday evening of 22nd January, 1881 A. C., in the Senate Hall of Calcutta to discuss the orthodoxy of certain religious usages, which the Swamiji had assailed. From the *Pioneer's* report and the account given in the *Arya Darpan* of Shah-jehanpur, it appears that Pandit Tannath Tarkvachaspathi, Pandit Jee-wanand Vidyasagar B. A., Pandit Bhuwan Chandra Vidyaratna, and the like about 300 pandits from Calcutta, Navodipa, Bhatpara, Vikrampore, Jessore, Burdwan, and the other parts of the country were present on the occasion. The following native gentlemen and noblemen also attended the meeting :—

The Hon'ble Maharajah Jotendro Mohan Tagore Bahadur, C. S. I., Maharajah Komoul Krishna Bahadur, Rajah Rajendra Narayan Deb Bahadur, Rajah Harendro Krishna Bahadur, Rajah Rupendro Lal Malik, Kunwar Devendro Malik, Dr. Sorendro Mohan Tagore, C. S. I., the Hon'ble

Roy Kristo Das Pal Bahadur, C. I. E., Babu Joy Kishen Mookerjee, M. Jamna Narayan Tewari and M. Banka Behari Bajpyi of Cawnpore, Pandit Sudarshanacharya of Bindrahan (Mathura), Ram Subrahma Shastri *alias* Ram Suba Shastri of Tanjore (Madras), Seth Narayan Das, Rai Badri Das Bahadur, Seth Naher Mal of Calcutta, Seth Jugal Kishore, Seth Mohan Lal, Seth Hanstraj, Lala Ghura Mal, and some 400 others. Although Pandit Ishwara Chandra Vidyasagar (a very learned pandit of Bengal) and Babu Rajendro Lal Mitra, L. L. D. were not present, yet they accepted the decision of the assembly.

Pandit Mahesh Chandra Nyayaratna, Principal, Sanskrit College, was appointed Secretary to the meeting. He explained its objects and then proposed the following questions :—

1st Question.—Whether or not the Bráhmāna Bhāg is as valid and authoritative as the Mantra Bhāg Sanhita of the Vedas; and whether the other Smritis are as valid and authoritative as the Manusmriti.

Pandit Ram Suba Shastri of Tanjore gave the following answer to the above question :—

The text of the Yajur Veda, *vis.* *यद्विद्वान्मनुर्वदत्तं* *मनुस्मृतम्*—meaning, whatever Manu has said, is true, establishes the validity and authority of Manu's Code. The word *वदत्तं* meaning whatever invalidates the assumption of a part of the Code as an authority. The inadmission of the validity of the complete Manusmriti does away with the authority of the Veda, which enjoin the necessity

of recognizing the authority of the Code. Hence, the admission of the authority of the Vedas is contradicted by the non-acceptance of the validity of the Manusmṛiti in its entirety. Dayanand Saraswati, recognizing the authority of the Manusmṛiti, writes on the 32nd page of his Satyārth Prakāśh प्रसाहितार सत्यार्थप्रकाशे, which proves his acceptance of the Manusmṛiti.

The six chapter of the Manusmṛiti has—

यथाशास्त्राय सेवेत दीक्षा विधी बने वसन्
विविधा शीपनिषदो राक्षसं विद्वदे ऋषीः

meaning, let a Brahmin hermit follow these and others as well as various Upanishads and Vedas for his spiritual welfare,—which proves the validity of the Upanishads besides that of the Brāhmanās.

The second chapter of the first book of the Yajur Veda Aranyak says—

अस्तिः प्रत्यक्षमेतिहाननुमानं अनुसृतम्
एते रादित्यमच्छसं सत्यं एवविधासते

—meaning, all that exists in the solar system will be known by Smṛiti (law), Pratyaksh (evidence), Aitibaiya (history), Anumān (inference), according to which all the codes are as valid as the Vedas; for, the word vidhasyate means pramityate, i. e. what gives true knowledge. This meaning is given by the commentator. Pandit Taranath Vachaspati writes on it: thus:—

वेदीयविधी षडसूत्रम् अस्तिदीप्ति च तद्विदाम् i. e. the Vedas are the roots of religion, and so are the Smṛitis.

This authority of Manu makes all the Smritis valid. Many similar arguments prove the Bráhmanas equally valid with the Vedas, and the other Smritis with the Manusmriti. In this all the pandits are unanimous.

2nd Question.—Whether or not the worship of the images of Vishnu, Shiva, Durga, and other Hindu deities; the performance of *shrádh* ceremony after the death of persons; bathing in the Ganges; and visiting sacred places, are sanctioned by the Shastras.

The Pandit gave the following answer to the above question:—

All these are sanctioned by the Shástras. For instance, the Rig Veda says, *सर्वे देव्यो मन्त्रो मन्त्रो देव्यो* इदं वचं अविमं वाहं विवमं; according to which the worship of the images of the Shiva's phallic and the like is meritorious. Its commentary is, "O Rudra! as your birth depends upon your will, your birth and life are wonderful, that is, you are not subject to the influence of actions. Hence, the gods erect and worship your phallics for their good and felicity." Erection or placing is impossible without the images of phallics and the like. Hence the worship of images. In the Rámáptni Upanishad Ramchandra says to Shiva, "I am present in the image of stone at your place, called Kashi, for the salvation of all. They who worship me in a stone image, are liberated from the sin of the slaughter of a Brahmin, and the like. There is not the least doubt at all in it."

The Brahjwál Upanishad clearly establishes the image worship by ordering, "Worship Shiva's phallas thrice a day."

The second chapter of the Manusmriti has, "Purify by daily baths ; worship (*tarpan*) the gods and goddesses, the sage, and the father ; and perform fire-sacrifices."

In like manner, many other books prove the propriety of the worship of Shava, Vishnu, Durga, and the like. Their non-worship brings on sin, as is shown in the passage of Gotam's Dharam Shástra. It means "He who does not worship images, will go to hell till the sun, moon, and stars shine in the sky. If a person does not worship one day, he shall undergo Brahmá Kurach penance ; if one month, Parah Kurach penance ; if one year, Udambar Kurach penance. That house is like a cemetery which has no image of Saligram and a conch. He is irreligious who does not worship it."

Though the Swamiji does not accept the authority of the Rámútápní Upanishad and Brahjwál, which clearly inculcate the worship of images, because they are not enumerated among the ten Upanishads which he recognizes ; yet he proves his object by the quotation of the Kaivalya Upanishad, which is not among the ten Upanishads on the 3rd page of the Satyáarth Prakásh.

Since he accepts the authority of the said Upanishad which is not among the ten Upanishads, he must accept the Rámútápní, Brahjwál, and the other Upanishads, which are equally valid with it. It is said that the worship of images can not be proper ; for it is not laid down in the Shruti

and the Śrutī. But it is not right; for it is clearly written in the Saṃh Veda, 36th Pāṭha, 5th Anuvāk, 10th Khāṇḍ,—

“*Sa parandivam anva vortante otha yodā syā yuktānt yānt pravastante devatā yatināni karmā te devatā pratimā hasanti rudantā gīyanti.*” This proves the images and temples of gods. But Dayanand Saraswati says that it refers to *Brahmalōk*, which shows that he has not consulted the whole context. If the word *parandiva* means *Brahmalōk*, how can the word *anveti*, which means to see, be proper here? For both words would then mean to get quietude by seeing *Brahmalōk*, which is impossible on the earth. The word *parandiva* can never mean *Brahmalōk*. Hence, it means Vishnu of this world, which is only suitable here.

Munu's Code says, “It is proper to make a temple of gods between two villages. If any body does not place a stone image in it, he should be fined Rs. 500.” With regard to this Swami Dayanand says that the word *pratimā* means weights, which shows that he has not read the *Mīmāṃsā*, which has ruled down that the primary meaning should not be taken where the secondary is proper. Therefore no meaning besides that of stone images can be proper. If the primary meaning be taken in place of the secondary, *वसुधैः कुर्वितस्तु* would have fire mean Indra and the like gods. Hence, all the scriptures ordain the images of gods and the worship thereof.

The Yajur Veda says of the *shraddh* that it should be performed by placing the sacred thread

on the right shoulder. The plural form of *pitrī* in the Veda denotes the manes of forefathers. Accordingly, the Vedas ordain the *shrādh* of the dead. Manu also says, "Every man should perform the *shrādh* of his father on every *amāvāsī* (the 15th of a month). Atri says that if anybody does not perform *shrādh*, he becomes sinful. Hence, it is plain that the *shrādh* is sanctioned by both the Shruti and the Smṛiti.

The Rig Veda says of pilgrimage, *यजन्नाप्यहमुनाप्यजामासीदरक्षी*, which shows by the words *Ganga* and *Jamuna* that the bathing in the Ganges and Jamna procures heaven and liberation from sin.

Manu says, "To be freed from the taint of sin, one should bathe in the Ganges and live in the Kurukhetra. The Itamayan and the Mahābhārata contain many confirmations of *teerath* and *kshetra*. Therefore the bathing in the Ganges and the living in the Kurukhetra and the like holy places are sanctioned by the Vedas and the Laws.

Then Pandit Taranath Turkvachaspati began his speech in proof of the worship of images. But as it was a long one, Pandit Maheshchandra Nyayaratna told him that though he could go on several days with the subject, yet there was no time that day, and there was much work to be done. Pandit Taranath said that he had much to say on it. However, he stopped short and brought his speech to a close.

3rd Question.—Whether the words *अग्निमीळे* in the Rig Veda mean God or fire.

The Pandit gave the following answer:—
The word *agni* occurring in the mantra means fire, otherwise it will contradict the rule of the Purva Mimamsa. Hence, the mantras really mean fire only.

4th Question.—Whether the Yagnas are performed to purify the air and the water, or to secure salvation.

The Pandit thus answered it :—

अग्नीषोरेव हवामः and the like mantras of the Yajur Veda prove that the *agnihotra*, &c., secure heaven.

5th Question.—Whether the denying of the authority of the Bráhmanas, a part of the Vedas, brings on sin or not.

The Pandit gave the following answer :—

We have said above that the Bráhmanas are a portion of the Vedas. Hence, to deny the authority of the Bráhmanas is to deny that of the Vedas. Manu says of the reviler of the Vedas, "the reviling of the Vedas produces the same sin as the drinking of wine.

Then the Pandit Ram Suba Shastri read to the audience the book of his own composition, called Dayanand Kautkôtháran. At the end, all the pandits subscribed their names in confirmation of what was proved in this extraordinary meeting.

The vain display of learning on the part of the meeting produced no effect on the movement of the Arya Samaj. The pandit's answers are imprinted with sophistry on the face. His

distortion of meaning and insisting more on the authority of modern idolatrous literature of the Brahmins than on that of the Vedas, which form the foundation of the Arya Samaj, were soon detected and ably refuted by our brother, Lala Sain Das, President, Arya Samaj, Lahore, in a pamphlet called the *Ek Arya*, to which the reader is referred, if he is confounded by the fallacious arguments of learned folly. He will perceive that despite all their pedantry the pandits durst not argue with the Swamiji, who, had he been invited to the meeting, would have removed their doubts.

Another society which the tender-heart-ness of our Swamiji inaugurated, is the *Go-rakshini Sabha*, a society for the protection of animals, and especially the cow. He published a pamphlet, called the *Gokarunānidhi*, setting forth numerous unheard-of arguments, based upon the science of true political economy and of theology. The truth of the fact, the cogency of arguments, the eloquence of language, and the pathetic appeal to the inherent mercy of human mind, soon laid hold on the tender heart of the Hindus, who, though outside the pale of the Arya Samaj, now chiefly carry on this propaganda of merciful utility. The first practical measure suggested by the originator was to memorialize the British Government on the enormous daily slaughter of cows, enforced by the existing laws; but it proved abortive, as the required number of signatures could not be procured before the Swamiji's death, which gave a serious blow to the infant movement. To show the reader the liberal aims of the plan, a translation of the rules of the society are herein inserted.

1.—The object of the society is to afford the whole world all kinds of comforts and to do harm to none.

2.—The duty of the society is to utilize all things by proper means, according to the laws of nature, for the good of all.

3.—It is not the duty of the society to be engaged in a work of little profit and great loss.

4.—The society will honor the persons who spend their time and money or otherwise assist in its beneficent work.

5.—It expects aid from all the people of the world, as its work concerns the good of all.

6.—It considers all other societies of the world whose object is general benevolence as its help-mates.

7.—It has no connection with persons who act against the desire of the law and the people, who are selfish, subject to passions and the pride of ignorance, and who do improper work for the ruler and the ruled.

The disinterestedness of these societies could not be long hidden from the scrutinising public. When they saw that all the mental and physical labor of the Swamiji was devoted to the ultimate good of them all, they began to enlist themselves in these societies. The result was that the Arya Samaj began to spread rapidly among the people.

But the sensible gentlemen saw that the lectures and discussions of the Swamiji would be forgotten in the lapse of time, and then ignorance and

superstition might invade the mind of people. They, therefore, thought it advisable to request the Swamiji to make a commentary on the Vedas according to the interpretation of them by ancient sages, and prepare other books that he thought useful and auxiliary to the study of the Vedas. On his compliance with their request, an amanuensis was employed under him, and a press was placed at his disposal. Since then his commentary is being published at Prayág every month, and the Vedic Press, for so it is called, is occupied in printing his voluminous works.

When his commentary began to be published and circulated among the people, some Sanserit scholars attacked it on literary and doctrinal points. All these were fully answered by the Swamiji either in pamphlets or in articles in vernacular newspapers. The objections of Pt. Maheshchandra Nyayaratna, the Principal of Sanserit College in Calcutta, were answered in a pamphlet, called the *Bhāratīnīṭāraṇa*, which is too long to be noticed in this book. But the objections of Mr. Hume and his conjutors were answered in a letter, which is thus translated into English:—

"In the recent issue of the *Bhārat Mitra*, dated 8th of bright fortnight of Ashādha 1940, somebody published an attack on the Vedas. The object of the writer seems to show that the Vedas are not the word of God and are not infallible. But he has simply expressed his opinions of the Vedas, and advanced no arguments to support them. Had he raised objections to any passage in the Vedas, they would have been instantly

answered. But his assertions, as they now stand, are not amenable to refutation. For example, if anybody says that a certain bag contains 1,000 counterfeit rupees. The only thing that can be said, is that as long as the rupees within cannot be shown to be spurious, we cannot believe his assertion. The same is the case with Mr. A. O. Hume and the person who has published the letter in the *Bhārat Mitra*. It was proper for these two personages to give their own version of any Vedic mantras (marking their number and chapter in the Vedas), and then to prove that the Vedas were not the word of God and were fallible. Their objections then would have been considered amenable to refutation: If they are even now desirous of getting an answer to their objections, they should do it; otherwise their objections amount to nothing. There is one thing, however, which deserves consideration, viz., Why are there different doctrines in the Vedas? Now, mark! this objection is also somewhat vague. Where, in what mantra, and of what kind the different doctrines are, is not mentioned. The different doctrines, on account of different kinds of knowledge in the Vedas, are not to be deprecated. Grammar, Nirukta (philology), poetry, astronomy, medicine, politics, music, mechanics and other sciences treating of all things from the earth to God, have their germs in the Vedas. Their technical terms and descriptions are different. As the technicalities of the knowledge imparted in astronomy are quite different from those of grammar, there are separate mantras treating of those subjects. If by different doctrines is meant

what I have said, the objection falls to the ground; if the writer means any thing else, his assertion is quite wrong. Therefore it is proper for the objectors to publish in a journal any mantra of the Vedas, which they consider fallible, with their comments thereon. An answer to their objections will be given at a proper time through the paper same. If they are truly desirous of understanding the doctrine of the infallibility of the Vedas, they can advantageously consult the Rig Veda Bhāshya Bhūmika published by me; if they do not have it, they can send for it from the Vedic Press, Prayāg. In case they are not fully acquainted with the Arya Bhāshā (Hindi), they should get it read to them by a truthful person familiar with the two languages, Arya Bhāshā and English. If they are not quite satisfied after reading it, they should remove their doubts in a personal interview with me; because much time is required for discussion through paper, and the publication of the Veda Bhāshya leaves very little time at my disposal.

As for their assertion that my Veda Bhāshya can be infallible, if I be God, or inspired by him; I only say that I am not God but his servant, and that God has revealed the Vedas, for the benefit of mankind; showing to what extent human knowledge, reason and action can go. I write the commentary on them according to the extent of my knowledge and reason, and in an unbiased spirit. It has undergone the scrutinising process of the public, and no one has come forward to find fault with it, and yet the doubts

of some persons about the Vedas are not removed! Such unfounded doubts can do no harm. The infallibility of the Vedas is manifest from the fact that they contain truth and truth only. If Mr. Hume has any objection against the Vedas, he should publish it in a paper, pointing out from my Veda Bhāshya any mantra which is the mark of his criticism; I shall then send my answer to it to the same paper. If the chiefs of the Theosophical Society raise a mere groundless doubt, there is no help for it. They are atheists and Buddhists, believing in spirits and witches. It is deeply regretted that they proclaim themselves as reformers and teachers of atheism and belief in spirits, witches, &c. They love atheism without its concomitant disbelief in *bhūts*, &c. It is true that those who leave one true God, will fall into superstition, deception, and belief in imaginary beings, such as Kut Hoomi Lal Sing, &c. Newspapers publish reports of Colonel Olcott's innumerable cures; if they are true, why does he not cure sick persons before me and thus convince me of the truth of those reports? I shall thank the chief of the Theosophical Society, if he heals any sick person whom I tell him to restore to health. I fully believe that in my presence his case would be like his Ghelā at Lahore, whose boasts procured him the amputation of his finger; his occult powers will be of no avail. I challenge the society to show me their spiritual powers or Yoga Vidya. What I have seen of their *siddhis* of Yoga, is not to be regarded as such. What new things can they be said to have learned now? I consider all these as ungodly dreams."

The triumph of Vedic religion and the fame of the Swamiji's learning spread not only in India, but in all other countries, and attracted the attention of the Rajahs or kings, who are the last to join in a good work but the first to take advantage of it. Accordingly, he was called by some of the kings of Rajputana, whence our Swamiji never came out. We now proceed to mention a few events of his life in the land of the Rajputs.

On Tuesday, the 11th of August, 1882, he went to Odeypore, the capital of Mewar, Rajputana, and was lodged in a splendid royal residence in the King's garden. The news of his arrival spread like wild fire. Hundreds of people poured forth to see him from the different avenues of the town. The King or Maharajah himself followed by a long retinue of his courtiers, came out on foot to pay respect to him. The interview so much pleased the King, that he used to attend his lectures on Vedic religion with the great grandees of his court.

The effect of these lectures on the mind of the King may be judged from his at once commencing the study of Sanscrit with the Swamiji, which he so ardently pursued, that in a comparatively short interval of seven months he mastered as much useful knowledge as could be acquired by an average man in two or three years. When the King was somewhat indisposed, the Swamiji drove to his palace in a royal car placed at his disposal. He was respected and feared as spiritual teacher by the King, who several times expressed his sense of deepest

obligation he lay under by the attention and kind visits of the Swamiji. The influence of the Swamiji's preaching went so far that the Maharajah gave up his habit of daily attending the musical party of dancing girls, without which kings can not live on earth with happiness, and ordered altars to be erected both in palaces inside, and in gardens outside, the city for the sacrificial purpose of *havan*, or burning drugs of peculiar chemical composition to purify the air, the common receptacle of breathing.

His lectures and sermons in the royal court were attended by a vast crowd of people, whom nothing but the intense interest of the subject could hold in order. His master mind endowed with heavenly knowledge and accompanied with extraordinary power of oratory, pulled down to pieces the hoary structures of superstition, viz. Hinduism, Jainism, Christianity and Mahomedanism. Although it was announced every day that the professors of these religions should come forward to defend them, yet none ever thought of speaking a word in favor of these monuments of anthropomorphism.

On the eve of his departure from Odeypore, the Swamiji established a benevolent society, called *Parôpkârnî Sabhâ* in vernacular, to do the work of general good after him. The document by which he empowered the said society was read and confirmed in the Court of the King of Mewar. It is, in fact, the will of the Swamiji. It bears the signatures of thirteen great feulatory barons of the Odeypore Court. Before we translate it here

for the information of the reader, it is necessary to say that the property of the Swamiji consisted of old books, the press (now at Allahabad) to publish his books, and the casual free-will offerings of kings and nobles. The press was started for him by the liberality of his rich disciples and placed at his disposal. Before the establishment of the press, he used to refuse presents, but since then he directed what was offered to him to be forwarded to the press. All this was made over to the above-mentioned society by his will, which can be obtained from my big Arya Samaj. Its fourteen articles specifying the duties of the Sabhā are as follow :—

(1) The Society should protect me and my property in adversity and manage and apply the said property to benevolent purposes both in my life-time and after my death, viz :—

(a) The printing and publishing of the Vedas and the books supplementary to their study.

(b) The preaching of Vedic religion by sending missionaries to the different countries of the world, so that people may reject falsehood and accept truth.

(c) The supporting and educating of orphans and paupers.

(2) The Society should delegate one of its members quarterly or half-yearly to examine and check the accounts, and to inspect the management of the Vedic press at Prayag (Allahabad). A report on the press of such an inspection should be sent to each of the members. It should distinctly

state any shortcoming, mismanagement, or any kind of bungling the inspector notices in the working of the press. The inspector should also point out remedies for the same. It will then be the duty of the members to express their opinions and forward it to the president of the Society, who will take necessary steps to correct the evils in conformity to the opinions of the majority of members. The members are requested not to be unmindful of their duty in any way.

(3) It is proper and necessary for the Society that it should do this most beneficent and virtuous duty with zeal, perseverance, seriousness, and magnanimity, equal to the importance of the task before it.

(4) The Society which consists of 23 Aryas, should be considered in place of me after my death; that is to say, it shall have the same powers over my property as I have in my life. If any of the said 23 members, either out of selfishness or any other cause, attempt at sole power, he shall be thought as having no right to do it.

(5) As the Society, in virtue of its authority, has power in my life-time to protect me and my property and to make improvement upon it; so it shall have the power of performing the obsequies of my corpse; that is to say, when my spirit departs from the body, it should not allow the corpse to be interred, drowned, or thrown away in the forest; but it should burn it on a sandal pyre. If it be impossible, it should take 2 maunds of sandal wood, 4 maunds of clarified butter, 5 seers of camphor, 2 seers and a half of

वृष (agallochum) and अरु (tabernamontana) fragrant roots, and 10 maunds of wood, to consume my body, according to the precepts of the Vedas laid down in the *Sanskṛbidhi*, on an altar with the chanting of the Vedic mantras as in a sacrifice. It should not do any thing else against the precepts of the Vedas. If the members be not present on the occasion, anybody then present may perform the said ceremony, and he should recover as much as he spends on it from the Society, which should pay the expenses.

(6) I have power in my life-time, and the Society has it after my death, to strike off the name of any member I or it likes, and appoint his substitute, who must be a competent Arya. But no member can be removed from the Society until his acts are proved to be inconsistent with the rules.

(7) *The Society like myself should always try to adopt those means and measures which have been voted for and agreed upon by all the members, in the execution of the will, in the fulfillment of its provisions, in the removal of a member and substitution of another in his stead, or in the protection of me in the time of misfortune. But if there be disagreement as to the adoption of those means among the members, the opinion of the majority should be followed; and the vote of the president should be considered equal to two votes.*

8 The Society should never remove more than three members on the examination of their faults until their substitutes are appointed.

9 If a member dies, does not observe the foregoing rules, or abandons Vedic religion, the president should ask the consent of all to remove him and appoint another competent Arya gentleman of Vedic persuasion in his stead ; but till then no new, except the usual routine, work should be done.

10 The Society shall always have the power of management and adoption of new plans. If it have no certainty of the correctness of its resolutions, it should take the opinions of the Arya Samajes at some appointed time through correspondence, and should act on the opinion of the majority.

11 The president should annually or half-yearly publish and send letters to the members of any increase or reduction of the establishment, the acceptance or rejection of any thing, the removal or appointment of members, the examination and audit of accounts of receipts and disbursements, of assets and liabilities, and of profit and loss.

12. No quarrel or dispute in connection with this will should be sent to the government courts of the time being. The Society should decide it itself according to the law. But if it be out of its power, it may be taken to the court for decision.

13. If I wish to appoint pension or give donation to any deserving Arya in my life-time, and get it registered, the Society should accept and give it.

14. I, and the Society after my death, always and in every respect, reserve to ourselves the power of amending the above rules in consideration of any especial advantage, improvement, benevolence, or public good.

During his sojourn at Oleyapore, the Swamiji received several letters from the Chief of Shahpura, inviting him to honor the place with his visit. Accordingly, he started for Shahpura on 3rd March, 1883. The Chief being informed of the date of his departure, arranged for conveyance at the place called Chittourb, where the Swamiji stopped for three days to despatch some work which had fallen into arrears. On the 7th March he reached Shahpura, where he was cordially received by the Chief and his courtiers. After the ceremony of reception was over, the Swamiji delivered lectures on religion and morality. The truth of his preaching won the hearts of all, who, as the report goes, embraced the Vedic religion en masse. While he was here, he was earnestly solicited by the Maharajah of Jodhpore to favor him with his visit. He, therefore, left Shahpura and reached Ajmere en route to Jodhpore on 27th May. On the next day he travelled by railway to Jodhpore, where the King with all his relations and courtiers gave him the most cordial reception. On the interview the King presented him with five gold and twenty five silver coins, and accommodated him in a splendid building, which was especially furnished for his residence. Here the Swamiji delivered lectures on true religion, the duties of the king and the subjects, and the pleasures of virtuous conduct. The sensible

people of Jodhpur became his followers. Besides daily lectures and discussions with the votaries of other religions, the Swamiji also continued his wonderful exegesis of the Holy Vedas. Thus he spent four months at Jodhpore; but in the fifth month he suddenly fell sick and was removed for treatment to Ajmere, where he died on the 30th of October 1883 A. C., corresponding to Tuesday, the 15th of the dark fortnight of Kartik, 1940 A. V.

The account of his sickness is thus given by a correspondent of the *Arya Magazine*.

"His death, which has been deeply deplored by all papers in India, is thus stated to have occurred. On the 25th of September Swamiji Dayanand Saraswati was seized with catarrh, and on the 29th he suffered from extreme pains in the stomach, to remove which he repeatedly filled it with water, and emptied it by vomiting; but with no success. On the 30th he took some water in which some ajwain was boiled, which gave him some motions. On the 1st of October the news of his ill-health reached His Highness the Maharajah of Jodhpore, by whom Dr. Ali Mardan Khan was engaged to attend the Swamiji.

Upto the 3rd the treatment was slow, but on the 4th the full dose of pills was given, and the case became considerably worse. He now suffered from the constant looseness of the bowels, which caused extreme weakness in his hitherto robust body. Blisters came out on the face, in the mouth and throat, so that it was not without much effort and trouble that he could talk now. He not only lost power to raise himself in his bed,

but required the assistance of several men to change his sides. Upto the 16th, however, the treatment of Dr. Ali Mardan Khan was continued, during which period Dr. Suraj Bal was also consulted. No relief was felt, but on the contrary, hiccough began to torment in addition. Upon this Dr. Adam was consulted, who advised the Swamiji's removal to Mount Abu for change of climate. The Maharajah of Jodhpore declined to send him away in that precarious state; but when the Swamiji insisted upon going to the mountain, His Highness could not help giving his assent.

The Maharajah presented Ra. 2,000 to the Swamiji, who instantly remitted them to the Arya Samaj at Bombay. Royal tents, six camels, three Ruhas, one phaston, four palanquin bearers, and some of the Courtiers were sent with the Swamiji, and the Maharajah, by way of respect, went afoot some two hundred paces with the palanquin in which the Swamiji was carried. The Maharajah also advertized a reward of Ra. 2,000 to any medical man who could cure the Swamiji.

When the Swamiji reached Mount Abu, Doctor Lachman Das, a Panjabi gentleman, undertook the treatment, and was so far successful that the hiccough stopped, and the looseness of the bowels removed within a couple of days; when he was transferred to Ajmere, and was ordered to proceed thither at once without any objection.

Finding himself successful in his treatment, Dr. Lachman Das was anxious to continue it till the cure of the Swamiji was effected; but he was not

allowed a day's stay there, nor was his resignation, which he tendered on that very day, accepted. He was therefore obliged to leave Abu for Ajmere; but before he did so, he requested the Swamiji to come to Ajmere, to which he did not agree. His attendants, marking the progress he had made towards recovery under the treatment of Doctor Lachman Das, brought him, though against his will, to Ajmere, where the disease, in spite of every means which the best medical authorities could devise, took an alarming aspect, and proved fatal on the evening of 30th October, 1883.

A little more than an hour before his death, he raised himself in his bed, and declared himself free from the disease and its consequent sufferings, and while in that posture he went into the contemplation of the Deity for some time, and then stretching himself on the bed ordered every one present to retire behind him, so that his mind might not be detracted by the sight of any one present; and when this was done, he began to sing praise to God in Hindi, and to recount his attributes in his glory. After this he cited certain Vedic mantras, and then reading the *Gayatree* mantra stretched his arms at their length, and clasping his hands in adoration to the Most High, and turning his body on the right he gave up his holy ghost.

He died at the age of 59. He was in full possession of his senses till the last hour. His body was wrapped up in a *shawl* coloured in *gairu*, and was carried to the cremation-ground on a wooden platform, on the sides of which small flags were

let loose with branches of plantain here and there. The funeral procession was attended by all classes of people,—Bengalis, Hindustanis, A arwaris, chanting hymns from the Vedas. Two maunds of sandal wood, eight maunds of common fuel, four maunds of *ghi* (clarified butter) and two and a half *seers* of camphor, were used in his cremation."

In order to give the idea of the general grief felt on his lamentable death, I here subjoin a few excerpts in testimony of his learning and greatness.

A master spirit has passed away from India. Pandit Dayanand Saraswati, the founder and supreme chief of the Arya Samaj of Aryavarta; is gone; the irrepressible, energetic reformer, whose mighty voice and passionate eloquence for the last few years raised thousands of people in India from lethargic indifference and stupor into active patriotism, is no more. He has passed out of this plane of strife and suffering into a higher and more perfect state of being.

A special telegram from Ajmere brought to many Arya Samajes the melancholy news that their master Swami Dayanand Saraswati, breathed his last at 6 P. M. on 30th October. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum.* All our differences have been burnt with the body, and with its now sacred ashes they are for ever scattered to the four winds. We remember only the grand virtues and noble qualities of our former colleague, teacher, and late antagonist. We hear in mind but his life-long devotion to the cause of Aryan regeneration; his ardent love for the grand philosophy of his forefathers.

relentless untiring zeal in the work of the projected social and religious reforms; and it is with unfeigned sorrow that we now hasten to join the ranks of his many mourners. In him India has lost one of her noblest sons. A patriot in the true sense of the word, Swami Dayanand laboured from his earliest years for the recovery of the lost treasures of Indian intellect. His zeal for the reformation of his mother-land was exceeded only by his unbounded learning. Whatever might be said as to his interpretation of the sacred writings, there can be but one opinion as to his knowledge of Sanskrit, and the impetus to the study of both received at his hands. There are few towns and but one province we believe—namely Madras—that Pandit Dayanand did not visit in furtherance of his missionary work, and fewer still where he has not left the impress of his remarkable mind behind him. He threw, as it were, a bomb-shell in the midst of the stagnant masses of degenerated Hinduism, and fired with love for the teachings of the Rishies, and Vedic learning the hearts of all who were drawn within the influence of his eloquent oratory. Certainly there was no better or grander orator in Hindi and Sanskrit than Swami Dayanand throughout the length and breadth of this land.

As soon as the sad rumour was confirmed, Colonel Olcott, who was then at Calcutta, paid a public tribute to the Swamiji's memory. He said that whatever might have been our rights or wrongs in the controversy, and whatever other pupils or orientalisists could say against the Swamiji, there was room for no two opinions as to his ever-

getic patriotism of the nationalising influence exerted upon his followers. In Pundit Dayanand Saraswati there was a total absence of anything like degrading sycophancy and toadyism towards foreigners from interested motives. At Bora Bunki, Lucknow, our President repeated the same ideas to an immense audience in the Palace-Garden (Kaisar-bag) of the ex-king of Oude, and the sentiment was warmly acknowledged.

Truly, however heretical and blasphemous might have appeared his religious radicalism in the sight of old orthodox Brahminism, still his teachings and Vedic doctrines propagated by him were a thousand times more consonant with Shruti or even Smriti than the doctrines taught by all other native Samajes put together. If he merged the old idols into One Living Being Ishwara, as being only the attributes and powers of the latter, he yet had never attempted the folly of forcing down the throats of his followers the hybrid compound of a *Durga*, *Moses*, *Christ* and *Koran*, and *Buddha-chaitanya* mixture of the modern reformers. The *Arya Samaj* rites certainly make the nearest approach to the real Vedic national religion. And now, on the death of the Swamiji, there is no one we know of in India capable of taking his place. The *Arya Samajes*, as far as we could ascertain, are all conducted by men who can as little fill the vacant place as a cardboard tree of a dramatical stage can become a substitute for the strong cedar, the king of the Himalayan forests. Loving old *Aryavarta*, as we do, for its own sake, it is with sincere sadness and fear, and with a deep sense of sympathy for bereaved India, that we say

once more—the death of Pandit Dayanand Saraswati is an irreparable loss to the whole country. At the present chaotic stage of its reformatory progress, it is simply a national calamity.

In connection with the above sad event, we may take this opportunity to make a few remarks in answer to a certain surprise expressed by several correspondents. They are at a loss to realize, they state, that a *yogi* credited with some psychological powers, such as Swami Dayanand, was unable to foresee the great loss his death would cause to India; was he then no *yogi*, no "Brahma-Rishi," as the organ of the Lahore Samaj called him, that he knew it not?

To this we answer that we can swear that he had foreseen his death, and so far back as two years ago. Two copies of his will sent by him at the time to Colonel Olcott and to the editor of the *Theosophist* respectively—both of which are preserved by us as a memorial of his by-gone friendship—are a good proof of it. He told us repeatedly at Meerut he would never see 1884. But even had he not foreseen his death, we do not see what bearing it can have upon the *yogi* powers of the defunct?"—A *Theosophist's* letter in the *Arya Magazine*.

Indian newspapers thus noticed his death:—

It would be a mistake to suppose that the work set on foot by the lamentable deceased is confined within the four corners of the Arya Samaj. The principles he preached spread far and wide, and created a revolution in men's opinions.—*The Tribune*, Nov. 3 and 10, 1883.

It is our painful duty to record the death of Swami Dayanand Saraswati the distinguished founder of the Arya Samaj and the foremost Hindu reformer of his generation. This melancholy event took place at Ajmera on Tuesday last. His vast scholarship, remarkable powers of debate, and unimpeachable independence of character will be proudly remembered by his mourning countrymen.—*The Indian Empire, Calcutta, Nov. 4.*

India has lost one of her foremost religious reformers of the old school—a rationalistic advocate of Vedic revelation—by the close of a really useful life of our now historical Pundit Dayanand Saraswati Swami, who breathed his last with the dying spasm of the year 1939. The difference may occur as to the preciseness or correctness of his exegetical exposition of the Vedic Scriptures, yet who will not miss on our public platform the deep fervour of his preachings, the great force of his language, the unopposable artillery of his forensic eloquence, the honesty of the purpose, the firmness of his resolve, the frankness and straightforwardness of his motives, his independence of character and action, and his genuinely patriotic ardent zeal to lift up his country from the depths of superstition and priestcraft, idolatry and unmeaning ostentatious ritualism?—*Gujrat Mitra, Surat, Nov. 11.*

The following are the most important of his books available at the Vedic Press, Allahabad, or any Arya Samaj in India:—

1.—*Veda Bhashya Bhūmika*, an introduction to his commentary on the Holy Vedas. It is an excellent compendium of their leading doctrines. Its perusal silences the objections of the persons unacquainted with their philosophy. In short, it is, as it were, the key to the right interpretation of the otherwise sibylline books of the Holy Vedas.

2.—*Veda Bhāshya*, his commentary on the Holy Vedas.

(a) *Rig Veda Bhāshya*, his commentary on the Rig Veda.

(b) *Yajur Veda Bhashya*, his commentary on the Yajur Veda.

These commentaries are appreciated by those alone who know a little of Sanscrit. It gives the prose order of the mantras, the meanings of words, the literal translation of the Vedic verses, and their purport in the easiest possible Sanscrit. It is supported all throughout with the authorities of ancient divine sages. It is written in two languages, Sanscrit and Bhasha or Indian vernacular.

3.—*Sātyārth Prakāśh*, an exposition of the monotheism and civilization of the ancient Aryans. Its first ten chapters treat of divine nomenclature, education, the four-fold mode of life, and the constitution of the Aryan society; and the remaining four chapters give an intensely interesting brief account of all the religions with their refutation. The study of this book will give clear insight into all the multifarious systems

of theology that are spread on the surface of the earth.

4.—*Vedānt Prākāśh*, a splendid illustrated translation and methodical arrangement of the wonderful Sanscrit grammar of Pāṇini. It is published in the following 16 parts:—

- (1) *Varnôchāran Shiksha*, orthœpy.
- (2) *Sanscrit Vākya Prabôdh*, colloquial.
- (3) *Vyavahār Bhānū*, a primer.
- (4) *Sandhi Vishaya*, coalescence of letters and orthography.
- (5) *Namika*, declension.
- (6) *Kārikā*, cases.
- (7) *Sāmāsika*, compound words.
- (8) *Struin Tuddhita*, genders.
- (9) *Avyārtha*, indeclinables.
- (10) *Akhyātika*, the verb.
- (11) *Sowvar*, accentuation and prosody.
- (12) *Paribhāshika*, technicalities.
- (13) *Dhātupātha*, roots.
- (14) *Ganapātha*, conjugation.
- (15) *Unādhikōsh*, word-making.
- (16) *Nighantu*, Vedic vocabulary.

5.—*Panch Mahā Yajna Vidhi*, an Aryan Liturgy, containing the formulæ of five rites of worship, which are as follow:—

- (1) Meditation of God.
- (2) Purification of the air.
- (3) Performance of filial duties.
- (4) Donation of alms.
- (5) Maintenance of the learned.

6.—*Sanscār Vidhi*, a ritualistic treatise on the following 16 Aryan ceremonies:—

- (1) *Garbhādhān*—conception.
- (2) *Puṣyaṅ*—festival on perceiving the signs of life in foetus, held in second or third month of pregnancy.
- (3) *Simantōnayan*—purificatory rite held in the fourth, sixth, or eighth month of pregnancy.
- (4) *Jāt Karma*—festivity of birth.
- (5) *Nām Kara*—naming the child on the 11th, 10th, or anniversary day from its birth.
- (6) *Nishkraman*—taking the child out of the house in the fourth month from its birth.
- (7) *Anna Prāshan*—feeding the child when six months old.
- (8) *Chāra Kara*—tonsure at the age of one or three years.
- (9) *Karṇa Vādk*—boring the ear or the nose by way of vaccination at the age of three or five years.

- (10) *Upanayan* and *Veidrambha*—sacrament of regeneration by the investiture of the sacred thread at 8 for the Brahmin, at 11 for the Kshatriya, at 12 for the Vaishya, as an emblem of the vow to study the Holy Vedas or the whole circle of knowledge.
- (11) *Samdvartan*—the student's return on the completion of Vedic study from the academy.
- (12) *Vivah*—marriage at the minimum age of 15 for the bride and 25 for the bridegroom.
- (13) *Grihasthashram*—entering the world or taking one's self to a profession.
- (14) *Vanaprasthashram*—retirement on the birth of the son's son or appearance of old age.
- (15) *Sannyas*—renunciation of all for exclusive devotion to preaching truth or the propagation of divine knowledge.
- (16) *Antyeshthy Karma*—cremation.

N.B.—The moral splendour of such a virtuous course of life requires no comment or description.

7.—*Aryoddesh Ratna Malà*, a vocabulary of 100 religious words of disputable signification.

8.—*Gò Caṅgana Nidhy*, a vegetarian treatise on the utility of the lower animals,—translated into English in the book called the Ocean of Mercy.

9.—*Aryābhivāya*; litany of selection of Vedic mantras for prayer.

10.—*Swami Narayan Mat Khandan*, refutation of Swami Narayan's religion.

Besides these, there are other pamphlets, and debates, which can be known from the *Arya Samaj*, but which can not be all noticed here.

With regard to his BELIEFS, the Swamiji says, in the last chapter of his *Satyārth Prakāśh* :—

The final conclusion of philosophy, acquiesced in by mankind in all times, is the only true, eternal, and universal doctrine, which readily obtains the implicit assent of common sense. If the folly of ignorance or the snare of priestcraft misleads some persons to contrary belief, the good sense of people in general does not voluntarily comply with them. But the doctrine which commands veneration for teaching righteousness, generosity, honesty, and justice, and which is stamped with the sanction and example of the learned, receives the general approval; for, the mind revolts to follow what is unsupported by reason and practice of sages. The outline, therefore, of what was believed by the refined reason of all the oriental sages of antiquity from Brahma down to Jaimini, versed in the sacred lore of the Vedas, is hereto subjoined for general information. The truth, which they have taught, and which I sincerely acknowledge, is entitled to universal acceptance in all times. Hence, it is not my object to institute a new system of religion in any manner whatever. I love to follow truth, say,

I have made it my duty to persuade others to act on truth and abjure falsehood for the sake of their own good. So, the eradication of iniquities is the end of my life. Had I been a dupe to prejudice, I would have joined any of the religious sects of India. But since I neither accept what is vicious, nor reject what is virtuous in the institutions either of this, or of any foreign country, I am incapable of dissimulation; for, it is contrary to the duty of man. The dignity of man is justified by his sympathy with the pleasure and pain, profit and loss of his fellow-creatures, by the undaunted attitude he can assume against the power of vice, and by his respect for the merits of virtue, although associated with the feebleness of constitution. Man asserts his dignity, when, to the best of his power, he loves virtue, although exhibited in a state of poverty, helplessness, weakness, and unacquaintance with the knowledge of the world. The grave responsibility and true nature of man are best exhibited by his affording protection, comfort, and honor to the children of virtue. Man's sense of virtue ever prompts him to dishonor, discourage, diminish, and destroy vice, although guarded by supremacy, strength, and considerable skill in the arts of the world. In fine, a man, true to his name, should by all possible means, encourage virtue and discourage vice. The most excruciating pain, nay, death itself, should not deter him from his pursuit of the course of virtue; for, the least deflection from righteousness would belie his human nature. Such a moral discipline has received the recom-

commendation of Maharaja Bhartrihari and other moralists in the following translation of their verses :—

The wise do not swerve from the path of rectitude, neither caring for the praise or blame of the so-called politicians, nor for riches or poverty, being regardless as to whether they would die in a day or after a millennium—*Bhartri Hari*.

Never sacrifice virtue for fear, base desire, avarice, or pain of death itself; for virtue, which gives happiness to the mind, is everlasting, but pleasure and pain, which originate from the circumstances of the body are transitory—*Mahabharat*.

There is only one true companion of man on earth, and that is virtue. It accompanies him even after death; but everything else perishes with the body—*Manu*.

It is not falsehood but truth, that ultimately prevails. It leads us to heaven by the royal road trodden by the ancient sages of subdued passions and curtailed desires. It lands us on the brilliant shore, and lodges us safe in the haven of happiness—*Upanishad*.

There is no virtue higher than truth, there is no vice baser than falsehood, there is no knowledge greater than truth. Truth, therefore, and truth alone must all follow.—*Upanishad*.

All men should act upon the disinterested advice of these truly great sages.

Now to mention briefly those simple truths with their proper meanings, which I have always believed in, and which have served me, as it were, for the beam of light in crossing the tempestuous ocean of life upon the earth. They are described at-large in my works.

1. The Supreme Being is called by the names of Brahm (the most high) Pramatta (the Infinite Spirit), the Almighty Lord, and the like. His chief attributes are denoted by the Sanskrit formula of "*Sat-chit-anand*" which literally signifies that God is truth, intelligence, and happiness; God is absolutely holy and wise. His nature, attributes, and power are all holy. He is omnipresent, incorporeal, unborn, immense, omniscient, omnipotent, merciful, and just. He is the maker, protector, and destroyer of worlds. He judges the actions of souls according to his immutable laws of justice and equity. Him do I consider and believe from the core of my heart to be the Lord of the universe.

2. The Vedas, the treasury of science and morals, are revealed by God. I regard their textual portion as self-evident truth admitting of no doubt and depending on the authority of no other book, *being represented in nature, the kingdom of God.* It is the condition of all kinds of proof, and is, therefore, capable of no other demonstration than *reductio ad absurdum*. As for example, the sun or the lamp, being a luminous body, illuminating the earth or other objects, requires no light from without.

The authenticity of commentaries on the Vedas, called in Sanskrit the Bráhmanas, 6 Angas, 6 Upánigas, 4 Upvedas, and 1127 Shákhás, all composed by Brahmá and other sages, lies in their adherence to the text, the departure from which annihilates their authority.

3. Religion consists in the maintenance of impartiality and justice, the speaking of truth, and the similar acts of virtue, which are the commandments of God, and are, therefore, consistent with the import of the Vedas. Irr religion is the commission of partiality and injustice, the telling of lies, and the like acts of vice, which are, the violation of God's law, and are, therefore, opposed to the sense of the Vedas.

4. The soul is an immortal, invisible principle, which is endowed with thought and judgment, desire and passion, pleasure and pain, and so forth.

5. God and soul are both incorporeal and unchangeable, and are related to each other as the pervader and the pervaded. The distinction of their respective individualities is constant; in other words, their physical natures are not identical. For instance, the material objects are always distinct from the space they exist in; both of them,—viz., objects and space—can never be converted either in thought or reality into one homogenous whole. Hence the relation between God and man is that between the container and the contained, the contemplator and the contemplated, the father and the son, and the like.

6. The eternal substances are 1° God, 2° soul, and 3° *Prakriti*—(Nature) the material cause of the universe. The primary properties the physical nature, and the modes of action of the eternal substances are also ever the same.

7. The manifestations of their secondary qualities, accidents, and energies constantly occur on their coalition and disappear on their separation; but their inherent power, which produces their union and disunion, is invariable in their nature. They again and again unite and disunite in eternity. Thus the secondary qualities are also eternal in their regularity of succession.

8. The creation is the vast empire of visible objects, the compounds of elements, constructed with all the perfection of design by the infinite wisdom of the Divine Architect.

9. The final causes of creation are the practical utility of the Divine powers, the equitable bestowal of rewards and punishments on the actions of souls, and the like. The eyes, for example, are to see with; so the attributes of God exist to be revealed for the general weal in the wonderful spectacle of nature.

10. The creation points to its creator; and he is no other than the aforesaid Deity; for, the display of design in the structure of the universe, and the inability of matter to form, say, the seed, and the like preliminaries of existence, conclusively demonstrate the certainty of the existence of a creator.

11. The phenomenon of birth and death like all other things is not without a final cause. That cause is, in Sanskrit, called "bond"—a trapdoor, as to speak, in the march of mind. It springs from ignorance, which consists in the perpetration of vicious acts, the worship of objects in place of God, and the obscurity of intellect. As they are all the various sources of pain, which nobody likes, but which everybody is constrained to suffer, their cause is called "bond" or captivity.

12. Salvation is the state of emancipation from the endurance of pain and subjection to birth and death, and is the life of liberty and happiness in the immensity of God. After the cyclic enjoyment of the sweet panorama of the stupendous universe, the soul resumes the course of its native activity.

13. The means of salvation are the contemplation of God, the abstraction of mind, the practice of virtue, the vow of celibacy in the time of education, the society of sages and philosophers, the love of knowledge, the purity of thoughts, the firmness of courage, and the like qualifications, which are the ornaments of humanity.

14. Wealth is a thing, earned with honesty and justice. Its opposite is the Mamon of unrighteousness.

15. Innocent pleasures are got by virtue and well-earned wealth.

16. The caste system should be based on the merits of individuals.

17. The excellence of royalty is derived from the honesty of intentions, the superiority of qualities, the justness of actions, freedom from partiality, the maintenance of justice, the ardour of paternal affection for subjects, and perseverance in studying their ease and improvement.

18. The loyalty of subjects is shown by the sublimity of thoughts, the excellence of accomplishment, the practice of virtue, the sincerity of intentions, the absence of prejudice, obedience to the laws of justice, the sense of duty, the readiness of devotion to the cause of the rulers and the fellow-subjects, love for government, hatred for intrigues, and the abhorrence of licentiousness.

19. That person is just, who, on due consideration of things, adopts truth and relinquishes falsehood, protects the just and expels the unjust, sympathises with all, and joins in undertakings for the promotion of ease and comfort of the general public.

20. The learned are called *devās* (gods); the ignorant, *asuras* (devils); the vicious, *vakshasas* (fiends); and the hypocrites, *pishāchas* (monsters).

21. The worship of gods consists in the respect and service of learned and virtuous men, parents, sages, philosophers, preachers and kings; in the fidelity of marriage contract; and in the devotion of women to their husbands. The contrary acts constitute the worship of demons. All worship is due to their living images and not to the useless idols of lifeless stone.

22. The perfection of education is attested by the competency of knowledge, the adoption of civilized manners, the performance of meritorious works, the subjection of senses, the control of evil passions and wicked desires, the improvement of character, and the absence of barbarism.

23. The proper *Puranas* (ancient books) are the works of Bráhmá and the other ages of antiquity, called the *Aitreyá* and the other three Bráhmans. The genuine history is found in the books called *Kalp* (chronicles), *Dáthá* (story), *Ndráshansi* (biographies of men). But the *Bhágwat* and the other seventeen *Puranas* are mythology, religious comedies, novels, mysteries, or miracles.

24. The *Teerath* (religious ferry) is the spiritual ark by which the sea of sorrows or abyss of pain is crossed. Hence, the *Teeraths* are the speaking of truth, the attainment of knowledge, the friendship of savants, the practice of morality, dominion over self, the discipline of mind, the magnanimity of heart, the instruction of science, and the habit of beneficence. These are the recognised ferries of the happy land; but cities, rivers, and tanks, which ignorance calls the holy places of pilgrimage, are only the pools of woe or the sloughs of despondence.

25. The spirit of enterprise is preferable to resignation to the decrees of fate, which are no more than mere consequences of the acts of previous lives; because it modifies and amends the entire series of the antecedent acts in the next

life. The slackness of exertion spoils all of them. Hence, the works of present life are more important than the wholesale reliance on the blind fate.

26. The commendable conduct of man is shown by his discriminate treatment of merits and sympathetic regard for pleasure and pain, profit and loss of others. The contrary course is reprehensible.

27. The observance of ceremonial should contribute to the improvement of body, mind, and spirit. There are 16 ceremonies from conception to cremation. These purificatory rites are binding on man. After cremation nothing should be done for the dead.

28. The *Yajna* (worship) is the entertainment of the learned in proportion to their worth, the business of manufacture, the experiment and application of chemistry, physics, and the like arts of peace, the instruction of people, the purification of the air, the nourishment of vegetables by the employment of the principles of meteorology, called *Agni-hotra* in Sanscrit, which showers blessings all around. It is the most important duty of man.

29. The ancient usage demands attribution of the appellation called "Arya" to the best, and "Daayn" to the vicious portion of mankind.

30. India is called *Aryāvarta*, because the *Aryan* branch of the human race has dwelt there since creation. It is bounded on the north by the *Himalaya* (the abode of snow), on the south by the *Vindhya* (the barrier of barbarians), on the

west by the Attock (obstruction) or Indus (Lane), and on the east by the Brahmaputra (the son of Neptune). The country within these confines is called Aryavarta proper, and its permanent inhabitants, the Aryas.

31. The competency of the teacher is proved by his power to explain the science of the Vedas and their commentaries, and to reform the character of pupils through the salutary medium of the instruction of morality and the prohibition of immorality.

32. The fitness of the pupil is shown in his love for the acquisition of knowledge, his willingness to receive instruction, his attendance on the teacher, and his execution of orders.

33. The Guru (initiator) is the father, the mother, the teacher of truth, and the corrector of misconduct.

34. The proper *Purohit* (prophet or priest) is one, who cordially loves the good of his folk and the practice of virtue and truth.

35. The *Upadhyaya* (professor) should be able to teach a certain part of the Vedic lore or should be the teacher of one science.

36. The *Shishtachâr* (etiquette) is the amiable behaviour with readiness to accept truth and to reject untruth after the careful examination of things by means of the octave evidence of logic, attentiveness to study in the bachelor life of school, and the general politeness of conduct. These are the characteristics of the truly civilized man.

37. The validity of the octave evidence of logic is unquestionable.

38. He is good and wise, who always speaks truth, acts on the dictates of virtue, and tries to make others happy.

39. The five tests of knowledge are relative to 1. the attributes of God—philosophy of the absolute and the theories of the Vedas, 2. the maxims of the octave evidence of logic, 3. the laws of nature, 4. the rules of morality, and 5. the principles of metaphysics. By these criteria distinguish between truth and falsehood. Then, abide by truth and give up falsehood.

40. Beneficence removes evils, introduces the active of virtue, and adds to general welfare and civilization.

41. The soul is free to act, but subject to the justice of God in reaping the fruits of its works. God is the executor of justice and the like laws.

42. The *Swarg* (heaven) is the uninterrupted enjoyment of pleasures and the possession of means thereof.

43. The *Nark* (hell) is the excessive sufferance of pain and the surroundings of tormenting circumstances.

44. The *Janma* (birth) is the entry of soul into the world in conjunction with the body. In relation to time, its existence is viewed as past, present and future.

45. The union of body and soul is called birth, and their separation, death.

46. Marriage (grasping of hands) should be performed in accordance with the precepts of the law, in the public manner, and on the mutual consent.

47. The *Niyog* (widow re-marriage) is the temporary union of spousless persons for the purpose of raising issue in the superior or their own tribe, on the death of the consort or the sterility of energy, in case of a prolonged disease, or on the like natural mis-hap to humanity.

48. The *Stuti* (definition) is the description of qualities for remembrance. It inspires love and the like generous feelings and sentiments.

49. The *Prārthana* (prayer) is the asking of God the gift of knowledge and the like boons on the inefficiency of one's own exertions. It results in the humility of temper and the tranquillity of passions.

50. The *Upāsana* (meditation) is the realization of the idea of God through the concentration of attention; the confirmation of conviction that God is omnipresent and fills all, that I am filled by Him, and that He is in me and I in Him; and the imitation of God's attributes in practice. The good of it is the enlargement of mental capacity for knowledge.

51. The *Sagun Stuti* (affirmative definition) is the assertion or recital of attributes predicable of God. The *Nirgun Stuti* (negative definition) is the negation or denial of properties inconsistent with the nature of Godhead. The *Sagun Prarthana* (positive prayer) is the supplication

of God's grace for the obtainment of virtuous qualities. The *Nirgun Prarthana* (negative prayer) is the asking of God's power in the elimination of vicious qualities. The *Nirgun Upasna* (positive meditation) is the unshaken belief of God's holiness. The *Nirgun Upasna* (negative meditation) is the total resignation of self to God's justice and providence.

Such is the summary of my beliefs, fully explained in their appropriate places in my books, called the *Satyarth Prakash* (guide of sense), *Bhūmika* (introduction of the Vedas). I accept such universal maxims as the speaking of truth and the condemnation of falsehood.

But I detest the religious warfare of sects ; for, they rouse their angry passions and crude notions in the form of religion. Therefore, the purpose of my life is the extirpation of evils ; introduction of truth into thought, speech, and deeds ; the preservation of unity of religion ; the expulsion of mutual enmity ; the extension of friendly intercourse ; and the advancement of public happiness by reciprocal subservience of the human family. May the grace of the Almighty God and the consent and co-operation of the learned soon spread these doctrines all over the world, to facilitate everybody's endeavour in the advancement of virtue, wealth, godly pleasures, and salvation ; so that peace, prosperity, and happiness may ever reign in the world !

Such was the great man that lived among us teaching, persuading, and leading. His premature and sudden death cast a gloom of melancholy

on the fair prospect of India's regeneration. But his Samajesoon recovered from the discouraging damper thus thrown upon their mind, debarring the progress of reformation so rightly commenced by the master genius of Swami Dayanand Saraswati. When our ignorance of the past had blinded us to the innate defects of modern education and civilization whose pernicious effects worked secretly in our hearts and corroded into our very spiritual and physical vitals; it was the shrewd penetration and clear-sightedness of this "greater man," who was much more versed in the learning of the remotest antiquity than in the superficiality of modern culture, that opened our eyes to the most effulgent glory of truth. His thundering and falsehood-condemning voice, the voice proceeding from the sincerity of heart and the purity of love for all, went into the heart of the children of knowledge and the friends of virtue. His friendly and disinterested call was obeyed by them. Their conviction of the truth of his preaching still actuates their philanthropic actions, enables them to work even more energetically than in his presence, and consoles their heart that they have thrown off the slough of sin and sorrow, which hold in the bondage of superstition the greatest portion of mankind, whose regeneration has, therefore, naturally passed into their hands.

The object of the Swamiji was only to inaugurate the true reform, and, since it was more than inaugurated even long before his career of piety and righteousness was abruptly brought to a close, his life was well spent and lasted only as long

as it was sorely needed, thus reminding us of the well-known law of Nature's economy, that she never works needlessly and to no end, and the equally well-known adage that "all is well that ends well." That the societies to work out the religious reform were already established in the Swamiji's life, is proved in the following translation of a song well-known in the Arya Samaj:—

Planted he the tree of knowledge
 In the land of Aryas,
 Preaching to us nature's privilege,
 And religion true that was.
 Vedas had long gone to disuse
 'Mong the people of this land ;
 But he preached their doctrines abstruse,
 Proving them as God's command.
 Swami truly loved the people,
 And he was a pious man ;
 He obtained the Heaven's temple
 By good works he here began.
 All his books him prove philos'pher
 In this selfish time of strife.
 Don't forget, O Brother ! ever
 What he taught you in his life.

We are unable to describe his virtues and the favors he did us and all the world in us. In these selfish days of bustle and strife, the ideal he presented to us, is quite efficient to remove our evils, if we are bold enough to copy it in our conduct in the world. Until this is done, it is hopeless to get out of the present slough of despond.

Look to his purity of character. From the time reason dawned upon him to the end of his religious life, he was always engaged either in study, asceticism, preaching, or in publishing books for the right information of the world. Day and night he was surrounded by persons either enquiring of him about the truth of religion or discussing with him on the continuance of modern superstition. His friends and foes all unanimously testify to the spotless character he presented to the world. Evil got no opportunity amid his incessant work to allure his mind to the ease of leisure and indulgence in pleasures.

His perseverance enabled him to surmount all difficulties. Having early broken all connection, he would be a sorry man, had he not been persevering. He cared for no obstacles that came across his way. Mountains and forests offered no impediments to stop him from visiting learned men in search of truth. Oppositions of men and hardships of travels did not deter him from pursuing the grand object he had set before his mind of the restoration of Vedic religion.

Temperance marked his entire life. The disadvantage of wine and other beverages he learnt from books and experience of others. The simplicity and homeliness of his coarse meal was never disturbed by the variegated flavour of savory dishes. The prominent result of this life-long temperance was exhibited in the great muscular development of his physique. Except the mortal disease that attacked him in the cause of falsehood, and to which he succumbed to our great misfortune, he

was almost stranger to any dangerous illness originating from the disturbed state of body.

The self-imposed hardship served him for physical exercise. Constant travelling mostly on foot, frequently attending the assemblies of sages and philosophers held at distance from the hum and clatter of town bustle, and daily meditation of the Supreme Being in a retired and calm place generally away in deep recesses of woods and dales, were enough to require of him an active and energetic constitution that knew but little rest.

He not only displayed the unremitting and sustained activity of body, but presented to the wonder of the Indian world the extraordinary persistency of mental application. Lectures and debates, books and pamphlets, all full of arguments founded upon logic and philosophy, and free from the filth of fables, are unquestionable proofs of the gigantic work of his ever active mind.

The regularity of all his actions might well nigh put the automaton of machines in shade. Never did nature demand of him any kind of relaxity in the usual routine of useful work. The voluminousness of his works that he prepared in the last decade of life, are sufficient to show how scrupulously every moment was employed to effect the purpose of his mission.

It is quite needless to speak of his eloquence, oratory, and debating powers, as their effects are till almost fresh in the mind of his contemporaries and survivors. The music of the east and the

logic of the west, all vanished from before the convincing truth of his philosophical religion. The boisterous learning of the moulvies, the shallow reasoning of the missionaries, and the foolish gabbling of the pandits were all exposed and held up to deserved ridicule of sensible people by his searching and scrutinizing force of invincible truth.

Though in his last days he was respected by rich nobles and chiefs who were willing to offer him money and other means of luxury, yet he was never tempted by avarice. He kept himself aloof from such surroundings as might destroy his philosophical simplicity and create in him a liking for vanity. His indifference to such worldly objects can only be admired by the appreciating sense of persons who are awake to the deteriorating effects of vacuity and indulgence in vices.

The readiness of his knowledge was one great cause of his uncommon success in preaching and his always overcoming antagonists in discussions. He was a living example of the enviable perfection of educational system of ancient Aryas. Instead of the constant possession of books for consultation or reference as is the case with the literati of modern times, he had almost all that was valuable on the tip of his tongue. And it was not little. The idea of his vast knowledge, both linguistic and objective, can only be conceived by those who have either seen him in discussions or heard his lectures. The most learned men, both Asiatic and European, miserably failed to maintain their ground before him. In the first place,

they were doubtless in the wrong. But, above all, their inability of reproduction and the defect of their knowledge combined to encompass their defeat.

Notwithstanding his invariable triumph in debates and his acknowledged superiority in knowledge to others, he was never puffed up with pride. His absence of anger, his openness of heart, his familiarity of conversation, his amiability of manners, his attention to persons of all ranks, his regard and sympathy for the rich and the poor, all testify to the humbleness of his spirit. Never did he pretend to assume an imposing character. He frankly admitted in public meetings that he was like one of his audience. He never blushed to acknowledge his shortcomings. Throughout his life pervaded the sincere love for the interests of humanity, the intense desire for the alleviation of human sufferings, and the ardent zeal for the diffusion of knowledge. All his virtues and qualities from the time we heard of him as a preacher of Vedic religion, were such as constitute a perfect ideal of human character for our imitation. If we heartily wish for our improvement and advancement in knowledge and true civilization, we have but one course open to us; and that is the imitation of the Swamiji's character in our life on earth. Do we wish to lead our countrymen from the darkness of ignorance to the light of knowledge? Then let us devote our days and nights to the study of Sanscrit, the mother of languages and religions. Do we wish to act on benevolence towards God's creatures? Then let us learn contentment from

his great resignation to the will of God. Do we wish to live a godly life in the world? Then let us take lesson from his entire renunciation of all worldliness. Do we wish to pass our life happily and in peace with our wife and children? Then let us obey the precepts he laid for the conduct of married life, and the advice he gave us in his works on the treatment of family members. Do we wish to acquire wealth by virtuous means for our and our fellow-being's benefit? Then let us adopt the professions and skills he chose for us. Do we wish to secure a good name? Then let us regulate our life in accordance with the commandments of the word of God, which the Swamiji so well expounded. Keep, therefore, O Brothers, the model of Swamiji's character always before your mind in your thought, speech, and action, if you really have your good at heart.



A
DISSERTATION.

UPON THE

Fundamental Principles.

OF

RELIGION.

INTRODUCTION.

The sages taught in ancient times,
That truth prevails in all the climes.
It holds on mind its pleasant grasp,
And sets it free from nescience's clasp
For truth and mind are kith and kin,
No joy equals when they join.
But when the mind is led to vice
Of ignorance by world's device,
Its pains and sorrows never end,
Its native peace, but ever rend.
So, when it sees the light of truth,
It runs to it, to joy as youth.
Let truth but once embrace the heart,
And none but death can ev'r them part.
Tho' what is false, is liked sometimes ;
But once found out 'tis damned betimes.
We all well know how bad we were,
That faiths to truth we did prefer.
Some liked the Crescent, some the Cross,
The Trident others at reason's loss.
We tho' suffered yet never knew,
The cause to which our woe was due ;
Till Swami taught that Vedic lore
Would lead us to the happy shore.
Its giving up brought all our woe,
Revival, hence, won't make us rue.
So, let us take to Vedic truth,
If, friend, we wish our good for-sooth.
"Look, how it triumphs," this book saith,
"In all debates with modern faith,
Which hip and thigh now vanquished lies,
Which learned men from heart despise,
And which, if left for good and all,
Will keep ye off from Adam's fall."

DURGA PRASAD.

ओम्

Fundamental Principles,

OF

RÉLIGION.

A large meeting was held on the 16th of March 1877, at Chandapore, under the supervision of Munshi Pyare Lal, to ascertain the true religion. It was attended by the learned Aryas (*volgo* Hindus), Mahomedans, and Christians. Swami Dayanand Saraswati and Munshi Lodermani were the advocates for the Vedic religion; Reverend Scot, Noble, Parker, and Johnson were the champions of Christianity; and Moulvies Mahomed Kasam and Syad Abdul Mansur represented Mahomedanism.

The following five problems were selected for solution by the above mentioned representatives:—

- 1.—Of what thing, at what time, and for what purpose did God make the world?
- 2.—Is the Deity omnipresent?
- 3.—What are God's mercy and justice?
- 4.—What are the proofs of the Veda, Bible, and Koran, being the word of God?
- 5.—What is salvation, and how can it be attained?

Munshi Pyare Lal opened the^e discussion with the following address to the assembled audience:—

GENTLEMEN,

How thankful are we to the Most Merciful God, who pervades and vivifies all, for his creating us in so benign a reign as that of our Most Gracious Empress of India, in which we can safely and fearlessly discuss dubitable points of religion! Certainly, auspicious is this day, and lucky this place, that so many respectable and learned gentlemen, versed in all the systems of religion, as are before me, have condescended to adorn the assembly, with their presence! I hope that all the learned doctors will explain their respective religious systems in gentle and polite language, so that truth may come out to light, and the people, if convinced of it, adopt it for their felicity.

DISCUSSION.

Moulvie Mahomet Kasam.—With the permission of the members of the convocation, I wish to say something for an hour relevant to my creed, before taking into consideration the afore-said subject of dissertation. If any doubt arise with respect to Mahomedanism after my statement, I shall remove it by arguments.

Now, what I would offer for your consideration, is that it is obligatory to serve the ruling power. The people, for instance, submit to the governor of the present time and obey his orders; but nobody serves him nor obeys his orders, whose rule is past away. Also, when a law is set aside,

none acts upon it. But the law which is substituted for it, is obeyed by all the people. Consequently, all the incarnations and prophets of the old time with their respective revelations, viz. the Old and New Testaments, the Psalms and the like sacred books, should not be believed in by the people of the present time; for, they were replaced by a recent revelation of the Koran through Mahomed, the last prophet of the current times. So all should accept him for their prophet and believe in the Koran as the word of God revealed in his time.

The Mahomedans do not reject Ram Krishna, and Christ; for, they were incarnations of the Deity and prophets of God in their respective times. But the orders of none but the prophet Mahomed are in force in the current time. Therefore, he who says anything against either Mahomed, Koran, or Mahomedanism, deserves instant death.*

*God has no necessity to send a prophet or ambassador to the world. It is only man that has recourse to such expedients; for, he is not present at the place where he deposes his agent. But such is not the case with God. (a) The beautiful configuration of the passive matter in continua' construction and destruction, which are the works of God, is the effect of the efficient cause—the Deity; in other words, the world is created by God. Therefore the created objects indicate the presence of God. Also, there being no place in the world where there is no created object, the omnipresence of God is established beyond all possible doubt. (b) It is an indubitable truth that he, who is present at a certain place, does not require to send his delegate there. To use the language of grammar, the delegate is to his chief what the pronouns are to its nouns. Now, nobody employs both the noun and its

Reverend Scot.—The mission of Mahomed and the revelation of the Koran are both suspicious; for, what the Koran says, can be traced to the Bible, and the Koran, therefore, cannot be the word of God distinct from the Bible. On the contrary, there cannot be the least doubt in Christ being the incarnation of God; for, his teaching clearly proves him to be the guide of the true path. His sermons, as recorded in the Bible, can alone save mankind. Moreover, he worked miracles before the people of his time.

pronoun in the same place and at the same time without violating the laws of syntax. Hence, the omnipresence of God does not require the commission of Mahomed.

It may be said that though God is omnipresent, yet He requires men to send down through them the books of religion; as the Pentateuch was brought by Moses, the Psalms by David and the Proverbs by Solomon. In like manner, the Koran was sent down through Mahomed. If God cannot send religious books without the agency of men, He is impotent and, therefore, not God; for, God is omnipotent, *Sec.* He does not want any assistance of man in sending down rain every year, in spreading seasons at proper times, and in making ten thousand other beautiful things of the world. Had He so wanted, He might have sent down the Koran like a hail stone. Therefore, inasmuch as Allah could not send Alkoran without Mahomed, he was not God, the Omnipresent and Omnipotent Supreme Being.

The Moulvie's reasoning is subversive of his own creed. He says Krishna and his book (Gita) should not be obeyed by the present generation, because their time is past away. In like manner, we can say that Mahomed and his book (Koran) should not be obeyed, because their time is past away. For man's time is his life; when his life is finished, his time is also finished, and with his time his orders are also gone away. For, it is improper to say that this is Akbar's time, his book being the "Ain-i-Akhari" or Akbar's laws. Thus the assertion of the Mahomedans proves that the time of the Koran is gone with the Prophet.

Moulvie Mahomed Kasam.—The Mahomedans acknowledge Christ to be the incarnation of God,* and the Bible, a heavenly book. But since the Christians have made alterations in it, it cannot be accepted as the original and genuine holy

* The incarnation of God means God's "assuming flesh or taking a human body and the nature of man." In incarnation God comes down to the earth, and in the case of a prophet He sends a man to the world. (a) As God has no necessity to despatch a plenipotentiary, so He has no need of coming down himself. That person who is not present at a certain place, may come to it. But nobody can come to the place, whence he is never absent. The omnipresence of God refutes his coming down or going away. So it was not God that came in the advent of Christ, but it was Christ himself and nobody else. (b) Now, God's assuming flesh is also impossible. If he takes on a body, he is thereby confined, and, therefore, limited on all sides. He is present there where his new body exists, and ceases to be at other places. Now, *creative power being one of his attributes, the work of creation will take place at that place only where he is present, and stop where he is not; for, it is absurd to say that he creates where he is not, or that he creates by substitution, which will give many creators. This being the case, the works of creation should have stopped in the whole world when he came down to Palestine, where alone they could be directly carried on. But everybody knows that in the time of Christ, the production and destruction of things went on all over the world in the same way after as before Christ. When the mother of God and her husband were wandering in the deserts of Syria en route to Egypt, lest Herod, the tetrarch of Palestine, should put God to death, supposing the story to be true, China, India and Persia were as full of men and other things as now-a-days, and therefore the rate of birth and death of everything was the same as now, that is to say, countless things in a second. This should have ceased when the Infant God was sucking the teats of Mary in Palestine or Egypt. But as it did not cease, it is plain that God was present there i. e. all over the world. Therefore God can not be confined to one place by the boundaries of flesh.*

scripture.* Besides, being refuted by Mahomed in the Koran, it is not now worth believing in. On the other hand, the prophet Mahomed being the last incarnation, his is the only true religion.

N. B.—Then the other Moulvies referred to a verse of the Bible and showed the place, where the missionaries themselves confessed that the verse in question could not be found anywhere.

Reverend Noble.—He, who has written it, has spoken the truth. If he has pointed out a mistake of writing, he has done no wrong. The Christians love truth and hate falsehood. Hence, their religion is true.

Moulvie Mahomed Kasam.—Quite so; by pointing out an error, he has done no wrong! But if one falsity is detected in a deed or document, it becomes unreliable for ever. Also, a document once suspected, is not accepted as valid and trustworthy even by the temporal magistrate.

Also, God is infinite, as proved from the immensity of his created universe. The human body is finite. Hence, in incarnation the finite contains the infinite, a part contains the whole, which is absurd.

* The version of 1882 of the New Testament has removed hundreds of awkward things that were stumbling blocks to the Christians in arguing with the opponents of their religion. Still there are many defects in it; for, how can a system that is rotten to its core, can be made pure? There is no doubt that the Christians were interpolating their opinions in the name of Christ into the Bible from the very beginning, e. g. from the Council of Nice, 325 of the Christian era, when the Bible was made in somewhat present form of a book by selecting a few pamphlets, called gospels, then in circulation among priests. The selection was made by casting votes. The rejected copies were called Apocryphal. They

Reverend Noble—Is not there a single mistake of writing in the whole of the Koran? It is neither proper nor pleasant to insist on mere bickering cavillation. As the Christians have a great regard for truth, which alone they seek, they have accordingly owned the blunder.*

N. B.—Then a Christian Moulvie cited many verses in Arabic from the Koran in proof of its being much altered since the time of the Prophet.

Moulvie Mahomed Kasim.—Indeed, the Christians seek truth! If it be so, why do they believe in three Gods?

Reverend Noble.—The Christians do not believe in three Gods. The three persons of the Holy Trinity† are all one and one only. It means the Triune God, Jesus Christ combined in himself both divinity and humanity. Hence, he discharged the duties of God and man. In

are still found with curious persons. Hence, in such a state of things it is impossible to determine what the person called Christ taught, and what the priests interpolated; and the Moulvies are right in doubting the genuineness of the Bible.

* The reasoning of the Moulvie is right, i. e. when a mistake is detected in a document, it becomes useless. As the missionary acknowledges the mistake in the word of God, it ceases to deserve our belief in it. A human work may still be tolerated, although it contains a mistake; but a divine work becomes contemptible on the detection of the least departure from truth; for, it is impossible to believe in a blundering God.

† We object" says Dr. Channing, "to the doctrine of Trinity, that whilst acknowledging in words it subverts in effect the unity of God. According to this doctrine there are three infinite and equal persons possessing supreme divinity,

virtue of his having the Divine Spirit, he performed superhuman works or miracles, and inasmuch as he possessed the human soul, he acted like man.

Moulvie Mohomed Kosam.—Hollow! How can two swords be kept in a single sheath? The assertion about the deification of Christ is altogether arbitrary. Jesus has never said anywhere that he is God. The Christians unreasonably persist in apotheosizing him.

called the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Each of these persons, as described by theologians, has his own consciousness, will, and perceptions. They love each other, converse with each other, and delight in each other's society. They perform different parts in man's redemption, each having his appropriate office and neither doing the work of the other. The Son is mediator and not the Father. The Father sends the Son and is not himself sent, nor is he conscious like the Son of taking flesh. Here, then, we have three intelligent agents, possessed of different consciousnesses, different wills, different perceptions, performing different acts, and sustaining different relations, and if these things do not imply and constitute three minds or beings, we are utterly at a loss to know how three minds or beings are to be formed. It is the difference of properties, acts, and consciousnesses, which leads us to the belief of different intelligent beings, and if this mark fails us our whole knowledge fails. When we attempt to conceive of three Gods, we can do nothing more than represent to ourselves three agents, distinguished from each other by similar marks and peculiarities to those which separate the persons of trinity, and when common Christians hear these persons spoken of as conversing with each other, loving each other, and performing different acts, how can they help regarding as different beings, different minds?" This is the confession of Bishop Channing that the trinity means three distinct Gods and not one god. How can then the Christians maintaining the doctrine of Trinity think that there is still one God, *i. e.* to use the language of mathematics, $1+1+1=1$? One Father God + one Son God + one Holy Ghost = one God and not three Gods!

Reverend Noble.—Here is a verse from the Bible, and it is not the only one of its kind, wherein Jesus Christ has declared himself to be God * Moreover, his miracles unquestionably demonstrate his Godhead.

Moulvie Mahomed Kasam.—If Jesus Christ was God, how was it that he could not save himself from crucifixion. ††

N. B.—Then a native Christian pointed out many inconsistencies in the Koran, and said that an order might be cancelled, but a news could not be denied. Hence, the Koran of the Mahomedans could not properly repudiate Christ's Gospel, ‡ which is the news of happiness to the world. In the beginning the Mahomedans turned their face in prayer towards Jerusalem; but in the later times they adopted the direction of Mecca as the

* If Christ declared himself to be God, it is neither wonderful nor credible; for thousands of men in the world have made such declarations, but none believes them to be God. Alexander called himself God and the Son of God or Zeus and worked miracles, for instance, the crossing of the river, which afforded passage at his command, just as Jesus did. Christ exorcised devils. Many low castes in India practice this black trade, but nobody believes in their divinity.

† Crucifixion really means killing. It was the mode of killing among the Jewish barbarians. Now, is it not wonderful and indescribable to fancy that God was killed by the Jews? It was the time for Jesus to prove himself to be what he professed. According to the Bible, he was asked to show his proof of Godhead in some such words as these. Come down from the cross, if thou art the Son of God. But he never gave that proof and left the matter to be decided by the purse and sword of the Christians.

‡ The Bill is not a news of happiness but a history of the Jews, Christ, and Apostles.

only orthodox side to turn to in their jesticulations of devotion. He then recited and explained many verses from the Koran in proof of self-contradiction in the Mahomedan Holy Writ. In conclusion he argued that none could obtain salvation without reposing firm and implicit faith in Lord Jesus Christ. He asked why the Mahomedans did not believe in the Bible and Messiah, seeing that their Koran enjoined obedience to them.

Swami Dayanand Saraswati.—Let it be known to all the Mahomedans, Christians, and the general public, that the convocation is held for an impartial enquiry into the truth of religion. Its object is chiefly to make out which of the prevailing systems of religion is true, and to accept what is thereby proved to be true. Hence, all persons should dismiss the thought of victory from their mind. It ought to be the rule with all good and wise men that they should always be glad to see that truth triumphs and that falsehood is renounced. As the Moulvies say that the missionaries have said such and such things wrong, so the Christians retort that the Mahomedan doctors have affirmed so and so falsely. Arguments like these do not become the learned. They should act on some such rule as this, that they should, by the help of their learning, reason out, support truth in the politest manner possible, and endeavour to refute and abandon untruth; so that all the men may sincerely incline to follow truth. Nobody ought ever to offend others, use hard words in conversation, or cry out in vain

that so and so has been defeated, and himself has won a victory. Nothing but truth alone ought to be spoken by all. It is the custom with the ignorant but not the learned to talk angrily with others. The purport of this long preamble is to impress upon the mind of the people that none should use disgraceful or passionate language in debate here or elsewhere. Let us therefore calmly begin the discussion.

Of what thing, in what time, and for what purpose did God make the world?

Reverend Scot.—The question so proposed is altogether useless, and it is a sheer waste of time to attempt to answer it. Since all are anxious to hear it answered, the following appears to be the only conceivable satisfactory answer of it. Though it is not known of what thing God has made the world, yet it is so far certain that He has created it out of nothing,* for, in the beginning there was nothing but God alone. Then He created the world by his fiat. In the same way, though the time of God's creating the world is not known, yet it has a beginning. The number of years can not be ascertained accurately. None but God knows them. Therefore nothing can be further asserted, nor it is proper to assert any thing more of it. Also, the purpose God has made the world for, is not known; but it is clear that it is the Divine intention that his creatures may enjoy pleasure and be happy in every way.

* As regards God created the world out of nothing, modern physical science has proved beyond any doubt whatever that

Moulvie Mahomed Kasam.—God has created the world out of his own body.* Hence, we are not distinct from God. Were we separate from Him, we could not be within the influence of his power. As regards the time of creation, it is quite futile to trouble ourselves with it; for example, it is our duty to eat bread, and not to know when it was made. The object of the creation of the world is the good of creatures; for God has made all things for man, and man for His service. It is evident that the world is for us, but we are not for the world; because, if we were not, the world does not feel the want of us; but, on the contrary, if the world were not, we would sorely want it. In like manner, water, air, fire, and the like substances, are all created for man, who is, therefore, called 'the lord of creation.' He is endowed with reason, which distinguishes the nobility of his birth from the servitude of the brute creation. To be brief, God has made man for His service, and the world for man's use.

nothing can produce nothing. If there was nothing in the beginning, nothing will be at present. But as there is a positive reality before our eyes, there must be some cause of it; for, it is an incontrovertible axiom in philosophy that *every thing has a cause.*

* If God created the world out of his own body, he was the material cause of the world. And as all the essential qualities of the material cause are produced in its effect, the world should discover the essential qualities of God, which are, for instance, infinitude intelligence, omnipresence omnipotence, indivisibility, and so forth. But since the world does not discover them, it is not made out of God's body. Also, if God's body is the same as the world, he is no more than dead matter void of intelligence. And an unintelligent God is no God at all.

Swami Dayanand Saraswati.—God has made the world out of Nature or atoms, which are, thus the material cause of the universe. The Veda and the profane sciences prove the matter or the aggregate of atoms to be the primary and eternal substance of the phenomenal world. This Deity and nature are both unbeginning and endless. Not one atom of the underlying substance of visible things can be increased, decreased, or annihilated. When God creates this external world, he modifies the aforesaid material cause or substance. This material cause of the visible world is like the external nature itself. As is the effect, viz, the external world, so in nature is its cause, out of which it is created. God united the elements to create the world in its diversified aspects. Being extended and complex, the material things become visible to the eye and fit for the use of creatures. Thus God has created all the objects, which man sees before him out of the aforesaid cause. When He destroys them and the earth supporting them, He decomposes the visible world into its component atoms. It is its resolution into the constituent elements that throws invisibility upon the world, which thus passes into chaos. This chaotic period has been denominated by shallow thinkers to be the destruction of the world, supposed by them to be annihilated or entirely wiped out of existence. But it is not so : it is merely turned into invisible atoms which float in the sky ; for, the cause is never reduced to nothing. Hence, destruction is nothing more than invisibility. When a thing

becomes invisible, the vulgar say that it is destroyed. Imperceptibility follows the separation of atoms; and their combination is the solution of cognition by the senses. Such is God's eternal law of creation and destruction.* It is impressed upon nature. The Infinite Wisdom allows no deviation from it. Its uniformity was inviolate in the past, and it will continue to be so in the future. Of course, none can count the number of times God has created and destroyed the universe, or He can do so hereafter. It is far from man's knowledge to put a limit to them.

* Speaking of chemistry, Dr. Draper says, "It has disposed of the idea of the destruction and creation of matter. It accepts without hesitation the doctrine of the imperishability of substance; for, though the aspect of a thing may change through decompositions and recombinations, in which its constituent parts are concerned, every atom continues to exist, and may be recovered by suitable processes, though the entire thing may have seemingly disappeared. A particle of water raised from the sea may ascend invisibly through the air, it may float alight in the cloud, it may fall in the rain drop, sink into the earth, gush forth again in the fountain, enter the vessels of a plant, rise up with the sap to the leaves, be there decomposed by the sunlight into its constituent elements, of its oxygen and hydrogen, and other elements, oils and acids, and various organic compounds may be made; in these or in its decomposed state it may be received in the food of animals, circulate in their blood, be essentially concerned in acts of intellection executed by the brain, it may be expired in the breath. Though shut in the year in moments of despair, it may give birth to the rainbow, the emblem of hope. Whatever be the course it has passed through, whatever mutations it has submitted to, its elementary constituents endure. Not only have they not been annihilated, they have not even been changed; and in a period of time, long or short, they find their way as water back again to the sea from which they came."

Now, what is the doctrine of the nihilists, who maintain that the world has come out into existence from nothing. They point out the fiat or sound as the cause of the world. This theory, being opposed to science, is incorrect. It is impossible that existence can come out of non-existence. If a man, for instance, says that he has seen the marriage of a barren woman's son, he is wrong; for, if the woman has a son, whose nuptials have been seen, she cannot be called barren; but if barren, she can have no son, and much less her son's match can be witnessed by people. In the same way, he is not right who says that before he came here, he had been nowhere, or that he has seen a serpent come out of a hole, although it was not there before. The learned men at least should never say so. There is no proof for it. If a thing *is* not, how can it afterwards be in existence? To take a familiar example, Had we not been at our houses, we should never have come here at Chandapur. It is the incontrovertible rule in philosophy, "वस्तु वास्तवतः नस्तु वास्तवतः" *—meaning, whatever exists in the present, will exist in the future; but what really does not exist at all, can never spring into

* "Ex nihilo nihil, in nihilum nil posse reverti." "When we are aware of something which begins to be, we are, by the necessity of our intelligence, constrained to believe that it has a cause. But what does the expression *that it has a cause*, signify? If we analyze our thought, we shall find that it simply means, that as we cannot conceive any new existence to commence, therefore, all that now is seen to arise under a new appearance, had previously an existence under a prior form."

existence. From this law of nature it is manifest that no existence can be by any means produced from non-existence. There is not a single object on the earth, which has no cause whatever. Hence the human experience establishes it to be the

"We think the causes to contain all that is contained in the effect, the effect to contain nothing which was not contained in the causes. Take an example. A neutral salt is an effect of the conjunction of an acid and alkali. Here we do not, and here we cannot, conceive that in effect, any new existence has been added, nor can we conceive that any has been taken away. But another example:—Gunpowder is the effect of a mixture of sulphur, charcoal, and nitre, and these three substances are again the effect,—result, of simple constituents, these constituents again of simpler elements, either known or conceived to exist. Now in all this series of compositions, we cannot conceive that aught begins to exist. The gunpowder, the last compound, we are compelled to think, contains precisely the same quantum of existence that its ultimate elements contained prior to their combination. Well, we explode the powder. Can we conceive that existence has been diminished by the annihilation of a single element previously in being, or increased by the addition of a simple element which was not heretofore in nature. This then is the mental phenomenon of causality,—that we necessarily deny in thought that the object which appears to begin to be, really so begins; and that we necessarily identify its present with its past existence. The principle that every event should have its causes is necessary and universal, and is imposed on us as a condition of our human intelligence itself."

"Consciousness is to be presumed veracious; a philosophical theory which accepts one part of the harmonious data of consciousness and rejects another, is manifestly a mere caprice, a chimaera not worthy of consideration, far less of articulate disproof. It is *ab initio* null."—HAMILTON.

Leibnitz truly says, "If our immediate internal experience could possibly deceive us, there could no longer be for us any truth of fact (*verité de fait*), nay, nor any truth of reason (*verité de raison*)."

universal law of nature, that existence comes out of existence, something from something, reality from reality. But a real thing can never be got out of nothing or zero. The condition of thought renders it impossible. It is a contradiction in terms. The very self-same statement refutes itself. To say that something comes out of nothing, cancels or contradicts the word something, which is the subject of the assertion. Having once affirmed that there is absolutely nothing at all, if we afterwards say that it is turned into something, we contradict ourselves in speech: the first proposition refutes the last. At least, no learned man can believe it. No science can prove that the effect follows from no cause. It violates the law of causation, the foundation of science, and subverts the law of association, the basis of reasoning. Therefore, it is conclusively proved that a positive entity cannot come out of absolute negation, that is to say, the creation of the world out of a fiat or world, a mere sound and nothing in reality, is impossible. Hence, we should admit as proved by science, that God has created the world out of its material cause or eternal matter, and not otherwise.*

Hence, if we do not believe that there is no absolute fresh beginning of existence, which is given in our constitution of intelligence, we have left no authority of reason in any thing under heaven: science and religion will all be swept away, and atheism will be established.

* The legal brocard, *falsus in uno falsus in omnibus*, is a rule applicable to all writings.

Here, then, two points crop out for consideration. First, if God is the material cause of the universe, all the world is God himself. Pantheism springs from the theory. It supposes that knowledge and ignorance, pleasure and pain, birth and death, profit and loss, health and disease, virtue and vice, liberty and bondage, heaven and hell, hunger and thirst, sin and salvation, godliness and worldliness, and so forth, all take place in God. Also, it makes the dog, the cat, the thief, the sinner, and the similar unhallowed beings become God.

Secondly, if the matter is the cause of the world, God plays no more part than that of a manufacturer or manipulator in the work of creation. This is remarkably confirmed and elucidated by the knowledge of causation. For, there are three different kinds of causes. The first is the material cause or the matter. All things are made of it. For example, pots are made of earth, ornaments of gold, cloth of cotton, furniture of wood, and arms of iron. Here, earth, gold, cotton, wood and iron are the material causes of pots, ornaments, cloth, furniture, and arms respectively. The second is the efficient cause or the Deity. Thus, man makes bottles of glass. Here man is the efficient cause or manufacturer of bottles. The third is the instrumental cause, or time and space, and the Divine power and knowledge of the principles of nature. For instance, the Indians write with reeds. Weavers weave cloth with looms. Here reeds and looms are the instruments to make letters or cloth with. Now, if we suppose God to be the material cause of the world, we transform Him into the dead matter; for, an

earthen vessel can not be separate or distinct in kind from the earth it is made of. If we imagine Him to be the efficient cause of the external nature, or the maker of the universe, He becomes simply the manufacturer, who can not make things without materials, say, cloth without cotton. If we think Him to be the auxiliary cause of the world, He is converted into an inert, unthinking principle, which cannot act of its own accord but with the agency of its handler; for instance, a machine works unless set going by somebody. The last two examples make Him depend upon substance and intelligence, which by themselves are inactive and lifeless objects. To avoid this unpleasant dilemma, some people believe that God is metamorphosed into the world. But their erroneous conjecture destroys his holiness and freedom. Therefore, in order to make Him neither the motionless moulded matter by supposing Him to be the material cause of the world, nor the thoughtless automatic instrument with which the creation has been effected, by conceiving Him to be the instrumental cause of the world, we should admit the trutless conclusion that the substance of the universe is co-eternal with God,* or the Divine Mind, who in the beginning creates all things out of it. By the bye, it may be borne in mind that the human soul is also eternal by its physical nature. Hence, the matter and the mind with its actions both enjoy the privilege of the eternity of being. Without some such hypothesis,

*D. Andrew speaking of the human soul says, "A being which continues simple must be the same to-day that it was

the wonder of the creation cannot be explained satisfactorily.

As regards the time the world was created, the people of India can tell better than any other nation. The cause is that the religions of the West date nearly 1900, 1300, and 500 years. They are, therefore, unable to know the time of creation. But the Aryans have ever applied themselves to learning from the very commencement of the world. It was this land that supplied other countries of old with the seed of knowledge.*

yesterday; and must be exactly the same to-morrow, for the same reason; and while this physical *stability* remains, it must continue the same for ever." The same Christian divine says of matter:—"Although all particles of matter by arrangement, configuration and variable combinations, are subject to every modification of which their nature is capable, yet it is certain, that these minute particles which are thus arranged, figured, and combined, must be, in themselves, of a more permanent nature."

"Although a mysterious union may subsist between that which is material and that which is immaterial, in the present life, yet this union can no more affect the identity of the one, than it can affect the identity of the other; because, with each other, they can have no physical connection. Of both, so far as human comprehension can extend, the pure primitive physical essence must remain for ever."

*Sir Walter Raleigh says in his *HISTORY OF THE WORLD*, the ancient store-house of learning, that "India was the first planted and peopled country after the flood."—P. 99. His argument is, that it was a place where the vine and olive were indigenous, as amongst the said Scythæ; and that Ararat could not be in Armenia, because the Gordian mountains on which the ark rested were in longitude 75 Deg. & the valley of Shinar 79 to 80°; which would be reversing the tide of emigration. "As they journeyed FROM THE EAST, they found a plain, in the land of Shinar, and they dwelt there."—*Genesis* XI. 2.

The historians of all nations on the earth unanimously attest that formerly knowledge travelled from India to Egypt, thence to Greece, thence to Europe, and so forth.* It is this reason that no religion can have the genuine history of this country. The Aryas possess the knowledge of the creation and destruction of the world from the Veda and the other sacred scientific books, acknowledged even by their opponents to be the most ancient records of knowledge.

The Aryan division of time is as follows:—
 Brahma's day and night contain each 1000 quadruple ages. Each quadruple age contains 43,20,000 years. The quadruple age is so called, because it is made up of 4 ages, called Satyug (age of truth) containing 17,28,000, Tretayug (age

* In remarking on the Greek philosophy, Dr. Draper says that "It is a mixture of the physical, metaphysical and mystical, which, upon the whole, has no other value to us than this, that it shows us how feeble were the beginnings of our knowledge--that we commenced with the importation of a few vulgar errors from Egypt. In presence of the utilitarian philosophy of that country and THE RIGVEDA OF INDIA, how vain and childish are these germs of science in Greece! Yet this very imperfection is not without its use, since it warns us of the inferior position in which we stand as respects the time of our civilization when compared with those ancient countries and teaches us to reject the doctrine which so many European scholars have wearied themselves in establishing, that Greece led the way to all human knowledge of any value. Above all, it impresses upon us more appropriate, because more humble, views of our present attainments and position, and gives us to understand that other races of men not only preceded us in intellectual culture, but have equalled, and perhaps surpassed every thing that we have yet done in mental philosophy."

of virtue) 12,96,000, Dwaperyug (age of justice) 8,64,000, and Kaliyug (age of strife) 4,32,000 solar sidereal years. Brahma's day means the duration of the visibility of the world (sam. creation). In the same way, his night signifies the interval of chaos or the decomposition of the universe into its component atoms (sam. destruction or conataclysm). Each of these periods lasts for 1,000 quadruple ages.* Also, the above mentioned Brahma's day and night are unitedly called a Kalp (chronological cycle). It is divided into 14 ages of Manu or Minos, denominated Manwantere in Sanscrit (Minos'age). Each Minosage consists of 71 quadruple ages. At present, the 7th Minosage, Vaivasvat by name, is going on; six Minosages, viz., Swayambhav, Narachish, Outtami, Thomas, Raiver and Chakshush,† have elapsed before it. Hence, the age of the world is found by adding these periods, which give 1,96,08,52,076½ years since creation. The world will last the seven remaining in Minosage, namely, 2,33,32,27,024 years. Thus the Indian history narrates these particulars with great minuteness and exactness. The Aryas have a regular almanac kept since the beginning of the world. Astronomically noting

* A complete revolution nodes and abscissa.

१ स्यायंभव, स्यारोचिष, शीत्तमि, तामस, वैवत, चाक्षुष

Hence, the Era is = 6 MANWANTERE (each containing 71 quadruple ages or 71×4 ages) + 27 quadruple ages of CHATURVEDIN + first 3 ages + 4876 years of KALIYUG, elapsed in 1877 to the Christian Era.

days, weeks, months, and years, with concomitant festivals and changes of weather, and correcting the equation of time by intercalation, they have calculated the time in uniformity with the precession of equinoxes. The immemorial custom of keeping the calendar, recording the prognostications of the atmospheric conditions and their consequences affecting the human affairs, is still in vogue among them. The examination of their details and divisions of time will prove their scientific accuracy. Year after year they make a calendar, adding the completed year to the time gone by. All histories of India are at one in avowing this fact. There is not a single instance whatever of divergence of opinion among millions of people in this matter. When the Jainees (Genii) and the Mahomedans began to destroy the historical records and chronicles of this country, the Aryas committed to memory the chronology of the world in a metrical formula. It is daily repeated by all from the child to the old man on the occasion of every religious or secular undertaking. Its Sanscrit name is *Sankalp* (mundane era). It is as follows :—

ॐ तस्मत् श्री ब्रह्मणे इतीये प्रहरार्धे वैवस्वते मन्व-
 तरे ऽ ष्टाविंशतितमे कलियुगे कलिप्रथमचरणे आर्य्या-
 वर्तमानैकदेशे ऽ सुक नगरे ऽ सुक संवत्सरायनर्तुमास
 पञ्चदिनचतुस्रमूर्ते ऽ चेदं कार्यं कृतं क्रियते वा,—

meaning, O Father of truth and existence ! I com-
 mence this work at such and such a minute, on such

such a day and in the bright fortnight (of the moon) of such and such a month, of such and such a season of the year A. V., in the first quarter of the 28th age of strife of the 7th Minoage, in the latter end of Braham's forenoon, and at such and such a town of such and such a province of India.

The immemorial Aryan custom of keeping the almanac showing the dates of each current year and the number of years gone by, is enough to silence all objections to this mathematical fact. Since history and astronomy corroborate it, none can reasonably deny it; because the mercantile account, daily and duly kept in books, cannot be called in question. The astronomical records of the Aryas from time out of mind, being kept exactly in the nature of banking transactions, leave no room for doubt in their veracity. Moreover, if the person who refuses to admit it, is asked as to what his religion says of it, he invariably replies that the world was created about 6, 7, or 8 thousand years ago.* This is all what the religions of the rest of the

* According to the Bible, "the world's age at the birth of Christ was 4004 years (Tod). Consequently" in 1877 A. C. the world was 5881 years old. "Respecting the age of the earth," says Dr. Draper in his Intellectual Development of Europe, "that so thoroughly was the ancient authority intellectually crushed that it is found itself incapable of asserting by force the patriotic idea that our planet is less than six thousand years old."

"The patriotic doctrine had been that the earth came into existence but little more than five thousand years ago, and to this a popular opinion long current was added, that its end might be shortly expected. From time to time periods were

world say of the mundane era. As this statement is merely dogmatical and without confirmation by science it cannot be accepted by the learned. On the contrary, a cursory reference to the geological calculation of the time the earth has been in existence, tallying with the Aryan chronology, due allowance being made for the infancy of the European science, struggling hard for progress under the adamantine shackles of the Jewish absurdities, will settle the point in of the question satisfactorily to the discerning mind. Thus

set by various authorities determining the latter event, and as true knowledge was extinguished, the year 1,000 came to be the universally appointed date. But the tremendous moment passed by, and still the sun rose and set, still the seasons were punctual in their courses, and Nature wore her accustomed aspect. A later day was then predicted, and again and again disappointment ensued until sober-minded men began to perceive that the Scriptures were never intended to give information on such subjects, and predictions of the end of the world fell into discredit, abandoned to the illiterate, whose morbid anticipations they still amuse."

"As it was with the end of our planet, so it was as regards her origin. By degrees evidence began to accumulate casting a doubt on her recent date, evidence continually becoming more and more cogent. As I have said, it utterly ruined past restoration the doctrine of the human destiny of the universe. With that went down all arguments which had depended on measuring man's life by the measure of things. Ideas of unexpected sublimity as to the scale of magnitude on which the world is constructed soon enforced themselves, and proved to be the procession of similar ideas as to time. At length, it was perceived by those who were in the van of the movement that the Bible was never intended to deliver a chronological doctrine respecting the beginning any more than the end of the things. In the end, truth overrode all authority and all opposition, and the doctrine of an extremely remote origin of our planet ceased to be open to dispute."

none but the Aryan religion has preserved the universal era in exact number of years as ascertained by astronomy. Hence, this law of computation of the mundane era deserves the acceptance by the learned men of all the nations without bigotry of religion or obstinacy of jealousy.

To understand the final cause of the world, it must ever be kept in view that the mind and the matter, which make up the complement of the world, are in their physical nature eternal. Also, the actions of the mind and the phenomena of the matter are continual or ever recurring just in the same way as the succession of day and night never ceases to be. When a cataclysm occurs, the mental activity is checked in its course. In order to let the souls accomplish their desires and get the consequences of their actions, God creates the world. Then his impartial justice deals them their appropriate doles. Moreover, the creation of the world manifests his infinitude of knowledge strength, mercy and the like divine attributes. As the eye is to see with, and the ear to hear with; so the creative power of God exists for creation. Therefore, God has created this world to exert his creative power and to let his creatures enjoy the happiness accruing therefrom. The senses are given to try for the attainment of virtue, truth, righteousness, and salvation. Besides these, there are many final causes, according to different views taken of the creation of the world. They can not be here described at length for want of time and space. The learned will make them out by themselves.

Reverend Scot.—What is bounded, cannot be unbeginning and endless. The world has a limit, ergo it cannot be interminate. Nothing can create itself. God alone has created all things with his almighty power. None can tell what materials God made the world of. The Pandit (S. D. Saraswati) has not named the thing the world was made of in the beginning.

Moulvie Mahomed Kasam.—If all the things are eternal, the belief in God is useless* and superfluous. Nobody can tell the time of creation.

S. D. Saraswati.—Rev. Scot has not comprehended the statement. The substance of the universe is without beginning of existence; but the visible reality being its effect or modification,

The fact of mere co-existence in eternity can not dethrone God from his almighty power over the universe. God and all things exist in the present time; but none dare say that their present co-existence is destructive to Godhead. If his present co-existence with other beings can not lower him from Godhead, there is no reason why his eternal co-existence with them should deprive him of his almighty power over all his creatures; rather it makes his almighty power infinite.

God had power over none, when nothing existed. A being who had power over none, could not be the all-powerful God.

Besides, God is over all, not by his eternity of being, which philosophy prizes of all things, but by justice and infinitude of other powers.

Nobody can assert that it is useless to acknowledge a certain king, because the latter lives as long as the former. For, the king is not superior to other people by his longer life, which seldom is the case, but by his justice and protecting power. In like manner, God is above all by the infinitude of his divine powers.

has, of course, its beginning of appearance. For example, the human body is three cubits and a half in height. It was not so prior to its birth, nor will it be so after its dissolution. But the atoms composing it will never be annihilated. After death they will be separated and will float in the sky. Their capacity of union and disunion is inherent in them. For instance, an earthen pot did not exist before its formation, nor will it exist after its destruction. But its smashing will not annihilate its component atoms of earth. The atomic capacity of modification, by virtue of which they are arranged into myriads of forms, is always retained by them. In like manner, the aptitude of combination and disjunction, being essential, is lodged in them since eternity. Hence, these atoms or minute films or tiny unseen particles are so disposed by the First Cause as to make the visible world. This atomic substratum is eternal and free from production or destruction. It was never asserted that the objects of the world could create themselves; but, on the contrary, it was clearly and familiarly described that the Deity composed the atoms into the present shape of the world, in other words, God made the world out of atoms. As respects Rev. Scot's affirmation that God created the world out of his power, it is asked whether that power is a real thing or not. If it is an entity, it becomes eternal by virtue of such an assertion. But if it is a non-entity, nothing can ever be formed out of it by any process whatever. With regard to Rev. Scot's statement, that the thing the world was

made of, was not told out, it is enough to say that his want of attention to the argument did not listen to the thing named. The substance the world was made of, was well defined and denominated as nature, atoms and the like.

With regard to the *Monist's* assertion, it is sufficient to say that, though the cause of all the things is eternal, yet man must believe in and acknowledge the power of the Deity. For example, earth has no power to be turned into a pitcher of its own accord. The cause cannot modify itself into its effect. It has no knowledge to assume any form. None can make a single natural thing, say, for instance, a hair of the animal body. Hence, nobody can create it or anything like it. Also, there is no man, who can catch the flimsy molecules, otherwise called atoms in science, and construct out of them, with his skill, any thing like a natural object: No human being can put together two particles, each containing many atoms. Hence, it conclusively proves that the power of creating things rests with God and God only. Consider a little, what infinite wisdom and skill are manifested in the construction of the eye. Although there has been many a sapient doctor all over the world, who has exhausted his medical skill in the treatment of the body, yet the knowledge of the construction of the eye still remains incomplete. Nobody knows how God has made it, and what properties He has put in it. In the same manner, it is the power of God that makes the sun, the moon and the stars, and upholds them without foundation in the illimitable expanse of

the sky. Also, it is His merciful divine duty to reward and punish the virtuous and vicious acts of men in proportion to their respective merits and demerits. None can do this. Hence, God must be owned and served.

An Indian Missionary.—There being two things, one cause and the other effect, both cannot be eternal and co-exist without beginning of time. Hence, God has brought the world into existence from nothing with his fiat.

Moulvie Mahomed Kasam.—Qualities are either internal or external. The internal quality is inherent in things, and the external is extraneous and imposed upon them. The internal or essential properties assume the form of things they enter into; but the things thus entered into by intrinsic qualities, are distinct from the qualities entering. For example, the light of the sun assumes the form of the thing it is cast upon, but no change takes place in the sun itself. In the similar way, God has made us out of his own will.

S. D. Saraswati.—Why does the native missionary doubt the co-eternity of the two substances, the mind and the matter? All the things in the world are made of the atoms, which are eternal. The mind is also ever-existent. Though the calculation of the mundane era founded on geology and astronomy is not satisfactory to him, yet it has been convincingly demonstrated that nothing can come out of zero. Were he to urge that God made the world of his power, he should plainly explain what that power was. If

it is something,—a real entity, it is eternal on account of its being the attribute of Eternal God and the cause of the world ; for, God's attributes and powers are co-eternal and contemporaneous with his divine essence, and cannot be supposed to be developed in him by the progress of time.

The assertion of the Moulvie that inherent, internal qualities were employed in the construction of the world, is altogether untenable philosophically ; for, it is impossible for those native, intrinsic qualities to exist apart from and go out of the thing, they co-here in, without its annihilation. Besides, substances are not mere congeries of qualities. If the world is made of God's essential attributes, it is that very God himself. And if it is made of the Deity's external, foreign, or extrinsic qualities, whatever they may be, these very qualities cannot but be co-eternal with the Divine Spirit. If it be affirmed that man and the world are spontaneously made of the Divine volition, it cannot but be some real and existing quality or substance. If it is a substance, it proves itself to be eternal and unbeginning like the Deity. If, on the contrary, that volition is a mere thought, unsubstantial thing, or non-entity, nothing can be framed out of it, as no amount of willing can produce a pot, which cannot but be made of earth and earth only. In like manner, the world cannot be made out of mere will.

Rev. Scot.—The Christians know so much only, that God has made the world out of nothing. But they do not know how and of what thing he

has made it. That God alone knows. No man can divine it.

Moulvie Mahomed Kazam.—God has made the world out of his glory.

S. D. Saraswati.—In reply to Rev. Scot, it is enough to state that the existence of the cause is inferred from the knowledge of the effect. The effect is always like its cause, i.e., it contains the same quantum of existence as its cause. From the knowledge of an earthen vessel, for instance, it can be inferred that it is made of a substance of the same nature as itself or the earth which it is made of. Hence, the vessel and earth are one and the same substance. If God has created the world out of his power, it is asked if that power is eternal or generated in him in process of time. If it is eternal, as already existing in the Deity, it had better be called a substance and acknowledged as the eternal cause of the world or the substance of the universe.

In reply to the Moulvie, suffice it to say that glory means light. 'It can not make a thing quite different in nature from itself.' It is the means of the perception of forms and figures of material things. It cannot exist apart from its possessor, i.e., the substance of which it is the property. Therefore, unless the eternity of nature, the material cause of the world, be assumed, it is difficult for one to maintain his ground in argumentation. By this, of course, it is not meant that the effect, which, doubtless, is the visible

external world, has no beginning; but the cause, of which this visibility is the effect, is eternal.

An Indian Christian.—If God has created the world out of his nature, it should exist from eternity in his nature, and, since He existed in his nature from eternity; He becomes limited.

S. D. Saraswati.—As the world was in the beginning in his nature, it is therefore eternal. That very eternal thing, being created to be, or to be transformed into, the world, has become limited. In other words, out of nature, God has made all sorts of things of various magnitudes. Hence, the creation of the world has set bounds to it, but not to the Deity forming it.

But to return. In the commencement of the discussion it was affirmed that out of non-existence nothing can come into existence, and that its converse alone was true, viz., that existence springs from existence. Now the reasonings of all the parties prove or tend to prove the assertion that the cause of the world is eternal.

A Christian's address to the audience.—Moulties and gentlemen! The Swami will answer on our questions in ten thousand ways. If thousands of us join in debate with him, he will never be found short of a reply to us. So, no more of this point.*

* The people talked among themselves that they found the Swami a thousand times greater than what they had before heard him to be.

N. B.—At this stage of discussion, the meeting revised the programme and came to the decision that the subjects were too many and too important to be discussed and shuffled off in a comparatively short interval of time at its disposal, and that, therefore, the question of salvation should be at once taken up for discussion. For some time the controversialists consulted as to who should commence the discussion. But when the missionaries and the Moulvies declined to broach the subject, the Swamiji consented to open it.

What is salvation, and how can it be attained?

S. D. Saraswati.—Salvation means not only mere emancipation from all kinds of pain, but positive enjoyment of God's glory, wisdom, and happiness for evermore. It is the liberation from the bondage of mortality. It releases man from sin and sorrow. But then, what are the means of the attainment of it? The first step is the adoption of truth. It should be previously ascertained by the human and the divine testimony. What is not proved by the evidence of universal experience and sacred knowledge, should be rejected as untrue. For instance, when a thief, apprehended for the crime of theft, says in his trial by the officer of justice, that he has not committed it, he says what is untruth; for his conscience confesses within himself that he has done it. When a man wishes to tell a lie, his conscience warns him against its wickedness and prohibits him from doing it. The same moral principle beings on in man's mind fear and the similar

feelings after the commission of evil. But when a person inclines to truth, his conscience diffuses happiness in his heart, and encourages him to act upon it. The mind does not rejoice so much in the perpetration of vices, as in the practice of virtuous actions. When a person disregards the dictates of his moral nature by doing wrong, he fails in his means for the attainment of salvation. He is then called the Devil, infidel, damned, or low caste fellow, as the Veda says :—

असुर्या नाम ते लोका अन्धे न तमसा हताः ।

तांस्तु प्रत्याभिगच्छन्ति ये के चात्सहनो जनाः ॥

Yajur, chap. 40, verse 3. It means that the violation of God's commandments and inattention in thought, speech, or action to the intimations of moral sense, make man, as it were, the destroyer of his own soul. In short, the following are the means of acquiring salvation:—

(i)—The adoption of the whole and unqualified truth and the constant strict observance of it on all occasions.

(ii)—The acquisition and advancement of true knowledge, which is amply found in the Vedic lore.

(iii)—The company of holy sages and philosophers.

(iv)—The subjection of the senses and the control of passions. Their diversion from wickedness and indulgence in righteousness.

(v)—The contemplation of God's attributes, the reflection of them, and concentrated attention to the object of their signification.

(vi)—The prayer, which should be thus :—

O Lord of the universe, Ocean of mercy, and Father of all, guard us against falsehood and confirm us in truth. O Almighty Lord, protect us from the darkness of ignorance, the wickedness of vice, and the like sins; and grant us knowledge and virtue! O Infinite God, liberate us from the concatenation of birth and death, and give us the nectar of salvation in Thy grace and mercy!

When the sincere and serene mind meditates upon the effulgent glory of the Deity, the mercy of the Supreme Being confirms it in the possession of the happiness of his grace. For example, when a small child wishes to reach its parents, they leave the most necessary work in hand and hasten to take it into their arms, lest it should tumble down against anything and get bruised thereby. Also, as parents always cherish hopes and exert their utmost for the ease and comfort of their children, so does the Most Merciful Lord receive, in his everlasting presence with his hands of infinite power, any righteous person, girding up the loins, in the uprightness of the heart, to walk in the path of eternal glory. God does not then suffer him to be afflicted anywise, but grants him the happiness of beatitude. Therefore people should impartially and without bigotry accept truth and abandon falsehood, in order to allay the craving of the heart. They will then enjoy the pleasures of contentment and the happy calmness of mind.

It must be borne in mind that misery in all its diversified aspects is the consequence of injustice,

vice and partiality of prejudice. For example, if any body covets, say, the Moulvie's fine raiments, he incurs the vice of partiality; since he cares for his own ease to the detriment of the Moulvie's comfort. In like manner, this selfishness brings forth injustice constantly to accomplish its private purposes. This has become prevalent and led people to believe that virtue, if rightly followed, entails misery upon society. Sin is the gratification of carnal appetites at the expense of justice. The complement of pleasures coupled with virtue, justice and honesty, constitutes what is termed *lexima* or righteousness. Pleasures acquired with wickedness and injustice, form selfishness. The three merits, therefore, viz., virtue, justice, and holiness, entitle persons to hope for salvation. But virtue is obedience to the Divine law, and vice, the violation of it. Hence, virtue, including holiness, is alone the means of salvation. To effect this great end, requires exertion commensurate with its dignity. There is no option in it.

Rev. Scot.—Salvation is not, as the Swami says, mere emancipation from troubles, but freedom from sin and accession to heaven. The reason of it is, that Satan's temptation of Adam, made pure by God, to commit sin, has rendered all his posterity sinful.* As the watch-maker gives free

* Satan's temptation of Adam cannot make all mankind sinful. Firstly, because all men are not born of Adam. According to Max Müller, the average of the life of ancients is 10 years. And there are 63 lines of descendants from Adam to Christ in the Bible. Hence, Adam lived 630 years B. C., or 2618 years ago. But geologists can trace the peopling

motion to the watch, no man commits sin of his own accord. Therefore he cannot obtain salvation by means of his merits, nor can he free himself from sins. Hence, there can be no salvation without belief in Lord Jesus Christ.* The Hindus say that they cannot obtain salvation in the age of strife, which tempts them to sin and thereby damns them to punishment.† But they should depend upon it that they will be saved, if they believe in

Europe alone to 25000 years back. Therefore Adam cannot be the progenitor of the people who lived more than 22000 years before him. Secondly, man inherits the body from the parents, but not the soul. For, if he receives the soul from them, it will be like theirs; namely, learned parents will beget learned children, and *vice versa*. But this is not necessarily the case in the world. Hence, man does not receive the soul from the parents, but the body only, which is always like theirs; black parents produce black children, and *vice versa*. Now, every-body knows that the soul is responsible for its actions but not the body; none punishes dead people or corpses, but living beings. This being the case, it is plain that if Adam committed sin, his posterity cannot inherit it; for, their souls are not from Adam, but directly from God; their bodies, supposing all man as descended from Adam, are not responsible for actions in any manner. Hence, Adam's sin can never contaminate his posterity, whoever they may be.

* "The objection that there is no hope for the sinner unless Christ be the infinite God amazes us. Surely, we have a Father in heaven of infinite goodness and power, we need no other infinite person to save us. The common doctrine disparages and dishonors the only true God, our Father, as if, without the help of a second and a third divinity, equal to Himself, He could not restore his true creature, man. In the Scriptures, our Heavenly Father is always represented as the sole original spring, and first cause of our salvation; and let no one presume to divide His glory with another. *Jesus teaches us that of himself he can do nothing.*" - BRAMHĀ CHARANĀND, 2.

† The Hindus do believe that salvation can be obtained in Kaliyug; as for instance,

Jesus Christ.* Wherever his gospel is preached, the people are guarded against sin. Can any other religion than Christianity boast at present of vast improvement in morality, virtue, and righteousness?† There was once a certain man

कृते तु तपसो मुक्तिं चैतायां यजनात्किञ्च ।

द्वापरे पूजनात् मुक्तिः कसौ शेषवकीर्तनात् ॥

Salvation is obtained in Satyug from asceticism, in Treta-yug from pious-offerings, in Dwaperayug from worship, in Kaliyug from singing hymns in honor of God or Christos.—**BHAGVAT, CHAPTER XI.**

* "Do not imagine that any faith or love towards Jesus can avail you. . . . Settle it as an immutable truth that neither in this world nor in the next can you be happy but in proportion to the sanctity and elevation of your characters. Let no man imagine that through the patronage or protection of Jesus Christ, or any other being, he can find peace or any sincere good but in the growth of an enlightened, firm, disinterested, holy mind. *Expect no good from Jesus any further than you clothe yourselves with excellence.*—**HISLOR CHANNING.**

† "Mosheim says that in the third century the 'Christian bishops were slaves of luxury and voluptuousness.' In the fourth century, he says, sadly, that the Church was contaminated with crowds of profligate Christians, and the virtuous few were, in a manner, oppressed and overwhelmed with the superior numbers of the wicked and licentious. Christianity clearly did not succeed in inducing a high standard of public morality.... In the fifth century a presbyter of Marseilles writes of his co-religionists. 'Who is there,' he asks, 'who is not rolling in the mire of fornication? What is almost every Christian congregation but a nest of vipers? For you will find in the Church scarcely one who is not either drunkard, or a glutton, or an adulterer, or a fornicator, or a ravisher, or a robber, or a man-slayer, and what is worse than all, almost all these without limit.'—**ANNIE BESANT'S FRUITS OF CHRISTIANITY.**

in England as strong as the Swami. But he was addicted to drinking, thieving, whoring, and the like abominable habits. However, when he put his faith in Christ, he gave up his wickedness all at once. As for me, my own conscience bears witness that I have obtained salvation and ceased to be wicked, since I believed in Christ. Therefore, there can be no salvation without obeying Christ's commands. All should believe in Lord Jesus. It will procure them salvation, otherwise they cannot save themselves.

After describing the horrible persecutions by the Christians, the venerable Anne Besant says, "Christianity is not only cruel; it also loves darkness rather than light, because ignorance is the condition of its authority. In the seventh century, the bishops in general were so illiterate, that few of that body were capable of composing the discourses which they delivered to the people, and it was not until the Ambians arose and revived learning, that any beams of knowledge broke through the thick black fog of Christianity."

Mr. G. W. Foote asks Hon'ble Mr. Gladstone, 'Can he name a vice that has not been amply illustrated by Christian practitioners? Can he name a crime in which Christians have not equalled Pagans? Was not Rome, under some of the Popes, worse than Rome under any of the Emperors? Was there not more general debauchery in the Middle Ages than at any other period in history? Did not the rapid spread of syphilis in Christendom, as soon as it was imported, testify to the promiscuous license of the believers in Jesus? Don't portions of our Christian capitals reek with as much moral pestilence as ever befouled Athens or Rome? Why was there so little civilization in Europe when Christianity was supreme? Why was every reform opposed by the Church of Christ? Why does Christianity fade as men become wiser and happier?' In short, Mr. Foote means to say that the present progress of Europe is due to the advancement of science and the retirement of Christianity.

Moulvie Mahomed Kasam.—The Mahomedans do not admit that merits alone as mentioned by the Swamiji can procure salvation ; for, it depends upon the will of God. He may condescend, if he please, to give it to anybody irrespective of his or her merits or demerits. As for instance, the ruler of the time being can liberate or imprison the guilty, if he like. God is almighty, he can do what he likes. Man has no power over Him. None knows what God will do. But all should believe in the ruler of the time. The governor of the present time is the Prophet. Salvation is got by believing in him. Of course, it is true that merits can be acquired by means of knowledge, but salvation is in the hand of God alone.*

* The Moulvie is wrong to say (a) that God gives salvation irrespective of works, (b) that salvation is got by believing in the Prophet, and (c) that none knows what God will do. (a) If God does not take account of works, it is useless to pray five times a day, to give alms, to read Alkoran, and to go on pilgrimage to Mecca, which everybody knows are meritorious works in the opinion of Mahomedanism. But since they are necessary, as is evinced by the constant preaching of the Mahomedan priests, it is plain that works are the only condition of salvation in Mahomedanism. Besides, the infidel, too, can obtain salvation, if works have no hand in salvation, for he performs no works. Rather he is wiser than the faithful ; for, he knows that works are useless, and hence he does not perform them. (b) For salvation, belief in the Prophet is useless. Because, suppose a man believes in a magistrate, and being convicted of a crime, say, theft, he is brought for trial before him. Can anybody suppose that the magistrate will save him from the capital punishment of theft on mere account of his belief in him ? And suppose another man does neither believe in the magistrate, nor commit a crime. Can anybody think that the magistrate will apprehend and put him in the jail, because he has

S. D. Saraswati.—The misapprehension of the previous comprehensive description has elicited the remark that salvation is not emancipation from pain, but freedom from sins. A little thinking will show that pain or misery is the result of sinful acts. No sinner can avoid troubles. In mentioning the means of salvation, the abandonment of vice and the adoption of virtue in all actions were proved to be unmistakable measures for securing imperishable happiness.

The hobby of the Christian theology, that God created Adam pure in nature, but Satan tempted him to sin by tasting the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge, which brought on his fall from paradise, and condemned all mankind in him as

done no wrong! Hence, we should perform good works, which must procure us salvation from the Impartial Judge of the Universe.

(c) If it is true that none knows what God will do, it is sinful to preach Mahomedanism; for, God may, perhaps, throw all converts to Islam into hell fire, and put infidels in heaven. The Moulvies are too ignorant to know that knowledge tells us what God will do. For instance, two and two make four. Do you think that God will make them five in heaven? Astronomy predicts an eclipse on a certain day, and we see in the heavens that the eclipse does take place most punctually. Can anybody be so foolhardy as to believe that astronomers fly to the heavens and play tricks there to verify their predictions? Philosophy teaches us that mind and matter are immortal. Who, that has a particle of acquaintance with science, can say that these will be annihilated in heaven? Hence, knowledge is the eternal prophet or incarnation of God. It is the prime minister of the kingdom of heaven. It alone can save us and not frail and ignorant prophets.

guilty of the original sin, is totally absurd. Because, on the one hand, the Christians affirm that God is almighty; but, on the other, they believe that Satan was strong enough to spoil Adam, made pure in spirit by God, raise a rebellion in, and subvert the order of, the kingdom of God. Common sense will see that this reasoning destroys the almighty power of God. None in the universe can spoil or overturn what God has made out of his infinite wisdom, much less poor Satan. Also, it is impossible and mainly unreasonable to suppose that the guilt of one man dooms all his descendants to punishment though innocent on their part. He alone suffers the painful consequence of his crimes, who perpetrates them; but no second person is punished for his sake without the reversion of the course of justice. No learned man will ever believe it. No lawgiver will signify his consent to the execution of so strange a law.

Furthermore, all mankind cannot be born of Adam and Eve only; because it is incestuous for brothers and sisters by the same parents to marry each other. The supposition of many men and women being created in the beginning avoids the stigma of the most abhorrent sin and sanctifies the institution of marriage; for, the power, which can produce one pair, can create many as well.

As respects Satan being the tempter of all, it is earnestly asked, who it was that originally tempted him. If he could tempt himself and did not want any other tempter, man may, in the same way, be

accredited with a power to tempt himself without the help of the Devil. Consequently, it is superfluous to suppose Satan to be the tempter of the first man. If some other body tempted Satan to sin, there was none but that body which tempted him in the beginning of the creation. But if it be supposed that God tempted him and in him all mankind, none is left by the Christian doctrine to dispense salvation, nor any candidate to receive it; for, when God himself is the tempter, none can save us. But this is contrary to the nature of God; He is just, true, and holy. He does not tempt anybody to sin, nor afflicts any for nothing. Strange it is that, although Satan is a rebel and does nothing but mischief in the rule of God, God does neither punish, kill, nor confine him! It clearly reveals God's impotency and love of temptation. Hence, the theory of the Devil is preposterous. There is no such individual as Satan. As long as the believers in the hypothesis of Satan retain their pernicious croquet, they cannot be deterred from the horror of sin; because they imagine that they themselves are not sinners, but that the Devil tempts them as he tempted their progenitor to sin, and, in the same way, God crucified his beloved Son for the sins of the Adversites. Consequently, they imagine themselves as untouched by sin, Satan being the tempter, and God the forgiver of sins in his Son, and are not afraid at all of further committing atrocities among God's creatures. If they sin at all, they believe in Christ, who will himself bear their sins, inasmuch as he has sacrificed himself on the cross in their behalf.

Therefore the follower of this monstrous tenet cannot desist from acting wickedly.

The illustration of a watch is proper; for, certainly every one is at liberty to do what he likes. But it is the inviolable law with the honour of the Divine Majesty to do right and not wrong.

Besides, entry into heaven cannot be secured; for, man has no power to guard its safety against the intrusion and temptation of Satan. It is quite a gratuitous supposition; for, man is endowed with free-will, and there is no Satan to induce him to evil; therefore, by keeping himself aloof from sin by the grace of God, he can obtain salvation. The only sin of Adam, for which he was driven from the garden of Eden, was that he tasted wheat. Will the persons, who wish to go to heaven, eat all the things there, in spite of Adam's fall and apostacy? Will not the tasting of wheat be a sin to them? Will they be not turned out of heaven in consequence of it? In short, it is all bosh.

In advancing the necessity of a saviour, in plain words, a mediator, an intercessor, a witness, or a pleader in the court of God, Christianity makes the Supreme Being a mere man, and thus circumscribes his omniscience. The loss of his omniscience ruins his power of omnipotence. But it is quite a mistake. The Deity knows all things, however great or small. He stands in need of no advocate or go-between. He has no necessity of help or recommendation of anybody in judging

the actions of man ; for, recommendation is sent to him, who himself does not know of the examinee. Also, it makes God depend upon somebody else ; for, without the testimony of Jesus Christ, He cannot award salvation to anybody, nor does He know anything of the criminals of the court. Hence, this strange doctrine equalizes God to a man of little knowledge, and thus takes off from him his noble and characteristic attributes of omnipotence and omniscience.

No recommendation or misrepresentation can pervert the course of God's impartial justice and equity. His violation of his own laws of justice and equity will make him unjust and partial. In like manner, the supposition of the presence of angels in the court of God after the fashion of the earthly monarch, naturally ascribes a host of discrepancies to the notion of Godhead. It fails to prove his immensity and omnipresence. If he is all-pervading, he cannot be conceived to have a body. But if he is not omnipresent, he can have a form or body. Being corporeal and so limited, he cannot encompass and pervade all the universe. A being of a certain determinate figure cannot exercise his power of apprehension and chastisement throughout the extent of his knowledge, which surrounds his body. If a being has a body, he must have been born, and so he must die too. Therefore, it is illogical and unwise to suppose God to be in a certain locality and holding a court of justice attended by myriads of angels. It defines and confines God and does away with his inherent immensity and ubiquity.

Now, it is the natural consequence of inattention to the study of the Yeda, which treats of the philosophy of the Deity enough for man to know, that people form the conception of God just the reverse of truth, and all their hypotheses militate against facts as happen in nature.

Rev. Scot's animadversions on the age of strife are also incorrect. The Aryas do not interpret the ages that way. The *Aitareya Brahman* thus expounds them in its 7th *Panchika* and 15th *Kandika* :—

कलिः शयानो भवति संत्रिहानस्तु दापुः ।

चत्विधं श्रेता भवति कृतं सम्यग्दत्ते चरन् ॥

It means that he who always really commits vice and apparently acts on virtue, is called *Kali* (hypocrite); he of whose actions one half are virtuous and the other half vicious, is termed *Dwaper* (indifferent or mediocre); he, of whose acts one quarter are vicious and three quarters virtuous, is denominated *Treta* (laudable); and he, who follows virtue in all his actions, is named *Satyug* (virtuous). It is not proper to assert anything of a matter, of which one is totally ignorant. Hence, he who commits sin, cannot avoid suffering pain for it; but he who is virtuous, whatever country he may be in, undergoes no tribulation. Cannot God save his votaries without the intervention of Jesus Christ? God is omniscient; he protects his servants with his inexhaustible means. He has no necessity of the mediation of a prophet. Of course, it is quite true that the people of the

country, which is favoured by the teachings of the virtuous learned sages, do not go astray from the path of duty and rectitude, but enjoy knowledge and happiness. It is looked upon as a piece of good luck of the people. It is for their welfare. But it has nothing to do with religion.

What a nice method of teaching truth was there among the Aryans of the old time ! It contributed considerably to their material prosperity. But in the present time diverse reasons have led to the decline of knowledge. However, the corruption of the people cannot cast blame upon their glorious ancestral religion. It is its credit that since creation the Aryan religion has survived to the present time in spite of the centuries of burning scientific books by the atrocious fanaticism of the modern occidental religions.* As regards corruption,

* "In Spain, Torquemada destroying Hebrew books wherever he could find them, and burning, at Salamanca 6000 volumes of Oriental literature; 119 learned men were thrown into the dungeons of the Inquisition in Spain—not for teaching heresy, but for teaching science. In France, the Huguenots forbade the study of Greek and of Chemistry. The Roman Church, in the same country, swept away all books that taught learning of any kind."—A. Bossat.

The Mahomedans burnt all books wherever they found them. The large library of Patna was consigned to flames by Bukhtiar Khilji in 1203 A. C. on the conquest of Bengal. The Mahomedans express their surprise when they hear the name of the Vedas; because they believe that they have burnt them and all religious books in the height of their prosperity. The world-wide famous library of Alexandria was, by order of Caliph Omar, burnt for months and months to warm the baths of the Mahomedans in Egypt.

even it is not very much. The chasm in the Church and the Mosque has split of the Cross and the Crescent during 18 and 13 centuries respectively into so many numbers of sects of clashing creeds, that they far exceed the Aryan denominations, produced from the debasement of the primeval religion in the course of more than 19 millions of centuries. The Christian improvement and civilization owe their existence to the wisdom of parliaments and the corresponding social and political assemblies. If they be abolished, no melioration and refinement will ever be left behind.

Rev. Seal's indecent comparison of a vicious English with me transgresses all bounds of decorum and politeness, and rudely infrings the laws of logical argumentation. The sanctity of his order should have prevented such a caustic slip of tongue in his mouth.

In reply to the Moulvie, it is not right to say that God can do whatever He likes; for his complete knowledge of creatures administers strict and impartial justice to them. The bestowal of undue favors upon any being is against his Divine nature. That he can do what he likes, includes the idea that his actions are vicious as well as virtuous, and that sin enjoys his implied connivance. Now, this heinous qualification cannot be predicated of him. God gives salvation to that person alone, who takes pains in the accomplishment of the meritorious works requisite for everlasting felicity. Without the adoption of proper means, none can obtain the desired end from God; for, He never does injustice,

The indiscriminate distribution of reward and punishment, in accordance with his wilful liking or capricious pleasure and apart from the consideration of virtue and vice of his creatures, equally aspirant of his forgiveness and pleasure, will expose His Sublime Majesty to the inevitable foul imputation of prejudice and injustice. Therefore, He never plays the mortal, ignorant, tyrannical man; for injustice is opposed to his holy nature. Thus, for example, fire has the property of lighting and burning; but it never manifests contraries, in other words, it never darkens, or quenches, or cools. In like manner, God never acts or makes laws contrary to his attribute of justice for the sake of favouritism. None but God himself is the governor of all times and dispenser of *summum bonum*. If any body interposes himself between God and his creatures, his pretensions, based as they are upon the total ignorance of the Divine nature, find credence with ignorance marked with the wholesale extinction of reason. All doctrines of a third person's intercession can be at once proved to be altogether absurd. Salvation cannot be got by believing in a body distinct from God. Because, if in awarding salvation to his creatures, He leans on the advice of the so-called intercessor, he becomes dependent upon him in the work of dispensation of grace, and, consequently, cannot be at liberty. But a dependent and limited being cannot be the Deity in the universal sense of the word; for, in all his actions, He does not want the assistance of any other being, inasmuch as He is all-powerful.

All the learned men believe so in their heart. It is another thing, if, out of fondness for their co-religionists, partisans and neighbours, and for the dread of shaking the received opinions of the vulgar, they feign to believe otherwise than what has been advanced above. It is remarkably astonishing to hear the doctrine of mediation from the mouth of the expounders of Mahomedan religion, for the Moslems say that God is "*lahúsharik*" i. e. without a partner, and yet they strive to prove the participation of the Prophet in the Divine dispensation of salvation. At least, so far it is certain that no learned man, with his reason right about him, will ever put his faith in this suicidal doctrine. Therefore, it is conclusively proved that God graces the virtuous with salvation impartially and without recommendation for their success in the performance of virtuous actions, the only means of working out emancipation from damnation. Another's advocacy is useless to Him, who knows all things, and who needs no assistance. Man requires the aid of his fellow-creatures; because, being more social than the bee or the ant, he is characterized by mutual dependence. This is not the case with God, who is over all. His judicious pleasure is never wasted upon the undeserving, and He always maintains justice and preserves his true nature. He gives salvation to his devotees, sanctified by their true love for him and implicit obedience of his commands. He protects them from all kinds of pain and ensures their security in his eternal happiness. There is not the least doubt at all in it.

N. II.—The incompleteness of the original programme of the discussion is due to the prudent unwillingness of the Christian and Mahomedan priests to prolong their stay at the place of congregation for the continuation of their enquiry into the truth of the religious systems, which engross so much attention of the Indian world at large, which owe their maintenance to the profusion of their votaries' riches, and which fill the pockets of the Hindu, Christian, and Mahomedan priests all over the world, although heartily taking so little interest in them, as is clearly proved here by their looking more to worldly than to religious concerns. The Swamiji expressed his regret to be thus disappointed; but to no purpose, the Missionaries and Maulvies would not stay. The latter, however, said that they should like to hold debate at Shahjehanpore. But when the Swamiji went there, none came forward to talk of any debate. What we are thus deprived of by the shifts and subterfuges of paid priesthood, we may anticipate the consent of the reader to our attempting a mere outline of the remaining problems proposed for solution at the beginning of the discussion in the accompanying Appendix.

APPENDIX.

Introduction.

Man's reason sure is th' noble attribute,
 Whereby he gains the power o'er the brute,
 Of all the gifts that God confers on man,
 The reason is the best and stands in van,
 To it are due the changes of his life
 And woe and weal as soon in worldly strife,
 Observe the state of beasts, to know its need ;
 Look, how much free from care the life they lead ;
 To them their food God sends at proper time,
 And suits their coat of fur to change of climate,
 Their families scarce for help on them depend,
 They don't in teaching young ones long time spend,
 Their pow'r of claws from ill's their safety guards ;
 And want of speech from sin of lie them wards,
 But such is not the case with helpless man ;
 His life is formed on quite a different plan.
 To earn his bread, in sun he tills the furrow,
 To guard himself, he makes all sorts of arms,
 To keep off cold, he weaves silk, thread, or wool,
 To teach his sons, for years he sends to school,
 To propagate his kind, he has to bear
 A large household's expense, a load of care,
 But reason guides him through this vale of pain,
 And takes him safe to goal of ease and gain,
 Without it man sinks low'r than the beast ;
 But for it, long ago he would have ceased,
 Its exercise succeeds in matters all,
 And failure flows from neglect of its call,
 The deeper down to root of things we go,
 The more convinced of reason's sway we grow,
 It gives man comfort, wealth, and happiness,
 Suggests him means defensive 'gainst distress,
 His native weakness arms with fortitude,
 And makes him fit to cope with multitude,
 Its voice is heard with gloe by Nature kind,
 That bids the things on earth obey mankind.

Electric wires transmit their urgent news ;
 And lenses show of light component hues ;
 The distant stars the telescopes observe ;
 The microscope reveals the knots of nerves ;
 The rail connects the parts of lands remote ;
 And intercourse and trade their wealth promote ;
 'Mong vulgars printing knowledge propagates,
 From fallen state to bliss them elevates,
 Dispels old ignorance from vicious hearts,
 And links in love their races in all the parts.
 All these the use of reason has achieved,
 And greatly man of phys'cal pain relieved.
 But bear in mind men's not hot flesh and blood,
 Which rots on death, so little understood.
 He is that vital understanding force,
 Which is of knowledge the chief resource,
 Which out of lies the only truth selects,
 Though each the organs equally affects.
 Abuse an Englishman in Sanscrit tongue,
 He knows it not, and so he is not stung.
 But call the same ill name in English words,
 And nothing earthly you an aid affords.
 His rage is roused, because he understands ;
 Then, he's not lump of flesh nor pineal glands.
 The sound of death affects the ear alike ;
 Why, that stirs nothing, whereas this dislike ?
 Hence, man that vital thinking force contains,
 Which actuates and yet unseen remains.
 The wise say 'tis a simple entity,
 And so maintains its own eternity.
 The compound body changes undergoes ;
 The simple thing as soul ne'er wastes nor grows.
 The welfare, then, of this immortal soul,
 Deserves our serious thought and effort whole.
 The fabric of this body soon dissolves ;
 But soul on rounds of time always revolves.
 When reason's efforts make this transient life
 With health, wealth, and ten thousand pleasures rife
 How can we think that it will do us harm,
 If used in faiths, which life with virtue arm ?
 As *Ikara* or virtue is the consort of the soul,
 Whose bliss consists in reaching God, its goal ;
 If virtue be in life kept out of sight,
 The soul on death will fall in wretched plight.

The rails and wires and bolts of toothed wheels
 In days of pain will list to no appeals.
 The things of heaven are not seen with eyes ;
 To know them, we must reason exercise.
 See, paltry things of world its use demand ;
 To buy a cheap pot, accounts understand,
 In such a state of things can you expect
 To know of them except by intellect ?
 To know gross things does not much sense require ;
 Their knowledge senses of themselves acquire.
 Great were the kingdoms ruled by crowned fools ;
 Sepulchralism in monkish age opened schools.
 Such worldly works not much intellect show
 On spiritual things no light they throw.
 To get at truth you reason lone will guide ;
 To make the success sure, put tales aside.
 We know that Nature ne'er gives useless things,
 But what to one in end its pleasure brings.
 Of all the pow'r's the reason is the best ;
 Those who disuse, discard their God's behest.
 O ye ! that love man, use your reason well,
 For heaven's sake, to save mankind from hell.
 To comprehend Dayanand's argument,
 Friend, wear this human nature's ornament.
 God of old' makes this your soul's command,
 And bathe in Spring of life in Nature's womb.

GURGA PRA S A D.



THE OMNIPRESENCE OF GOD.

" O Thou Great Power ! in whom we move,
 By whom we live, in whom we die,
 Be now, while on Thy name we call,
 Our life, our strength, our joy, our all !
 Without Thy presence, earth gives no refection ;
 Without Thy presence, sea affords no treasure ;
 Without Thy presence, air's rank infection ;
 Without Thy presence, heaven itself no pleasure."

If there is a doctrine to which all the philosophers of the world have unanimously agreed, it is that God is present everywhere. " We," says Spinoza " live in God." John Gregorio says in his works, page 136, " All things are full of God. He is therefore called in the Holy tongue *Hammakom*, the place or that Fulness which filleth all in all. God (as the Great Hermes) is a Circle, the centre whereof is everywhere, and the circumference nowhere. " If I climb up into Heaven, Thou art there ; if I go down to Hell, Thou art there also. Nor is he present only to these real capacities of Earth and Heaven, but even also to those imaginary spaces of incomprehensible receipt and infinite extension. He is there where nothing else is, and nothing else is there where he is not." Cowper says,

" All scenes alike engaging prove
 To souls impressed with sacred love !
 Where'er they dwell, they dwell in Thee,
 In heaven, in earth, or on the sea.

To me remains nor place nor time;
 My country is in every clime;
 I can be calm and free from care
 On any shore, since God is there.

While place we seek or place we shun,
 The soul finds happiness in none;
 But with a God to guide our way,
 'Tis equal joy to go or stay.

Could I be cast where Thou art not,
 That were indeed a dreadful lot;
 But regions none remote I call,
 Secure of finding God in all."

If we examine our own books, we find that the Vedic philosophy, which is the common mother of all kinds of true knowledge prevalent in the world and which indispensably requires much exercise of reason on account of stating things in the abstract, most prominently puts forth the omnipresence of God. What can be more explicit than that *the Creator of the universe pervades the stupendous whole like the expansion of space*:—
 विश्वकर्मा विश्वनासाद् विश्वाया, In Him exist all the worlds: तस्मिन् इत्यस्य, सुखानि विश्वा. The Upanishads, the source of Indian metaphysics, maintain the same opinion. "Search Him, who is the repository of countless worlds, in the core of thy heart:—

अनन्तसोकामस्योपतिष्ठां विदित्वमेतनिहितमुहायाम्

The authority of books alone has not brought about our conversion to the universal pervasion of

God. The experience of daily life presents to the inquisitive mind abundance of so cogent proofs as challenge the resistance of conviction. Let us take a walk in the field, and we shall be convinced of it. Here we see a plentiful green crop ripening in the genial warmth of sunshine. A few months ago, the field was simply a layer of black mould. Had not the farmer sown it, no blade of stalk would have sprung up at all. Therefore the produce of grain is due to the dissemination of seeds. But what is true in this particular instance, holds good in all the vegetable kingdom, viz. the plant comes out of the seed or something equivalent to it, as the stem, the root, and the like. As the seed is the original, and the plant the subsequent circumstance, they are, in the dignified dialect of science, respectively denominated as cause and effect in the phenomenon of vegetation.

If we extend our observation to the animal kingdom, we find that the two circumstances, which constitute the principle of causality are invariably present there also. As for example, from the yolk of an egg comes out a beautiful pigeon in the due course of incubation. In fine, whatever we see on the earth, has been due to a certain cause. Without a cause we are unable to conceive of any existence whatever.

By the constitution of mind we are unable to seek the causes of things we are surrounded with. And this tendency of mind is indubitably confirmed by observation in the empire of nature, as is already

illustrated by the foregoing examples. Our mind cannot realize in thought an absolutely new quantum of existence, but it regards everything as only a modification of pre-existent constituents. Hence the world and all the things therein are the effects of certain causes. If we again examine these causes, we find that they assort themselves into a few elementary causes, which are not themselves the effects of others. Take a concrete example, and we shall comprehend the nature of causes. Now, in the manufacture of the pen I write with, are concerned the manufacturer, the material, and the machine, which are philosophically called the intelligent, the material, and the instrumental cause. These three antecedent forces produce all the things we observe in the museum of nature. The first of these is *par excellence* called the Deity, the efficient cause of the whole universe. Let it, by the bye, be ever borne in mind that the truth of knowledge, which we thus obtain in the world, is not confined to the paltry limits of our planet; nay, it transcends to the boundless regions of sky. Are not the calculations of astronomy, for instance verified by the occurrence of eclipses, which would never have been the case, had our knowledge been circumscribed by the terrestrial objects.

Thus from what is said above, it is manifest that the connection of cause and effect is so intimate, so inseparable, and so invariable, that no effect can take place without its concomitant cause. Take away the cause, and the effect ceases to be. Hence, all the things are maintained in their existence by the presence of their causes, the primary,

the original, and the most important of which is God, whose presence is thus demonstrated in all of them.

Moreover, as the things of the world are continually in the process of construction and destruction, which nobody pretends to have any hand in, not only the presence but the activity of God is constantly displayed before our eyes.

If we look through the telescope, we see that the heavens are peopled with worlds similar to and often larger than our planet. The laws of nature, which constitute our whole circle of knowledge, prove us, in virtue of their uniformity of operation, that they are also the works of the Divine Architect and that since the things there, as everywhere else, pass at every moment through the portals of birth and death, the presence of God is kept up there at all times. The more magnifying is the power of lenses, the more numerous are the stars that crowd upon the field of vision; and the points of analogy and the uniformity of nature will lead us to the inference of God's presence throughout the indefinite vacuity of space at the one and the same time. Thus the Supreme Being is believed by us to be simultaneously present to all eternity in the entire range of existence. "This notion of God's omnipresence necessarily includes the proposition that the existence of the Divine Being cannot be partial anywhere, but must be perfect everywhere."

Furthermore, the universal intuition of mankind attests the ubiquity of God. The inhabitants of

Japan, China, Barma, India, Persia, Greece, Italy, France, England, and America, all praying at the same time in their several countries, instinctively believe in God hearing their prayers and scrutinising what passes in their hearts. If God be not believed to be all-pervading, this fact cannot take place. Hence, the omnipresence of God is a datum of intelligence and an intuitive conviction of mankind.

Besides, there are many advantages in believing God to be omnipresent. For the sake of examples, I enumerate only five here, leaving their illustration to the imagination of readers. (1) It makes God accessible to all people without the distinction of creed or color. (2) It alone can sufficiently explain the mystery of nature, and consequently it does away with the hosts of imaginary beings that are otherwise assumed by the poetical fancy to work in the economy of nature. (3) It sweeps off the trickery of priestcraft once for good and all. (4) It diffuses inexpressible joy and tranquillity in our hearts by placing us in the company of our common Father, who is the source of happiness and the destination of our journey in the world, and who thus becomes the immediate object of our contemplation and adoration. (5) It regenerates the whole constitution of soul and purges off the depravity of our nature. Let a person be once thoroughly convinced of the universal presence of God, watching the secret springs of ideas inside and the overt results of actions outside, and it at once ceases to do evil even in the darkest recess of a creek or corner. The wickedness of heart being

gone, the soul shines in its native transcendental beauty and rises in the scale of creation by virtue at its perfect purification and godly works that follow then from it.

But the blindness of mythology hoodwinks the truth of God's ubiquity. Though some of its passages can be quoted in support of it, yet in the main it does not accept the doctrine in its entirety. The principal branches of mythology that sway the faith of our countrymen are Hinduism, Christianity, and Mahomedanism. They confine God to an unknown place of bliss, and represent him to be seated amidst the singing throng of human birds. It is useless to fight on dialectical differences and geographical peculiarities that distinguish these grand divisions of mythology from each other. But for this unimportant distinction, they are all one in essentiality. Are not these ministrant monsters called *apsaras* in Hinduism, *angels* in Christianity, and *farishtas* in Mahomedanism?

Mythology supports its hypothesis of the localization of God by the incubation of belief in the creation of one world we live in and the rest as mere shining points for the ornament of heavens or the glory of saints. But the science of astronomy proves beyond all doubt the existence of countless worlds spinning in the immensity of space. The localization of God in heaven to the exclusion of worlds cannot reasonably account for the phenomena of birth and death in all descriptions of life and of formation and destruction in the configuration of the earth, which constantly take place

in them. These events, which none can have the hardihood to deny the occurrence of, are effects happening in worlds. Therefore their causes, and especially the most important of them, the primary cause—the Deity, must also be present with them in worlds; for, the cause and the effect are, as a rule, intimately and inseparably connected together, the dependence of their existence and action being constantly reciprocal. If the primary cause is absent from the scene of its alleged effect, no event can take place. There is no instance in the whole range of science, which can prove that effects happen in the absence of their legitimate causes. But if other agents than God be deputed to accomplish the works of omnipotence, they will become Gods, and thereby establish the system of polytheism. If the works of intelligence be attributed to the eternity of matter, we shall have no proof of God's existence, and be launched into the shoresless ocean of atheism. All these recondite deformities of mythology disappear before the all-sufficient doctrine of God's omnipresence.

To these heavy objections against the localization of God, mythology gives no satisfactory answer. Only it has started a crotchet for crazy heads that whenever wickedness is rampant in the world, God either comes down himself or delegates an ambassador extraordinary. But since the incarnations and prophets of God, for so they are called, were subject to the same laws that govern other creatures, and had no hand in the works which

require the exercise of almighty power, their mission cannot be proved. Even the wickedness, which formed the object of their mission to suppress, received confirmation from their own examples, and did increase after them, as history lamentably narrates the destruction of mankind in the sacred tridentates of Hinduism, the pious crusades of Christianity; and the meritorious crescentades of Mahomedanism.

Among the many evils that result from such crude suppositions, only ten are given here by way of examples. (1) Ignorance becomes ambitious of asserting its claims to incarnation or prophethood by appeal to arms: the sense of learning knows its insignificance and never makes such preposterous and blasphemous pretensions. (2) The events which the incarnation and the embassy of God are conjectured to account for, remain completely unexplained, or rather hid in an impenetrable veil of mystery. (3) This false charge of mutability to the Immutable, the change of mind to the Unchangeable, degrades God to the frailty of humanity and sinks him lower than brutes. The unerring eye of science in reading the book of Nature, the history of her Master, has never met with an instance where God ever changed his mind. Whence is it that mythology has discovered that God not only changed his mind once, twice, and many times; but he will change it again? Look, how it expects the incarnation of Nishcalank (spotless), the second advent of Christ, and the appearance of Mihdi (captain

general! (4) The spirit of learning is discouraged by the removal of the First Cause from the field of observation, which is the most potent stimulus to the children of knowledge on the otherwise rugged path of science. (5) Our alienation from God, which mythology would have us believe, is so painful to the mind that all the teachers of religion try to inculcate the omnipresence of God. It is to eradicate this estrangement that Christ taught that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, meaning thereby that God is in us. Is it not sufficient to demolish the whole fabric of mythology which shuts God in heaven alone? (6) The incarnation and the embassy of God destroy his justice by favoring a few to the exclusion of the rest of the world, which is equally entitled to his grace and mercy. (7) It is in the uncertainty of God's locality that idolatry offers itself as the proper place of God and blinds the eye of faith with the spell of its tinsel pomp. (8) Priestcraft takes advantage of this idolatrous propensity of ignorant people. Temples and places of pilgrimages soon proclaim their possession of God. Crowds flock to take a sight of the prodigy, and are fleeced to the skin by the harpies of sordidness. (9) Evils are increased by a belief in the absence of God from among us; whereas it was the end of religion to drive them off from the world. The presiding of angels over destiny cannot deter people from doing evil; for, angels are corrupt and often throw in their lot with might and bribery, as can be proved from the wild stories of mythology. (10) The most lamentable consequence of the incarnation and the

embassy of God is the mediacy of worship. People are not allowed to worship God directly, but are called on to pay homage to a go-between, as mutable and weak as themselves.

Thus "the mythological system of faith is a sort of religious denial of God. It is made up of manism with a particle of deism, and is as near to atheism as twilight is to darkness; for between man and his maker it interposes an opaque body as the moon does herself between the earth and the sun," and thereby produces a religious eclipse of the Divine Sun shining beyond in the full strength of his glory. "It has put the whole orb of reason into shade." The only safety from this hideous blasphemy is therefore the implicit acquiescence in the Vedic teaching of God's omnipresence. Let us then pull down these dark mediums which cut off the glory of God from us.—Amen!

GOD'S MERCY AND JUSTICE.

Look how the sun imparts us light ;
 The moon with stars doth shine at night ;
 With fruit and fragrance trees regale ;
 With warbling songs birds daily hail ;
 The fields nev'r tire of yielding corn ;
 The clouds nev'r dry of rain ev'r thrown ;
 And charms of knowledge heighten mind !
 Of God's mercy us all remind ;
 Since we nev'r made them for our ease ;
 'Tis He who made and gave us these.

Mercy is a disinterested desire to remove the suffering of others. Like all desires, it owes its being to the want of pleasurable feeling. It originates from our inability to bear the sight of pain. But where it flows unrestricted and unimpeded, it is twice blessed ; it blesseth him that gives, and him that takes. This mutual gratification is especially peculiar to mercy, the noblest quality of humanity, and the brightest jewel in the crown of 'the lord of creation'. Whereas other desires end in the self-satisfaction of their possessor alone, it results in the serenity of mind. It allays the ebullition of passions. It composes the mind to the proper state of devotion. The joy and happiness it brings to the receiver, are indescribable. Under its influence a marvellous power of endurance springs up. Its hope supports the drooping energy of mind, which gathers and pushes on with redoubled proclivity to its desired goal.

Being a coactive power, mercy impels us to action. But all the acts that it excites in us, are not necessarily always pleasant in appearance; because all actions, whatever may be their origin, are either agreeable or disagreeable. Actions are mere means to accomplish an end. The end of mercy, as already stated above, is the alleviation of pain, and the ultimate purity of mind. It is indifferent what measures are adopted to effect the purpose in view. It is to the final result that the sensible portion of mankind looks to. The doctor, for example, may think it advisable to open a vein to bleed under the smarting pain of the patient, to effect perfect cure by lowering the temperature of the blood. But none would call it a cruel or merciless act, although it is too disagreeable to look at.

Mercy is also taken in the sense of total forgiveness of crimes. It is defined by lexicographers as a "disposition to overlook injuries or to treat an offender better than he deserves." Why don't they call it an act of kindness to one and injustice to the rest of the world? But, strange to say, it is the common signification of the word. In this sense it is quite inapplicable to God; for,

"A God all mercy is a God unjust."

The most merciful God, according to this meaning, would signify the greatest instigator of crimes, the arch tempter of sins, or in other words, the Devil himself. Such is the blasphemy that is hid in the accepted meaning of mercy.

Moreover, in its general acceptation it can not become universal; for then it would be nothing

but the unbounded license for the commission of iniquities. But since God's attributes are all infinite and universal, and not partial and finite, its current or vulgar meaning cannot be predicated of Godhead. And we must be content with that meaning only which expresses its primary object—the amelioration of mind.

Justice is what accords one right,
 And curbs the rage of tyrants' might.
 On nature's laws 'tis based for truth;
 It hence maintains eternal youth.
 It guards the holiness of God,
 And makes just man a demigod.
 Without it world would seem as nought,
 Divine virtue, remain unsought;
 This life, become a source of pain;
 Belief in God, be quite in vain;
 The lot of man, be worse than stone,
 And only joy, be death alone.

Justice is "the rendering to every one his due, right, or desert." It is a conformity to truth. Hence it is plain that it belongs to the cognitive powers of mind, intellect, comparison, or judgment; for, it is only in comparing things that we can know what belongs to one and what to another. On this acquisition of knowledge of rights the act of justice, or the bestowal of rewards and punishments, depends for its existence.

Justice being an act of judgment, an act of distribution, it is not necessary that it should always reveal itself in chastisement. As is already said, any act, irrespective of its origin, can only

give us either pain or pleasure. When an inspector of schools awards a prize to a successful examinee, he does justice, inasmuch as he rewards merit, which gives great pleasure to the student as well as spectators. Thus the object of justice is not simply the affliction of punishment, but the final improvement of soul.

From the foregoing remarks it is manifest that mercy and justice are two different things, or rather two ways to accomplish the same end. They agree in their ends, but differ in their origins. Mercy refers to volition, justice to action which takes its source from the knowledge of rights. Thus the same difference exists between them, as is there between conation and cognition.

They have nothing like the physical contrariety of light and shade. Both can reside in, and emanate from, the same individual simultaneously. The internal modification of volition is the image of mercy, and the external manifestation of action is the form of justice. Mercy impels an action, justice executes it. Mercy is an agent, justice an instrument. Mercy is the excitation of cause, justice the operation of effect.

Hence, there is no contradiction in God being both merciful and just. God's will is called mercy, God's way is called justice. God is merciful, inasmuch as He loves the perfection of soul. God is just, inasmuch as He takes the most effective means to achieve the end.

If God overlooks our sins, we shall never be pure and holy ; and consequently we shall be completely disqualified to enter the kingdom of heaven. The forgiveness of wickedness would impute to God the sin of injustice and the ignorance of purificatory laws. As these qualities cannot be ascribed to God, He is, therefore, just and knows best how to do justice. Again, if he knows justice but never exercises it, how can it be ascertained that he does know it ? If he forbears all crimes, it is useless to call him just ; for, justice presupposes the comparison of two things. But when nothing is judg'd, when nothing is compared, there is neither judge nor justice. Besides, the remission of sins will lead to the repetition of iniquities, and the consequence will be that we shall be more and more impure and sinful. In this unhallowed state we cannot hope to reach heaven ; but we shall certainly go to hell. Who it was that first said that mercy meant entire forgiveness, and justice, either complete inaction or excruciating torture alone ; and what the effects were that led to this monstrous assertion, it is now impossible to determine.

We do not object to the opinion that regards mercy and justice as synonyms ; for we have already seen that they both have the same thing, viz, the elevation of soul, for their final end. The profusion of beneficence and the liberty of soul attest the mercy, and the unequal distribution of happiness and the universality of death demonstrate the justice of God. Therefore there is no

absurdity in our believing that the Supreme Being is both merciful and just.

A glance of reflection in the calm and satisfied state of mind at the order of things as found in the world, will clearly bring home to the contemplator the Divine dispensation of all blessings that defy even the descriptive power of science. The exuberance of vegetation to support the increase of animals in the spring, the secretion of milk in the mother's breast anterior to the child's birth, the appearance of teeth to chew the solid on the disappearance of the lacteous food, the covering of hair or skin to protect the tender parts from the effect of weather, the angelic gift of reason with its object of knowledge depicted on the boundless chart of nature, and ten thousand things beside, all conferred on the inhabitants of the world without even the thought of prayer for them. Is not all this the mercy of the Most Merciful God? Behold, the whole world, the store-house of all our wants, containing, as it does, all the precious stones, all the sweet fruits, all the delicious foods, all the desired clothes, all the beautiful women, all the delightful gardens, all the picturesque landscapes and all the luxuries, is freely given away to all the creatures for their general support. Can it mean anything else but the infinite mercy of the Almighty? Ponder well, open the eye of intellect, and you will find the whole world bestrewn with the flowers of His mercy. To look for mercy beyond these blessings, is to build castles in the air

It is the moral bluntness of human nature that calls the forgiveness of its weaknesses to be the only manifestation of God's mercy.

In the world, the garden of God's mercy, His divine attribute of justice acts as the ever watchful gardener. The ignorance of the properties of things is the bane of their misuse and improper application. The considerable liberty of action has opened the enjoyment of the choicest blessings. But as extremes result in ruin, the hand of universal justice checks the inevitable destruction of this vanity fair. This deprivation of the continuance of enjoyment is attributed by ignorance to the wrath of heaven or judgment of God. But a little reflection will bring the true cause of suffering or enjoying to light. However useful a thing may be, it turns to our hurt, if we are ignorant of its use. Place the sword, which protects from our enemy, in the hand of a child, and it will hurt itself; for, it does not know how to use it. A check is therefore necessary to save the child. In like manner, the check of Divine justice which is revealed in rewards and punishments of merits and demerits, is a necessary companion of mercy, which would otherwise tend to our ruin, as is shown in the example of the child and sword. Give up, hence, that beastly desire of obtaining pardon of sins at the hand of Just God, which would leave us impure with sins by covering us with the cloak of mercy. Look to the magnanimity of the sense of philosophy that hails God's correction of our sins to secure our original purity.

Moreover, how can God be called just, when he does not judge ; but he dismisses sinners with mercy alone ? When is he said to exercise his noble attribute of justice ? If all the religions are to be credited with truth, the world's embracing any one of them, say, for example, Christianity would strip God of justice, altogether as there would be then no occasion for its existence. Hence, it is absurd to think that a merciful God cannot be a just God ; rather, considering philosophically, the combination of the glorious attributes of mercy and justice in Godhead sustains the spirit of activity and the cheerfulness of contentment in human nature.

REVELATION.

To understand easily and clearly what revelation is—

Let us hie from town to country,
 Sit in shade of howers by brook,
 Hear the signs of creatures atry,
 See plants dance so pleasant to look,^h
 Observe how primies pick fobler,
 How birds their seeds make with small bills,
 How small flowers sweet with odour,
 How fun pe-bee can goe behind hills;
 Watch at night the stary heavens,
 Holding worlds of countles number,
 Shining stars till crew of ravens;
 We then true God shall remember,
 For from nothing these things can't come;
 Cause and effect teach us strongly,
 They thus prove us Maker's wisdom,
 Wherein no man don't do but wrongly,
 They disclose His wondrous knowledge,
 Being diagrams of science;
 Those He made as nature's privilege,
 Gave all this in Vols of Arzuna,
 Both are parts of power of Great Lord,
 Seen, unseen is their distinction.
 We, hence, call the Ved Divine Word,
 Nature's scenery illustration,
 There men don't get tales of marvels,
 Told us by Religion Holy,
 We, hence, call her writings novels,
 Useful to impose on folly.

Revelation is something immediately communicated by God to a person who knew nothing of it

beforehand, and is wholly unconnected with action performed by persons upon the earth. It is the communication of God's laws, which, but for His assistance, would have remained unknown to us. These laws are no more than what are impressed on the structure of the universe and the constitution of the mind. They constitute what we call science, comprehending the principles of both the spiritual and the material existence. In them God instructed the progenitors of mankind. He not only opened the eye of man's mind to the study of science, but gave him sufficient stock of knowledge for his happiness.

Knowledge here means a bundle of ideas passing from mind to mind by the process of instruction. It is adventitious or acquisitive in contradistinction to the spontaneity of instinctive impulses, which characterise man's animality. These natural impulses man possesses in common with brutes. It is on the complete subjugation of, and the absolute dominion over them that man asserts his claim of spirituality, which consists in the knowledge of the idea of God and His laws that regulate the universe. The pains persons take to acquire it, unquestionably demonstrates its foreignness. But the time and labour spent in the acquisition of it are more than compensated by the joy which it infuse into the mind, and the comforts which it procures for the body. These are so well known to its votaries that they need no explication whatever.

The extraneous quality of knowledge or science, the mastery of which is repletewith the aforesaid

remote advantages, but entails upon the learner a world of hardships, does not attract the indolence of man's instinct, which is naturally prone to indulge in the sensual pleasures of the present moment. It, therefore, gave rise to the light study, which did not heavily tax the powers of understanding, but which agreeably pandered to the cravings of the senses. It delighted the extravagance of imagination and afforded irresistible allurements to the preposterous hopes of ignorance. It promised to supply good to all the senses. It smoothed the monstrosity of sin and shame, and paved the way to unbounded licentiousness, in which revels the wickedness of ignorance. It described wonderful tales, which webbed morality and iniquity with great ingenuity. Poetry came forward to lend its bewitching charms. The consequence was that science gave way to the spell of mythology, which soon spread over the world with the speed of electricity. This is why our stories can be traced from the Pacific to the Atlantic ocean. The nations which adopted them took care to obliterate our manners and customs and interpolate theirs instead, to suit the tastes of their country. But science did not die altogether. It lurked in solitary breasts, and sallied forth many a time to scare away the whore of mythology. At last, its supremacy is now recognised by most of the European nations, and the old adage that truth ultimately prevails, is verified to the letter. It is now planting the garden of Eden upon our planet, which was before converted into hell by mythology. Our Swami, Maharshi Dayanand

Saraswati, the champion of knowledge, vanquished all the mythologists of the world in the modern time, and now it is the duty of India to erect the triumphal monument of a scientific academy in commemoration of his glorious victory.

However, the caution for self-preservation requires that a few rules may be borne in mind to avoid the snares of imposition ; for, mythology claims celestial birth in opposition to knowledge, the legitimate heavenly maid. The following criteria I have learnt for my guidance from the Arya Samaj.

I.—Revelation must take place at creation, that is to say, at the dawn of reason in the first individuals of the human species.

If it happens afterwards when many generations of men have passed away, it will impute the charge of partiality to the justice of God ; for, he cannot judge men by the law, which was not given to them. It is the law only that points the distinction between right and wrong ; consequently those, who have no law, can be neither punished nor rewarded. They thus become independent of the court of justice of God, who is the common judge of the all creatures.

This rule holds good in the case of the Veda 'the four books of science,' revealed in the beginning of the creation or 1960852989 years ago. This mundane era is calculated from an ancient astronomical formula, the working out of which is omitted here for the sake of brevity.

The Jains, Christians, and Mahomedans, who deny the authority of the Vedas, substitute their scriptures for revelation. But since recent origin is stamped on their front, they do not fulfill the most important condition of revelation.

The first revelation of the Jains (*genii*) comes from Rishabh Deva, the son of Nalus (Noah), whose descent is lost in antiquity. Consequently, the generations of men prior to him are left without a law to teach them the duties of man.

The Christian Apocalypse dates from the 96th year of the Christian era. Hence it is about 1800 years old.

The Mahomedan revelation is the Koran, which is only 1300 years old.

Thus these revelations leave the former races of mankind to grope their way in utter ignorance as well as they can. According to them, all the persons who believe in them go to heaven; but the ancients and unbelievers are damned to eternal hell-fire. This doctrine is most derogatory to the Divine justice and highly disgusting to the theist.

The Europeans, by the bye, affirm on the veracity of the Bible (a collection of the Jewish legends), that, since the world was created only 4004 years before Christ, the Vedas could not be older than 3100 years before Christ; in other words, they must have been composed after the time of Noah, who survived the universal deluge, (Gen. ix. 29). Though this religious hypothesis is now exploded by science, it proves the priority of the Vedas to all other religious books in the world.

II.—It must exclude all stories.

This is a corollary of the first rule ; for, stories are the records of actions performed either by men, prophets, gods, sons of gods, or by devils, whose creation necessarily precedes the performance of those actions and, consequently, the origin of those stories ; whereas, the nature of revelation requires that it should govern the actions of men, but not be governed by them.

Now this condition is happily fulfilled by the Vedas. But the absence of stories in the Vedas is destructive of its popularity, owing to its abstract character. Its dry truths and antiquated simplicity pull upon our degenerate sense, which requires the pompons and the marvellous. It is therefore almost left out by the common course of education of the pundits or the Indian scholars.

On the decline of the Vedic study, these men formed an anonymous mythology in eighteen ponderous volumes, all ascribed to Vyas, the greatest metaphysician of the world. But the learned men of India, who possess a capacity of linguistic discrimination, do not accept the received opinion of that divine sage being the author of the fables, the language of which is decidedly modern. Besides these eighteen books, called the Purans, there are others of minor note, which are also looked upon as inspired books. Their argument hinges on the prevalent notion of the incarnations of God and his revelation. The doctrine is based

upon the possibility of all kinds of things with the omnipotence of God, which is undeniable.

Many of the tales of mythology are childish. For instance, Baly, a monkey king of Mysore, wrestled with Ravan, the ten-headed giant king of Ceylon, and, having got the monster under the armpit, forgot to take him out for six months. They don't tell us if he was given regular rations all the while.

The Bible relates the traditions of the Jews from 4004 years before, to 96 years after Christ, an ignorant Jewish carpenter (Mat. xiii. 54, 55), who is the measure of time with the Christians. It is divided into two parts, called the Old and the New Testament. Both of them are full of tales. The stories of the former are marked with incest, war, rapine, and murder; while the latter treats of the curious. For instance, the Old Testament says

"The Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God. I will make my covenant between me and thee. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you," (Gen. xvii. 1 & 10, 11.) After changing the name of Abram to Abraham, and that of his *sister-wife* (Gen. xx. 12) *Sarsi* to Sarah, this God went up from him. Lot took his two daughters to wives, and begot two sons by them (Gen. xix. 36). "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying . . . avenge the Lord

of Midian." Moses armed his Israelites and "warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses; and they slew all the males and the kings of Midian. The children of Israel took all the women of Midian captives, and their little ones, and took the spoil of all their cattle, and all their flocks, and all their goods. They burnt all their cities wherein they dwell, and all their goodly castles, with fire. They brought the captives and the prey and the spoil unto Moses. Moses was wroth with the officers of the host, which came from the battle, and said unto them, *Haya ye saved all the women alive? Now kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.* The Lord spoke unto Moses saying (for such is the slang of the Holy Bible), take the sum of the prey that was taken both of man and of beast, thou and Eleazar the priest, and the chief fathers of the congregation divide the prey into two parts; between them that took the war upon them, who went out to battle, and between all the congregation. Moses and Eleazar the priest did as the Lord commanded Moses." (Num. xxi. 17, 18, &c.) "The Lord our (Moses') God delivered him (Sihon King of Heshbore) before us (Moses and Israelites), and we smote him and his sons, and all his people. We took all his cities, and utterly destroyed the men, and the women, and the little ones, of every city, we left none to remain. (Deut. ii. 33, 34).

David was enamoured of his military officer Uriah's wife. He sent for her in the absence of her husband on service and lay with her. When Uriah returned, David sent him back with a letter to his general. He wrote in the letter, saying, "Set ye Uriah in the forefront of the hottest battle, and retire ye from him that he may be smitten, and die." So Uriah died and David got his wife (II. Sam. xi. 2, 4, 15, 17, 27).

Solomon had 700 wives and 300 concubines and worshipped the idols called Chemosh, Ashloth, and Milecon (I Kings xi. 2, 5, 7).

The new Testament says in the Revelation :—

"There was war in heaven. Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not ; neither was their place found any more in heaven. The great dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the Devil, and Satan which deceiveth the whole world ; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him (Rev. xii. 7, 9)."

When the lamb Christ opened one of the seals of the Bible which is placed before God) and I heard, as it were, the noise of thunder, one of the four beasts saying, come and see. I saw behold a white horse : and he that sat on him had a bow ; and a crown was given unto him : and he went forth conquering, and to conquer. And when he opened the second seal I heard the second beast say, come and see (for God is served by speaking beasts in heaven). And there went out another horse that was red : and power was given to him that sat thereon to take place from the earth, and

that they should kill one another ; and then was given unto him a great sword (Il. v. vi. 1-4)." &c., &c., &c.

The Koran also contains the stories of the Bible and others which pleased the fancy of the Arabians. Only one is here adduced, which is perhaps not in the Bible. "The Jews will ask thee, says Allah to Muhomet, his Prophet, "concerning Du' ulkarnein. Answer, I will rehearse unto You an account of him. We made him powerful in the earth, and we gave him means to accomplish everything he pleased. And he followed his way, until he came to the place where the sun setteth ; and he found it to set in a spring of black mud ; and he found near the same a certain people. And we said, O Du' ulkarnein, either punish this people, or use gentleness towards them. He answered, whosoever of them shall commit injustice, we will surely punish him in this world ; afterwards, shall he return unto his Lord, and he shall punish him with a severe punishment. But whosoever beliveth, and doth that which is right shall receive the most excellent reward, and we will give him to command that which is easy. Then he continued his way, until he came to the place where the sun riseth ; and he found it to rise in a certain people, unto whom we had not given anything wherewith to shelter themselves therefrom. Thus it was ; and we comprehended with our knowledge the forces which were with him. And he prosecuted his journey from south to north, until he came between two mountains ; beneath which he found certain people

who could scarce understand what was said. And they said, O Du' ulkarnein, verily Gog and Magog waste the land ; shall we therefore pay the tribute, on condition that thou build a rampart between us and them ? He answered, the power wherewith my Lord hath strengthened me, is better than your tribute ; but assist me strenuously, and I will set a strong wall between you and them. Bring me iron in large pieces, until it fill up the space between the two sides of these mountains. And he said to the workmen, Blow your bellows, until it make the iron red hot as fire. And he said further, bring to me molten brass, that I may pour upon it. Wherefore, when this wall was finished, Gog and Magog could not scale it, neither could they dig through it." (Sale's Koran Chap. xviii.)

The writer of the Koran does not say what His Highness, Du' ulkarnein, did in the south and in what country this metal wall was built. If the Mahomedan mean Alexander the Great by Du' ulkarnein, Allah, who is supposed to be the writer of the Koran, miserably fails in writing the history of that mighty hunter before the Lord, which has been successfully accomplished by Strabo, Arrian, and the like, with great eloquence and correctness. How is it that man writes better history than Allah ?

" O Prophet, stir up the faithful to war. Unless a revelation had been previously delivered from God, verily a severe punishment had been inflicted on you, for the ransom which ye took from the captives at Bedr," (where Mahomet gained a

splendid victory over his enemies)—Sale's Koran, Chap. viii. " Thus God propoundeth unto men their examples. " Where ye encounter the unbelievers, strike off their heads, until ye have made a great slaughter among them ; and bind them in bounds. He (God) commandeth you to fight His battles. As to those who fight in defence of Gods' true religion, God will not suffer their works to perish, and he will lead them into paradise. O true believers, if ye assist God, by fighting for his religion, he will assist you against your enemies and will set your feet fast, but as for the infidels let them perish ; and their works shall God render vain," (Sale's Koran, Chap. xi. vii). When God himself is in need of our assistance and cannot fight his battles, how can he fight ours and assist us against our enemies ? The Almighty God supplicating man's aid is a self-suicidal doctrine.

III.—It must be useful and therefore inevitably necessary to man.

The Veda teaches us the properties and the use of natural objects, the rules of morality, mathematics from arithmetic to astronomy, agriculture, the manufacture of machinery, medicine, mental philosophy, theology, and the like useful things in the world, without which we would have been classed with beasts. Instead of giving examples, I humbly refer the dissenter to its examination with necessary experiments to verify its truth.

But the foregoing stories and others that fill the Bible and the Koran are not only useless, but

fraught with enormous mischief. It would have been well, had they been never revealed. The ruins of the ancient magnificence and the misery of the countries, wherein the western mythologists set their foot, bear witness with me to the irremediable harm they have done to the world. Before their revelation: "the land flowed with honey and milk;" but afterwards it was turned into a Dead Sea by the inhuman Moses and his followers, who waged war in the name of God and religion, butchered children, and "left none to breathe." In the east, our scientific books, the labour of innumerable ages, warmed the water for the bath of myriads of mistresses of the Mahamedan monarchs. In the west, the famous library of Alexandria, the storè-house of the Grecian learning was consigned to flames by the mandate of Mahomet's successor on the throne of the Arabian Empire. Surely these blasphemous tales of God ordering to murder sucking babes, to debauch girls, and to sabre their mothers, can not be a revelation from the Common Father of mankind.

IV.—*It must contain knowledge or science.*

It is already said that the Vedas contain nothing but science. From it the ancient sages took hints and perfected the various departments of knowledge by their personal experience and observation. The Mundkopenishad says that in the four Vedas called Rig, Yajuh, Sam, and Atharv, there are two kinds of knowledge, viz. natural and spiritual. The former treats of

matter, and the latter of mind and God (II. 4,5). For instance, in Yajoh iii. 9, we read that the earth and other heavenly bodies spin in sky round their centres, and in Rig, Book 8, Chapter 2, Sec. 10, Verse 1, that it moves on its appointed path round the sun.

But the Bible tells us that, at the command of Joshua, the successor of Moses, "the sun stood still and the moon stayed; until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. The sun stood still in the midst of heaven and hastened not to go down about a day" (Josh. x. 12, 13). The author of Altkoran gives God the lie of the sun sinking into an ocean of black mud which has been quoted above.

Joshua forgot that the sun's course marks the time of a day. The sun was at the meridian, and yet one day was finished, so that he knew that it stood a whole day; for the Jews had no other means to measure the day. He does not say what use he made of the moonlight in the noon-day.

The Preamsagar (sea of faith) says that the moon watched Krishna's nocturnal dance with milkmaids at a village near Mathura for full six months!

Such is the blasphemy of mythology which imputes its ignorance to the Author of knowledge.

V.—*It must be true, i.e., conformable to the laws which govern the universe.*

Science alone can stand this test. Hence it is no wonder that the Vedas (knowledge), which consist of the laws of mind and matter, and the rules for attaining the perception of the Deity, should pass through it, for truth is that which is represented in nature. For instance, they say that the earth, sun, and other objects of the universe, both visible and invisible manifest the glory of their Creator, who alone deserves admiration, that people may derive wisdom therefrom, and practise beneficence and the like virtues, as these works reveal, He does towards all the creatures (Rig. v. 9). The wind carries off the water rarified by the heat of fire or the sun, forms it into clouds, and rains it down to the ease and nourishment of all the creatures (Rig. vi. 4). Nobody can reasonably doubt what is said in these two verses except the fool. But can mythologies, both of the east and west, prove the existence of flying horses, Gog, Magog, and devils? It is from this dread of proof that the cunning of mythology relates the very remote past and future but never the present, which alone is the time of truth. So it is, why mythologists require and recommend *faith* and blind faith only, and denounce and destroy logic and learning. As a rule, they call all philosophers atheists, infidels and the like ill names.

VI.—It must be immutable.

This cannot be true of stories. For example, the Koran says, in Chapter 37, that the Arabians regarded the angels in heaven to be of the female

works of God. Allah asked them to produce the evidence of a revealed book, but did not accept the traditions of genii; so the dispute was left undecided, and nobody knows the sex of angels. In Chapter 5 it says that Jesus caused a table to descend from heaven to fix a festival day, but there is not a whisper of it in the Bible. Its 5th Chapter tells us that "they are infidels, who say, verily God is Christ the son of Mary." The contrary is proved by the Trinitarians from the Bible. Though these specimens of the marability of tales are few and harmless, for I have taken care to give you only innocent and trifling instances, yet they evidently prove that corruptibility is the fate of tales.

But man can discern the facts of science contained in some such propositions as, for instance, the sun is the source of light and heat. The people of all creeds believe in the teachings of Euclid, who is called infidel, heathen, pagan, and the like by the religions of the west. I cannot understand how it is that neither the Israelite nor the Ishunite loses his faith by believing in this pagan philosopher. Thus this jewel of men, a real prophet and true son of Lord (for we are all sons of God), proves that immutability is a typical characteristic of knowledge or science. Who can change the truth that the two sides of a triangle are greater than the third? Also who can doubt when the Veda says that all ought to adore the Supreme Spirit, which fills all, knows the souls of all, and sees their actions (Rig, Sec. L. 5); or that as the sun causes the day, supports

the earth, gives light, disperses darkness, makes clouds rain, and thus dispenses ease and plenty among creatures, so man should learn from these to adopt the virtuous, and to reject the vicious qualities, to protect the righteous and to punish the wicked persons, and thus make all happy by showering, as it were, the blessings of education, morality, and knowledge of God (Rig xxxiii. 5) ? Is not unchangeability stamped upon these laws of mind and matter ? For millions of ages they have not altered. The sun has always given light, attracted the earth, and so forth. But how the tales change in passing from book to book and through the long lapse of time !

VII.—It must be beyond man's power of invention, or of completely unaided discovery.

The readers of novels know that man can make stories, for scarcely a year passes, when they do not receive some fresh novels of very amusing tales, told in sweet and eloquent language. They are right in not believing their previous existence, for otherwise the books will be unjustly deprived of their great merit of novelty, which is their only right. But such is not the case with knowledge.

It is the calumny of ignorance to call science human invention ; for, being the system of laws and principles impressed upon the structure of the universe, it can never be made by man, who is only a part of nature. To call the laws, according to which man is made, his invention, amounts to saying that man existed before himself, which

is absurd. He simply discovers it in the world, where he finds it already made. The earth moved before he knew that it did move. If man is the author of the motion of the earth, he can unmake it, as the potter can do with his earthen wares ; but the earth will still move. Suppose a Brahmin tells you that a solar eclipse is to take place on a certain day. You call for the grounds of his prediction. He produces a few dog-eared leaves of his almanac, probably made by a Bapu Deva of his caste. Order or bribe him to burn his book, to prevent the inauspicious cross of planets from happening ; for the time of imposition is past. But, behold, in spite of your joint efforts, the eclipse occurs exactly at the time foretold ; for, the laws, which bring on such phenomena, do not acknowledge you to be their father. Thus they convince us that the poor Brahmins have no hand in the manufacture of science, which not only exists in earth, but also in heavens everywhere, as eclipses and transits clearly show. Hence science is independent of man's power. Wherefore, the Vedas being full of sciences mental, physical, natural, moral, and spiritual or theological, are not made by man, but by the Almighty, Omniscient Lord of the universe, the Author of science.

It is not for us to quote many verses from the Vedas in support of the statement that they are the germs of knowledge, the repository of the universal laws, and the original fountain, wherefrom science spread upon the earth, when it arose from the bottom of the chaotic ocean ; for, our end is

achieved, which was to prove that knowledge (Veda) is made by God and stories are man's fabrications. Do not think that the papers inked with letters are the Vedas ; for, we still print and bind them in all manners of type and convenience. But the Vedas are the ideas which those symbols call in our mind, and of which the prototypes always exist in the Divine Mind. Our forefathers thought it no better plan to catch the Vedas for transmission to us than to attach them to those characters.

Furthermore, as man is unable to invent science, so he can not discover it without some assistance. This aid is called teaching. It was given by God in the beginning of creation, but since then it has been transmitted from teacher to teacher. Our civilisation is due to the inestimable blessing, of the Vedas with which the Divine justice graced the previous austere devotion of our forefathers, who were the patriarchs of the world, when it formed only the outskirts of the Himalayas. Until this help reach a nation of savages, say, the Papuans, it makes no progress whatever, that may distinguish it from the beasts of forest. We see that man learns rudiments of science in schools, which serve to sow, as it were, the seed of knowledge in his brain. He nourishes it by observation and experiment, the method of which he has learnt from his teacher, and reaps the harvest of discoveries. But these new discoveries were contained in the seed of science, although invisible at commencement for want of maturity. For instance, the tree is contained in its seed

although no microscope can detect it. Persons learn propositions from Euclid and therefrom draw many deductions, which, if you think deep, are only the transmutationst of their original. Even the great Newton stood in need of help from his teachers in discovering gravity ; for, anterior to his discovery, he not only received instruction in the rudiments of science, but mastered its complete system, then known in the whole of Europe. He had read of weight before he applied his acute mind to the various modes of its actions. The dignity of science demanded the change of of its name to gravitation and attraction, when he proved its existence in all bodies by means of the mathematics, in which he was an M.A. By this I do not signify that knowledge does not improve ; but what I mean is, that some stock of knowledge is necessary in the outset of improvement, just as some capital is essentially useful in starting a commercial business. Hence, the argument runs thus :—Newton learnt wisdom from his teachers, they from theirs, they again from theirs, and so forth, till we come to the commencement of the world, that is to say, the formation of our planet, when the first created men learnt it from God.

Therefore, our knowledge comes from God, who made the world, though we cannot conceive how. He instructed man in the beginning, yet our inability of realizing each step of the method, which brought about the phenomenon under investigation, does not destroy the force of our argument, which refers only to the fact of its occurrence.

Though we cannot understand how he made the world, yet we believe that he did make it. Though we cannot realize in thought how he created man without cohabitation, which is now the only successful and established process of producing the bimāna, yet nobody can ever doubt that he did make man somehow by his Almighty power. Though we cannot know how a man dies, yet we confess that he does die. In fine, the long and short of what I say, is that the how of a thing is quite different from the fact, reality, or being of it. Still to accrue it to our mind, let us imagine that he so directed the mind of our primitive ancestors to the object he wanted to reveal them, that it was impossible for them not to see it ; for, we daily find that the experienced professor, by a series of pertinent questions, puts his pupils in the path of solving problems by themselves. Also, there is a variety of sounds, inside the head almost articulate and quite distinct from the din of the circulation of blood heard in the stopped ear. Anybody can accustom himself to hear them at pleasure by first attending to them for some time in the silence of night. In my humble opinion the modification of this un-emittent cerebral sound was the organ by which Omnipresent God communicated his knowledge in the form of the Vedas to the primeval teachers of mankind. But everybody has a right to account for it any way he likes. My purpose was to establish the fact. In this I am supported by *Patanjali*, who says that God was the

original teacher of men's ancestors.* It is a mere boast of arrogance that scientific discoveries can be made without any kind of previous instruction. In society man lives his whole life instructed and instructing. See, how the child is engaged in picking up knowledges as it falls from the mouths of old men ! Just as the locomotive engine can only then move when it is put on rails and propelled by the driver, after which it sets others in motion by contact ; so does knowledge come down to us through teachers and get developed as it goes onwards ; but its fountain-head is Omniscient God.†

VIII—*It must not be partial and biased to any, but equal and just to all in every respect*

Books of science only are free from partiality and favoritism. They do not talk of any person or nation as especially in esteem with them. But all the books of tales abound with panegyrics of the author and his friends. Justice is unknown to them, or rather consists with them in their dogmatical statements.

The Vedas, being the original books of science, mention nobody's name, but relate general truths. For instance, Rig, Book 8, Chap. 49, Ver. 2, says that all men ought always to act only on justice unalloyed with partiality, and on virtue accompanied with godliness. They must never foster enmity against any, but, on the contrary, always

* पूर्व यामपि गुरुः कालेनानवच्छेदात्

† तत्र निरतिशयं सर्वत्र वीर्यम्

live in friendship with all. They should apply themselves to knowledge, which improves the mind and brings happiness to all. They should imitate the conduct of the virtuous, the wise, the just, and the righteous. Virtue can be learnt from the teachings of the learned, the purity of conscience, and the knowledge of the Vedas.

The Bible is the book of the Israelites only. The simperton alone can place the hope of happiness on it. The former quotations may be again consulted in addition to these two. "The Lord spoke unto Moses saying . . . thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you. Ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession : they shall be your bondmen for ever ; but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour (Deut. XXV 1, 44, 46). The Christian Revelation (VII 4-8) informs us that 1,44,000 Israelites alone are to be saved from hell-fire and lodged in the new Jerusalem lighted by God and Lamb, (XXI 10; 23).

The Koran is profitable to the Moslems only. The believers in it are promised eternal habitation in Allah's 'carnal paradise' and nymphs of angelic beauty, as is already proved by quotations. "O true believers, contract not an intimate friendship with any besides yourselves." The 3rd chapter gives the Arabian Prophet an unbounded license in selection of wives and interdicts the remarriage of his divorced wives, concubines or widows. Is not this dictated by the jealousy of

love? War in name of religion can not be justified by equity. How is it that the female unbelievers are not infidels, and that wealth acquired by infidels is lawful to the true believers?

IX.—It must be sufficient and productive of happiness for the whole human race.

If what is revealed is insufficient, man must supply the deficiency of God's gift from his intellect to accomplish his end in view. This imperfection will then be a source of uneasiness. If he can make a part of it without God's assistance, he has the power to make the whole of it; whereas, we think that whatever falls within the range of God's work, man cannot do, not so much as a jot of it. For instance, God made man's body. If man can make a part of it, he will be able to make man's whole body. Hence, an incomplete revelation is worse than useless.

The Vedas are quite enough for man to know; inasmuch as it teaches all that he requires both on earth and in heaven. It divides the human life into four parts, and prescribes appropriate duties for them. The first quarter is employed in learning knowledge or profession; the second, in enjoying its fruits and doing good to the public; the third, in retirement from public affairs to learn how to meditate on God, to subjugate the senses, and to control the mind in revision of one's knowledge, and in scientific experiment; and the fourth, in contemplating on God's attributes, abstracting the mind, and preaching truth and virtue among the laity. The first state is

preparatory for the second, and the third for the fourth, which is the final step towards salvation. This beatitude consists in the obtainment of the Holy, Glorious, Infinite Spirit, present in the human mind, and perceivable by the sages who have conquered their self and destroyed their sins by the mortification of penance. This subject deserves treatment by the learned rather than by me, who have no pretensions whatever to learning; so I excuse myself of further quotations.

The time of the Bible and the Koran is already past at least in the civilized portions of the globe. The Christian and Mahomedan conquerors are obliged to borrow learning from the Pagans to get on peaceably in the world. These books serves in conquest only. For settled empires they are altogether unfit. In India nobody can act on them literally. Their votaries cling to the dogmas of secondary importance. The burden of the Koran is thus briefly told. "O true believers, shall I (Allah, the Mahomedan word for God) show you a merchandise which will deliver you from a painful torment hereafter? Believe in God and his apostle; and defend God's true religion (but who attacked it?) with the substance, and in your persons. This will be better for you, if ye know it. He (Allah, changed from the 1st to 3rd person) will forgive your sins, and will introduce you into gardens through which rivers flow. Ye shall obtain other things which ye desire, viz, assistance from God and a speedy victory. O true believers, be ye the assistants of God" (Ch. lxii.) This book is full of war. There are very

few chapters, that do not preach war against mankind. There is no instance in history to show that the Mahomedans were attacked for their religion. Hence, "Wage War" (Ch. ix) is their motto of religion. Here is a riddle from the Bible. "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of needle than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God" (Mat. xix 24). Yet the Christians are the richest people in the world. The Bible was never meant to be acted upon.

X.—*It must be eternal.*

Being imbedded in the texture of the world, science is indestructible and consequently eternal. Mythology did its worst to wipe it out of existence; but it survived to vanquish it. To take a concrete example. Here is a triangle. We find that its three angles are equal to two right angles. I rub the figure out. But I have no hesitation to say that the principle, namely, the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, is still true, although the figure of a triangle does not exist now. Make the figure again and the principle attaches itself to it as if by magic, having lived somewhere in the absence of this figure. It is therefore independent of the figure. The figure is destructible as is manifest; but the principle is not so, and is hence eternal. It existed before I made the figure; it remained intact when I destroyed the figure. If man made this property of a triangle, he could unmake or alter it. But we see here that he can not even touch

much less destroy it. It is invisible to him except through the figure. Now this principle is a piece of knowledge. Carry out the reasoning with a few more axioms of science, and you will be convinced of the indestructibility and eternity of knowledge.

But it is not so with tales. They are gone for ever. They had never existed before they happened; and they left no vestige behind after they were finished. The reason is that they were composed after the actions of mortals, who leave no "footprints on the sands of time." Hence, the fate of tales is like the path of an arrow or the course of a ship. You cannot revive them, as you can do a property of the triangle or circle. Since men never return after death, the stories which were the accounts of their actions, never take place. But as actions imply time and place, no two actions can exactly coincide or be identical. Hence, if the men return who were the cause of these stories and perform similar actions, these actions will not be identical with those performed before, being separated in time. So tales once finished can never recur in eternity, being absolutely dead and gone. But knowledge, science and truth, unnumbered with time, are ever living. We use identically the same principles of geometry which Euclid discovered. In like manner, all knowledge is the same as it was before; there is no date in it.

The Vedas, being full of knowledge, and destitute of tales, are everlasting. They are independent of the materials in which we keep them. They are engraved in the starry heavens. Thus

are knesaded into the mould of the earth. They are written in the beams of the sun. They are seen in the light of the moon. They are in the flashes of lightning. In short, they are always with God who fills all in all.

The Bible and Koran are gone with the prophets who brought them. They have now no existence in nature, except on paper. Whatever is true in these books, is plagiarized from the ancient religions, and therefore they cannot be credited for its merit. They will disappear before the advance of science and civilization.—*Amen.* A Christian gentleman made this following objections to the above in a letter to the Editor, when it appeared in *Arya Patrika* :—

REVELATION.

SIR,—Through the kindness of a native gentleman, my attention has been drawn to an article bearing the above title, which appeared in your issue of the 26th instant. The writer endeavours to disprove the legitimacy of the claim which the Bible (among other books) makes to contain a revelation from God, and to prove that the 'Vedas were revealed by Him. His method of demonstrating the authenticity of the Vedic revelation is really worthy of a admiration. He merely *Asserts* that "the Vedas" were "revealed in the beginning of the creation, or 1,960,857,983 years ago." But "for the sake of brevity," as he explains, he omits to state the proof—1st, that "the Vedas" were then produced : 2nd, that the date mentioned was the beginning of creation, and 3rd,

that, even if both hypotheses be granted "the Vedas" are inspired. It is much to be regretted that "brevity" should have caused your correspondent to be reticent upon all these points, in perusing the proofs of which much interest would doubtless be felt by all members of the Arya Samaj, not to speak of modern scientists, who would be delighted to sit at the feet of one able to give them such an amount of information upon these very important points. Really, Mr. Editor, although modesty is doubtless one of the distinguishing virtues of Arya Samaj, your correspondent's reticence in this matter seems carried too far. One is the more surprised at this, because in the rest of the article the writer speaks in such a tone of conscious superiority to the rest of creation.

The first criterion of a Revelation is, he states, that it must have been given "at creation, that is to say, at the dawn of reason in the first individuals of the human species." I purpose to consider this statement further on; but, granting for the present that it is true, let us proceed to test by it not all books purporting to be inspired, but the Bible and Rig Veda only. I mention the Rig Veda as the most important and the most ancient of the three Vedas. If it will not stand the test, none of the other sacred books of the Hindus will. Your correspondent tells us many things of which I at least was previously unaware; for example, besides stating the immense antiquity of "the Vedas," as above quoted, he informs us that "The Europeans . . . affirm on the author

ity of the Bible . . . that since the world was created only 4,004 years before Christ, the Vedas can not be older than 3,000 before Christ." I have carefully studied the opinions of eminent European scholars regarding the antiquity of the Vedas, and can confidently deny that such an opinion is held by competent Sanskrit scholars. I am not now endeavouring to prove the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, but, as a Christian who has studied the original languages of our Holy Books, I may be allowed to state that the Bible makes no such assertion as that the world was created only 4,004 years B. C. The calculations of Archbishop Usher, to whom this chronology is due, are not generally regarded by Christians as necessarily inspired. I may be allowed to add that no educated Christian maintains such a preposterous opinion as that the word is of such recent origin. The marvel is that your correspondent should venture to show such complete ignorance of the opinions which he is trying to confute. In order to show what is the real opinion of scholars regarding the date of the composition of the Rig Veda, I quote Professor Max Müller's words on the subject. He says, "The *Rig Veda*, or the Veda of the hymns, is in truth the only real or historical Veda, though there are other books that have been called by the same name. . . . The period during which the ancient hymns were collected and arranged as prayer-books for the four classes of priests, so as to enable them to take their part in the various sacrifices, has been called the *mantra period*,

and may have extended from about 1,000 to 800 B.C. It is therefore before 1,000 B. C., that we must place this spontaneous growth of Vedic Poetry, such as we find it in the Rig Veda and in the Rig Veda-only" (Hibbert Lectures, pp. 151, 152). In his "Sanskrit Literature," (p. 572) Müller gives 1,200 B. C., as the approximate date of the Rig Veda; and elsewhere he assigns the period between 1,000 and 1,500 B. C. to the composition of these hymns. Owing to the total want of any historical records in this country in early times, we can say nothing more definite than this. To anyone who knows anything about this matter, I need not say how weighty Max Müller's opinion is on a subject to which he has devoted his life. There is now a science of language quite as much as sciences of Astronomy and Geology, and the scientific conclusions regarding the date of the most venerable monument of the Sanskrit language are those which I have quoted above. Moreover, as to the preservation of the Rig Veda in its original form, it is a well known fact that "few Sanskrit manuscripts in India are older than 1,000 after Christ, nor is there any evidence that the art of writing was known in India much before the beginning of Buddhism or the very end of the Vedic literature (Max. Müller, Hibbert Lec., p. 153). The text of the Rig Veda now in our hands cannot therefore be said to have been fixed before about 450 or 500 B.C. at earliest though doubtless the archaic style of the language shows that the composition of these books as a whole must be attributed to a much more distant epoch. In refutation of the statement that

"the Vedas" (which "Vedas?") are more than *nineteen hundred and sixty millions* of years old (!!!) if such an assertion can be said to need refutation in this age of enlightenment, it may be pointed out that the Sanskrit language in which they were written must then be the mother of all other languages and the original language of the whole human race. But science has proved that this very ancient language is only the elder sister of Greek, Latin, Gothic, Teutonic, Celtic, etc., all of which belong to the Aryan or Indo-European branch of human speech. Besides this, there are two other great branches, the Semetic and the Turanian, none of which can possibly be derived from any other of these three, though all three are but branches of the one original language. Sanskrit therefore has no more right to be deemed the original tongue of our race than has Hebrew, Arabic, Greek, Turkish, or Chinese; nor would any man of learning venture in the present day to uphold such a theory in the face of the clear deductions of science.

With regard to the long series of revelations contained, as we Christians believe, in the Bible, all forming parts of the graduated course of instruction which God gave to men, according to their ability to receive it, I need only say that the books of Moses began to be written about the time of the Exodus, *i. e.* about B.C. 1490, but that recent investigations have rendered it certain that many of the earlier portions of the book of Genesis were certainly composed and written some hundreds of years before that, in Abrahams

time and previously perhaps, or between 1,900 and 2,000 years B.C. Writing was well known in Egypt and in Babylonia long before that time, and so we have no difficulty in crediting the preservation of works of such extreme antiquity. From that time, and the close of the first century after Christ's birth, God continued His course of instruction to chosen men of the human race. Taking merely antiquity into consideration then, we see that the oldest portion of our Scriptures is *at least* as old as, if not older than, the most ancient part of Rig Veda.

To return to the question as to the truth of the criterion stated by your correspondent, it is certainly not axiomatically clear that "Revelation must take place at creation," at least if he means, as his words seem to imply, *only* at creation. We might as well say that instruction can be given to our children *only* in their very earliest infancy. Now, although education may *begin* then, it certainly requires to be continued when their powers of reasoning and moral faculties have been much more fully developed. We do not generally teach our infants algebra, for instance, however desirous we may be that they should become accomplished mathematicians. Why is this? Because we know that as yet they have not the talents needed to comprehend the subject. So with revelation:—had God given a complete and final revelation, to our first parents, it would have been quite useless to them and would have become corrupted so much that, when it descended t

their later posterity, it would be completely worthless. Heathen poets and philosophers have spoken of men as children of the great All Father. We must not therefore expect to find God dealing with our race in the matter of instruction in such a way as no human father, however simple, would dream of dealing with his children. If your correspondent means to assert that God could not have left mankind in the earlier ages entirely without instruction on the highest of themes, I quite agree with him. Our Bible tells us that He *did* teach our first parents according as they were able to bear it, and moreover, in all ancient religious books, and not least in the Rig Veda, we find, underlying the gross polytheism (in the Rig Veda 33 gods are mentioned) and Nature worship therein inculcated not a few faint but significant traces of an earlier knowledge which our ancestors possessed of the truth. These early writers sometimes seem to be groping for the light, half conscious that they once knew something which they have forgotten. It is therefore the more pitiable to see their children in the present age, when God has graciously restored and amplified His earlier revelation, obstinately turning from the truth, and, like the writer whose article I am considering, actually reviling Him who is the light of the world.

It is hardly necessary to discuss the 2nd criterion which your correspondent lays down,—*viz.*, that a true revelation "must exclude all stories." Apparently he means all narratives whether true or false. Such an assertion needs no refutation; but it may be pointed out that, if this be a

critèrion, it entirely disposes of the claim of the Vedas, which, as is well known, abound in the most silly though fragmentary tales. Yet this gentleman tells us that "this condition" (i.e. of excluding stories) is happily fulfilled by the Vedas." I really fear, Mr. Editor, that he can never have read recent English version of them, for I hesitate to believe that a member of the Arya Samaj would be guilty of unblushing falsehood. With reference to the narratives which he quotes from the Bible, he has omitted to state probably through wishing to be brief how surely and severely the sins (e.g. that of David) which he mentions were punished by God. He does not notice what a wonderful proof it is of the unflinching truthfulness of the inspired writers that they record their own sins and those of their sovereigns together with the punishment that ensued, thus drawing for us pictures of actual and not merely ideal men and women. To most people it is clear that we can gain much warning and much instruction from the plain and unvarnished account of the lives of those who have trodden before us the path that all must one day tread. Let me add the expression of my hope that the writer of the article which I have been reviewing may, ere his time comes to "tread the way of death," accept the aid of that light which he as yet so imperfectly comprehends, and which he therefore bids to receive as his guide.

A. Christian.

The Christian gentleman's objections were answered as follows :—

REPLY TO "A CHRISTIAN."

SIR,—In the article on Revelation the dates of the Hindu, Christian and Mahomedan revelations were given according to the statements of their followers. As its object was to consider the result, but not the grounds, of the assumption of those dates, it was useless there to enter into the lengthy details of its merit. Had these religions selected some other dates, they would have been accepted. For instance, it is now asserted, without any reason whatever "that many of the earlier portions of the book of Genesis were certainly composed and written some hundreds of years before that (viz. 1,400 B.C.), in Abraham's time and previously perhaps, or between 1,900 and 2,00 years B.C. ; that the Bible makes no such assertion as that the world was created only 4,004 years B. C.;" . . . and "that no educated Christian entertains such a preposterous opinion as that the world is of such recent origin." If this be taken for granted, it will not at all destroy the argument that on the opinions of the Christians those unlucky fellows who had the misfortune to be born prior to the commencement of "the graduated course of instruction" of their revelation, were unjustly deprived by God of the inevitably necessary gift of knowledge. It is now demanded to state the grounds of the Aryas' assumption of a tremendous mundane and Vedic era. Hence it is quite a distinct question.

The ancient text upon which the era is based is "*Brahmano dvitiye prohurādhe, Vaivasvāte manvantare, ashtavinṣatītame kalīyuge,* ki

prathamam charane." It means that the present time is "the first quarter of the twenty-eight cycle of the seventh age in the second quarter of the time of the exertion of the Divine Power." It is used on important undertakings by the millions of Indian people. Its calculation is founded on the rules of astronomy and also the directions laid down in the code of Manú (Minos), Chapter i. 68, 74. It is always written in the Indian almanacs generally sold at an anna or so in all the markets. Our venerable and learned Shastri Bâjû Deva's calendar is commonly preferred by the people of Northern India.

As to the reason of believing it, suffice it to say that it is told us by all our astronomical forefathers, so worthily represented in the present time by the Shastri; the expounder of *Siddhant shiromani* (oriental astronomy). That they spoke the truth is proved by the confirmation of their observations by the modern scientists of Europe. "The antiquity and originality of the Indian astronomy form subjects of considerable interest. Cassini, Bailly and Playfair maintain that observations taken upwards of 3,000 years before Christ, are still extant, and prove a considerable degree of progress already made at that period. . . All astronomers, however, admit the great antiquity of Hindu observations, and it seems indisputable, that exactness of the mean motions that they have assigned to the sun and moon could only have been attained by a comparison of modern observations with others made in remote antiquity. Even Mr. Bently, the most strenuous opponent

of the Hindus, pronounced in his latest work, that their division of the ecliptic into 27 lunar mansions (which supposes much previous observation) was made 1,442 years before our era, and without relying upon his authority in this instance, we should be inclined to believe that the Indian observations could not have commenced at a later period than the fifteenth century before Christ."—Elphinstone, Book III, Chap. i., p. 127.

All the sages of antiquity have admitted that astronomy is a part of the Vedas (Vedāᅅga). There is only this difference that it is an exhaustive and compendious explanation of the astronomical aphorisms of the Vedas ; for they contain only germs of all kinds of knowledge without lucid illustrations, which are usefully left for the exertion of mental activity. The Mundkoraishad enumerates the six Vedāᅅgas (Part i. Chapter i. 5)—vide Swami Shankaracharya's commentary on it. Being derived from the Vedas and containing ample explanation, they are made auxiliary or subordinate to the course of Vedic study. If it be said that these Vedāᅅgas or the explanations of the Vedas were formed before the Vedas, it will be tantamount to saying that the working existed before the problem, which is absurd. Thus the oriental astronomy is later than the Vedas. Now, since this very astronomy records observations of more than 3,000 years before Christ by the confession of the Europeans, how can it be maintained that the Vedas were made only 450 B. C. ?

Also, the aforesaid mundane era is invariably given in all the Indian books of acknowledged authority. As the Vedas are impressed on the structure of the universe, Manú, among others, says, (Chapter i. 23), that in the beginning God "milked them out," as it were, to make a gift of them to the first men. "God endowed man from his creation with consciousness, the internal monitor, and made a total difference between right and wrong as well as between pleasure and other opposite pairs. He then produced the Vedas for due performance of the sacrifice from the beginning."—Elphinstone's Manú. The Mandukopaniśad, (Part. ii. Chapter i. 6), after describing God and the creation of the universe, says "Tasmádrichah, Sam, Yajunshi, Dikṣha," &c., meaning, from Him at creation came the Rig, Sám, Yajur, and Atharva Vedas. The evidence of these philosophers, greater than Plato and Euclid, all perfect scientists and children of truth, carries a greater weight with the man of reason than the nomadism of Moses, who spent his life in contriving plans for the conquest of Palestine, and murdering people. So much for the three questions.

Now, to the Sanskrit scholars of Europe. Are Prof. Max Müller's conjectures reliable before the evidence of Shankeracharya and Dayanand Saraswati, whose works attest the profundity of their Sanskrit and Vedic knowledge? How is it that the Professor "merely asserts," and the credulity of creed believes, as if the hollow thunderings of the magnanimous Sanskrit gun of

Europe were the revelations from On High? The logic of the learned Professor is very curious. He says that "the period during which the ancient hymns were collected *may* have extended from about 1,000 to 800 B. C. It is *therefore* before 1,000 B. C. that we must place this spontaneous growth of Vedic poetry, such as we find in the Rig Veda." Reasoning requires two distinct premises, from which an inference can be deduced. Instead of this, our Professor first makes an arbitrary guess, with Adam's date before his mind, in the form of the potential mood, and then repeats the same in the indicative mood, with the illative conjunction 'therefore' interposed to look like a conclusion! Who will believe me, if I say that the book called the Bible may have been composed in the fourth century of the Christian era by the minions of Athanasius, the inventor of trinity; and it is therefore written by them? Does such a mode of reasoning require the devotion of life to learn it? Surely not. The depth of knowledge is not measured by the length of time.

It is the calumny of Professor Max Müller to say that the ancient Aryas were ignorant of the art of writing. Professor Wallace remarks on the system of the Hindu trigonometry, "However ancient any book may be in which we meet with a system of trigonometry, we may be assured it was not written in the infancy of science. We may therefore conclude that geometry must have been known in India long before the writing of the Surya Siddhant."

"This book contains a system of trigonometry, which not only goes far beyond anything known to the Greeks, but involves theorems which were not discovered in Europe till the sixteenth century."

"Their geometrical skill is shown among other forms, by their demonstrations of various properties of triangles, especially one which expresses the area in terms of the three sides, and was unknown in Europe till published by Clavius (in the sixteenth century) ; and by their knowledge of the proportion of the radius to the circumference of circle, which they express in a mode peculiar to themselves."

"The Hindus are distinguished in arithmetic by the acknowledged invention of the decimal notation ; and it seems to be the possession of this discovery which has given them so great an advantage over the Greeks in the science of numbers."

"But it is in algebra that the Brahmins appear to have most excelled their contemporaries."—Elphinstone.

Who can believe that all this was done without writing ? Professor Max Müller alone can conceive in the face of this mass of evidence of the Europeans themselves, that the old Aryas could make discoveries in the science of mathematics without drawing a figure, which in fact is writing in the strictest sense of the term !

As to the statement that "had God given a complete and final revelation to our first parents,

it would have been quite useless for them, and would have become corrupted so much that, when it descended to their later posterity, it would be completely worthless." I humbly ask how much of it is now corrupted since the actual giving of it ; for the corruptibility of revelation is now admitted. If it could become " completely worthless" from Adam to Christ and from Christ to us, it must become so in proportion to time from Christ to us, which is already included in the statement. Now, the time from Adam to Christ is, roughly speaking, twice that from Christ to us. Hence, corruptibility being uniform and equal to one, by ordinary division one-third of the Christian revelation has become corrupted and worthless, and it will be entirely useless after 4000 years hence. But revelation being God's knowledge, those who impute corruptibility to it, really revile Him, in whose mind knowledge ever exists.

No sensible man will admit that " our first parents" were children or fools to speak plainly, and therefore unworthy of the gift of " final revelation," Adam, who is supposed by the Christians to be the progenitor of the whole human race was not a child. He was produced upon the earth in perfect manhood in the coat of skin (Gen. iii, 21 26). No sooner he came into the world, than he began to beget children (Gen. iv. 1). In judging the matters of good and evil, he was equal to God himself (Gen. iii, 22). Above all, he lived full 930 years (Gen. v. 5) ! Now, since then no man has ever possessed any of these qualifications. If he was unworthy of " a complete and

final revelation," how can his children be? Also, according to the Christians each man's soul is newly coined at his birth: so everybody is as crude and foolish as Adam. By this supposition no process of time can develop any soul; firstly, it is not allowed to ripe so long as Adams, and secondly, after death it is shelved somewhere to rise at an uncertain time!

When it is said that the first members of the human family were children of God, it is not meant as the Christians suppose, namely, that they were fools like our children; but, on the contrary, the poetical expression means that they were created by God himself without the common process of coition. Hence, it is on this account that their mind, being pure and uncontaminated with the foul stains of vice, was by far the most deserving of the heavenly knowledge. Wherefore the primordial men were graced with the Vedic or scientific revelation.

To the assertion that in "Rig Veda we find the gross polytheism and Nature worship," I oppose Elphinstone's remarks that "the primary doctrine of the Vedas is the unity of God. There is in truth," say repeated texts, "but One Deity, the Supreme Spirit, the Lord of the universe."... "The following view of the Divine character, as represented in the Vedas, is given by a learned Brahmin, quoted by Sir William Jones:—

"Perfect truth; perfect happiness; without equal; immortal; absolute unity; whom neither speech can describe nor mind comprehend; all

perending ; all-transcending ; delighted with his own boundless intelligence ; not limited by space and time ; without feet, moving swiftly ; without hands, grasping all worlds ; without eye, all-surveying ; without ears all hearing ; without an intelligent guide, understanding all ; without cause, the first, of all cause, all-ruling ; all-powerful ; the creator, all-server, transformer of all things ; such is the Great One."

Let us see what the Bible, the complete and final revelation of the Christians, says about God. " I (St. John) saw in the midst of the seven candlesticks (in heaven) one like unto the son of man (God, not Christ) clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow ; and his feet like unto fine brass as if they burned in a furnace ; and his voice as the sound of many waters. He had in his right hand seven stars ; and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword, and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength," (Rig i. 12, 16).

As to the statement that " the Vedas abound in the most silly though fragmentary tales." I shall be glad to know any of them. I have the first book of the Rig Veda, which is made up of eight such books. If it is full of tales, it must contain at least one in the first book of it. I affirm again on the authority of Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati who thoroughly comprehended the Vedas, that there are no tales of any kind in them.

Professor Max Muller gives (1) 1,000, 2) 800 (3) 1,200, (4) 1,500 B. C., as probable dates of the composition of the Vedas. I humbly advise the learned Professor to settle his mind first before confounding us.

"From that time (2,000 B. C.) until the close of the first century after Christ's birth, God continued his course of instruction to chosen people, He has kept quiet since 1,800 for reasons known to priests. Has the development of "the powers of reasoning and moral faculties" reached its climax? "Could we permit ourselves to suppose that the Almighty would distinguish any nation of people by the name of *His chosen people*, we must suppose that people to have been an example, to all the rest of the world, of the purest piety and humanity, and not such a nation of ruffians and cut-throats as the ancient Jews were, a people, who, corrupted by, and copying after such monsters and imposters as Moses and Aaron, Joshua, Samuel, and David, had distinguished themselves above all others, in the face of the known earth, for barbarity and wickedness. If we will not stubbornly shut our eyes, and steel our hearts, it is impossible not to see, in spite of all that long established superstition imposes upon the mind, that that flattering appellation of *His cho^{se}n people* is no other than a lie the priests and^s leaders of the Jews had invented, to cover the baseness of their own characters; and which Christian priests, sometimes as corrupt, and oftou as cruel, have professed to believe."—Dr. Thomas Paine's Age of Reason p. 84.

David was not punished as he deserved. Omitting the lengthy description of this case of adultery and murder for the sake of obscenity, I only add that David was so glad to learn the death of his love child, that he instantly anointed himself, changed his apparel, and sat down to dinner (11 Sam. xii. 20). The death of the love child, which being a standing shame to its parents, seldom meets with any other fate, as told us in the Bible is the punishment of David for the murder of Uriah, and adultery upon his wife. Does not this story accuse God of the violation of moral justice in killing an innocent child for the crime of its father? Moreover, the moral of the tale is that a man may force a woman to be his wife by killing her husband with no more of God's punishment than the loss of the first fruit of love, which is afterwards more than compensated by the birth of legitimate children.

With regard to the total want of any historical record of this country in early times, I quote Col. Tod, an acknowledged authority on the Indian history.

After giving a splendid history of Guzerat, he asks, "now, if from the foundation of Anhutwarra, in S. 802 (A. D. 746), to its destruction by Allaud-din in S. 1,354 (A. D. 1,298), we can establish an unbroken chain of princes, contemporary with Charlemagne, the Calipha Haroun, and the Saxon Heptarchy, down to the Plantagenet John, shall we still be told that the Hindus have nothing even approaching to history? If it be meant that the philosophy of it is not intermingled

with the narrative of events *à la boue leuze*; but because the Jain Monk, in the year S. 1,220, did not deem it necessary to draw deductions from the facts which led to Kumarpal's assumption of the crown of the Balaras, are we, therefore, entitled to say these facts do not belong to history? Look to the Saxon, the Ulster, and the French chronicles of this period—the foundation of the superstructures of Hume, Hallam, Vernet, &c., are they materially more copious or philosophical? Let us, then, abandon this assumption, which serves only to palliate the apathy of those whose researches are restricted to a contracted sphere of observation, and which, if not controverted, would quench the spirit of discovery."

Since Cassini and others admit the astronomical observations of the Vedas to be "upwards of 3,000 B.C." old, their expression may at least mean 3,001 B.C. I know some historians put down 3,001 B.C., making "upwards" mean one year only instead of one century.

As regards the statement that neither the Bible nor the "educated Christian" asserts that the world was created 4,004 B.C., I adduce an extract from Haydn's Dictionary of Dates. "CREATION OF THE WORLD. The date given by the English Bible, and by Usher, Blair, and others is 4,004 B.C. There are about 140 different dates assigned to the Creation, varying from 3,616 years to 6,985. Dr. Hales fixes it at 5,411."

With reference to the antiquity of the Bible, I confidently affirm on the authority of Paine

and Gibbon that it is not older than the Christian Era. But as its proof is not called for, I do not needlessly enter into it. I conclude this reply to "A Christian" with my conviction that it is man's works, and not Christianity, that can avail him in the obtainment of felicity here and hereafter.

An Arya.



METEMPSYCHOSIS.

To comprehend the wonderful but abstruse doctrine of metempsychosis, it is necessary that the chief characteristics of soul should be clearly premised. Now the soul is an invisible "vital force," which reveals its existence by means of cognition, cogitation, reflection, recollection, feelings of pleasure and pain, volition, spontaneous activity, passions, emotions, sentiments, tendency to life, respiration, nutrition, employment of senses in the use of objects, susceptibility to hunger and thirst, desires of propagation, and preservation, and subjection to fever and the like diseases. "Aristotle defines the soul from its phenomenon as the principle by which we live, and move, and perceive, and understand." It is synonymous with mind, spirit, and intellect. Its prominent features are as follow. (In the proof of first two axioms I have adopted the method of a Christian writer.)

(1)—*It is immaterial.*

Now, among the essential properties of matter may be included its extension, solidity, gravity, magnitude, figure, divisibility, inertia and tangibility. Without these important primary qualities, we can form no conception of any thing which is material. But they cannot be predicated of the soul. As we determine a substance from the

nature of its primary and inherent qualities, it is evident that we cannot admit the soul to be material.

Again, besides the essential characteristics of the soul mentioned above, man discovers in himself the faculties of imagination, abstraction, discernment, judgment and reason, which are all similar in their physical nature. Their operations prove their existence. Their diversity of display demonstrates their distinction. They are all co-operators in the act of perception, and unitedly declare the necessity of some common substance, in which they inhere. To assign them independent existence would be to suppose that imagination, comparison and discernment exist without the being which imagines, compares, and discerns; which is absurd. Therefore their existence is only relative and points out a common principle from which they flow and in which they inhere. This principle, their common receptacle, must partake of their common nature. But, as they bear no affinity to matter, it follows as a necessary consequence that there must be an immaterial principle in man.

Lastly, every body knows that matter cannot extend beyond its being. For example, solidity cannot go beyond a solid substance, nor extension beyond an extended body. But knowledge can operate beyond the compasses of body, as exemplified in the discoveries of astronomy. Therefore it is plain that knowledge is not from matter. Now, knowledge implies a capacity, and this capacity implies a substance in which it must inhere. But this substance must be of the same

nature as knowledge or its capacity itself. Since this is not material, it is undeniably proved that there must be an immaterial substance in man, to which we give the name of soul.

(2)—*It is immortal.*

The imagination of poets has painted death in horrible colours, which represents it as a terrific person to the fancy of common people. But it is not known why birth, its counterpart, has been deprived of a similar deification. However, it is certain that if there is any such thing as death, its existence must be either positive or privative; for negative existence is merely the absence of being. If death exists positively it must exist even though nothing were to die; which is absurd. Hence, death has no positive existence. Nor it has a privative existence. For, supposing it to be a subtractive power, death cannot affect the soul. Under its subtractive influence the body, which is the compound of material concretes, may be subject to accidents and decompositions; but the simple entity of spirit is placed beyond the reach of privation.

Again, soul can be destroyed but by three ways, (1) dissolution, (2) subduction, and (3) annihilation. A substance which can survive these modes of destruction, must continue for ever. Firstly, the dissolution of a thing means the separation of its component parts. But soul is an immaterial simple substance. It has no part, and consequently can not lose them.

To suppose it to have parts is to attack its immateriality, which has already been proved. Hence, the soul cannot perish by dissolution.

Secondly, subduction implies the taking away of something essential to the existence of a substance without destroying its entity. Consequently this process can take place in those things which are capable of separation and change. But soul is a simple unit of life. It has nothing but its entity to lose. Therefore subduction, if it can be applied to soul, must take off its simple entity and yet leave it the in existence; which is absurd. Hence, the soul cannot perish by subduction or the taking away of something essential to its existence without destroying its entity.

Thirdly, as regards annihilation, the soul must perish either through the tendency of its own nature or by the application of external force. Now, that the soul has a tendency to life, is manifest from its actual being, and that it is the essence of life is also evident from its simplicity of nature. To suppose that, besides its natural tendency to life, it has an opposite tendency to its own destruction, would be to make its simple unity of being consist of two hostile and mutually repulsive tendencies. This we know is a plain contradiction, for on this supposition the soul tends to live and not to live at the same time. Hence it can have no tendency to its own annihilation.

As regards its destruction by external force, the annihilating force must be either material or im-

material. If it is material, the soul can have no danger from it. All material bodies act by bringing their surfaces into mutual contact. Their influence ends the very moment their physical contact is cut off. Now, soul is an unextended substance; it has no surface. Therefore, matter, which only acts through some sort of contact, cannot bring its surface in contact with soul to accomplish its destructive work. To suppose such a contact possible, is to suppose a surface in an immaterial being, which at the same time is excluded from its nature of immateriality. Hence, soul cannot be destroyed by the action of matter, which can not even reach it.

“ The soul, secure in her existence, smiles
At the drawn dagger, and defies its point.”

If the force annihilating the soul is immaterial it is certain that it must have intelligence, for an immaterial agent without intelligence is a nonentity, of which we can form no conception. If this immaterial intelligent cause, which is in fact a soul, destroys the soul, we have still a soul left in existence. Hence, no immaterial cause can terminate the existence of soul.

(3).—*It is distinct from body.*

This is a corollary to the immateriality of soul. The incompatibility of mental phenomena to cohere in matter, or the effects of material qualities to be ascribed to the mind, leads, us to suppose the existence of two substances, the mind and the matter. Their distinctness is seen on the occasion of death, when the body, made of pure matter is left to decomposition.

" Ah! I had 'that I seem mere flesh and blood,'
 A branching channel with a rosy flood?
 The purple stream that through my vessels glides,
 Dull and unconscious flows, like common tides,
 The pipe through which the circling juices stray,
 Are not that thinking I, no more than they;
 This frame, compacted with transcendent tree,
 Of moving joints obedient to my will;
 Nursed from the fruitful globe, like yonder tree,
 Waxes and wastes,—I call it mine, not me.
 New matter still the mould'ring mass sustains,
 The mansion changed, the tenant still remains;
 And from the fleeting stream repaired by food,
 Distinct, as is the swimmer from the flood."

(4).—*It is affected only when brought in conjunction with the body.*

When the soul is detached from the body, it becomes inaccessible to all objects, which alone are the source of its enjoyments and sufferings; for the objects whatever they may be, affect the soul through the medium of senses which depend for their operation on their corporeal organs. For example, in preception a luminous body impinges its rays on the retina of eyes, and sets ophthalmic nerves in motion, after which the mind perceives the shining object. But if this influence is prevented by the destruction of eyes, nothing is perceived by the mind. With respect to enjoyment or-suffering, which enters the soul along with the influence of objects through the organs of senses, it arises accordingly as the object of perception is agreeable or disagreeable to the mind. The soul though possesses the powers yet stands in need of the organs of senses in the knowledge of objects. In the state of swoon all connection between the body and soul is cut off; therefore, nothing is felt in it. But in dream,

some secret connection between them still subsists ; therefore the mind is subject to reflection. If an organ of sense is destroyed, every body knows that the knowledge flowing in through it together with the pleasure and pain consequent on it, is at once stopped. In like manner, if all the organs of senses are destroyed supposing it to be possible without destroying life, it is plain that no knowledge whatever will ever get into the mind, which will then be insensible to any joy or sorrow. Therefore the body, whether terrestrial or ethereal, being the instrument of the soul, is indispensable to the susceptibility of pleasure or pain. But, as the verdict of knowledge is always and everywhere true,—as, for instance, 2 and 2 make 4 on earth and will make 4 in heaven also, the proposition that the union of body and soul is necessary to the sensibility of any kind of pleasure or pain, holds good both here and hereafter.

(5). *It is common to all animals.*—

That animals possess souls, is *prima facie* evident from the signification of their name ; for the word animal is derived from a Latin word *anima* meaning soul. If we observe the ways of lower animals and compare them with the actions of human beings, we shall find that the principle actuating all of them is one and the same. We discern in their sports and cries that animals are susceptible to pleasure and pain. Their spontaneous activity is proved by their voluntary motion in ranging the forest. Their senses perform

the same functions as ours. Like us, they are subject to hunger, thirst, lust, anger, and the like appetites and passions. Veterinary surgeons tell us that they share many diseases with us. When they mate and feed, they evince their desires of propagation and preservation. Birth and death are the same among them as among men. Parental and filial affection can be ascertained by a little careful observation. Their selection of wholesome food implies their judgment. When they distinguish the master from the stranger, they assert their power of comparison and discernment. Their responding to the call of masters testifies to their powers of perception, understanding, and moral sense. The construction of nests and shells proves their engineering skill. Their return from pasture, or coming back to lairs from prowling abroad, indicates their capacity of memory. See, how the dog recognizes its old master! Without memory this is impossible. Now, I earnestly ask if these are the effects of matter. Since these and many other powers which we detect in animals cannot be attributed to matter, they certainly belong to mind; for, in the vast empire of nature there are but two substances that have permanent existence, and these are the mind and the matter, from which all things both animate and inanimate derive their being, and into which they ultimately resolve. Hence, the distinction of soul and instinct, put forth by the cruelty of flesh-eaters, is altogether null and void.

The disability of animals to cope with men in the human pursuits is due, not to their possession of different actuating principles, but to their imperfect adaptation of organism to such pursuits. Had the morphological and physiological structures of animal frames been similar and identical, there would have been no classification of animals into four animal kingdoms, which specialization subdivides into no fewer than 64,000 species at present. As the mental force acts through the medium of the body, which is so much divided, its effects are modified by the suitability of structural conditions. Had all these circumstances, which vary by virtue of the difference of bodily construction, been constant, and the external effects resulting from the internal workings of the vivifying principle different in men and brutes, the supposition of their possessing different principles would have been fair and valid. But the difference of organization, discovered by elaborate researches of science, invalidates the popular conclusion that animals do not possess souls. If a photographer spoils his negative by taking it in the pale light of the horizontal sun, can he deny the actinic property of solar rays? If a lamp without a chimney and a reflector does not give light as white as another furnished with them, is the diversity of effect due to the difference of light and kerosine? In the same manner, the vital flame burning inside the lantern, as it were, of 64,000 kinds of phases of body, is the same in physical nature; but the light of diversity of

actions is due to the variety of colors of matter. Hence, there is no difference in the physical nature of souls of all animals: the difference of actions arises from the difference of channels, through which the exertion of mental energy is exhibited to us. Even among men we observe the difference of intellectual endowments, as for example, in idiots and philosophers. But this difference, great as it is, can not warrant us to conclude that they possess different vital principles. The anatomist ascribes it to the varying weight of brains. Therefore it is improper to think that animals are no more than dead matter, and that man alone possesses the soul.

Having thus got hold of the rallying points of the nature of soul, let us next consider whether its transmigration is a fact or fiction. Like all other things, the truth of metempsychosis must fulfill the conditions of the following crucial tests. It will either stand or fall, according as it does or does not pass through them.

I.—It must be attested by the senses

It has already been proved that the soul pervades the whole animal kingdom, and that the diversity of actions is due to the peculiar bodily construction, through which the effects of vital force are transmitted to the external world. It is also worth while to remark that eyes claim superiority to other senses by virtue of their rank and quality, and that, therefore, ocular testimony is most convincing to all. Hence, we shall give example of the metamorphoses of insects

whereby God, as it were, graphically illustrates transmigration before our eyes ; for, what is metamorphosis to lower animals, metempsychosis is to human beings.

Now, butterflies and moths pass through three stages, which completely differ from one another. These insects, in the rainy season, are seen crawling upon the ground in the shape of reptiles. This is their first stage of metamorphoses, wherein they are called larvæ or caterpillars and grubs.



Caterpillar.

The larva is vermiform, segmented, provided with feet and masticatory organs, and eats green leaves voraciously. Having remained in this condition for some time, in which it undergoes several changes of skin, it passes into its second stage and becomes a pupa, which gradually assumes the form of chrysalis, in which all the functions of vitality are at a fullstop. In this

*Chrysalis.*

stage it looks like a pearshaped marble of unusual brilliancy. It can be detached from the leaf or the object it is stuck to, and carried about in hands. If this is kept till maturity, which takes only a few days, it is transformed into a beautiful

*Imago.*

butterfly. This is the third stage, which is called imago. It now possesses four legs, two antennae, and four splendid membranous wings. Also we see that these stages are passed in different elements. Caterpillars crawl upon the ground or swim in water, while in adult or last stage these insects fly in the air. These changes of animals

are so similar to our transformations, that the word soul itself means a butterfly in Greek.

II.—*It must be inferred from present circumstances.*

When a child is born, it begins to suck its mother's teats to extract milk from them. The young ones of animals take to their elements almost as soon as they merge into life. Now, this piece of knowledge is not acquired by them in this world, which they have just entered. It must have been acquired by them in an antecedent life, for all knowledge is adventitious and therefore acquired; the capacity of knowledge being native to the mind. Thus the amount of knowledge at birth presupposes a preceding life.

Also, all animals from man down to animalcules evince the fear of death. It is, no doubt, due to the knowledge of agonies accompanying death. But the question is, When and how have they acquired it? Because, pleasure and pain cannot be learnt from the example of others. Nobody knows how much pain a patient of disease actually suffers. People may feign to be sorry in sympathy with him; but feel actually they cannot, and therefore neither conviction nor the consequent fear can be produced in their mind. As their horror of death is not a mere sham but a real one, it cannot be said to arise from simple sight, even though it were possible in the case of children or young ones of animals. It proceeds from the bottom of heart. Therefore

it must have been actually experienced by all. To take another example, we cannot know the taste of a fruit, unless we actually eat it. Second hand knowledge is merely potential, and, therefore, not convincing to the mind. But this is actual, namely, everybody knows the taste of the fruit of death, and, therefore, avoids to taste its bitterness again. Thus this fear of death cannot but arise from the actual experience of mortal agonies. But nobody has suffered death in the present life while it lasts. Therefore the inevitable conclusion is that all must have died before, that is to say, in some preceding life.

Again, we discover the unequal distribution of happiness on earth and the vast difference of intellectual and corporeal endowments in the individuals of human species. If these inequalities be inherent in the nature of substances which compose men, no improvement can ever be expected; for the shortcomings will be natural and therefore permanent. But we know that this is not the case.

The mind is capable of very great improvement under favorable surroundings; while the discrepancies of the body remain invariable. For example, the mind of women can acquire the accomplishments of men; but their difference of sex, which appertains to their bodies, cannot be obliterated under any circumstances. Hence, the visible incongruities, which we perceive in individuals, are not from the internal constitution of souls. In like manner, it can be shown that

these disproportions are due to the essential nature of the matter, which is the same in all animals; nitrogen, oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and a few earths being their components of bodies.

We have, therefore, no other cause left to account for individual dissimilarities than the peculiar arrangement of material particles of animal organism. Now, this can never arise from mere matter; for it is incapable of moulding itself to the diversity of design, which is foreign to its nature. As this is not due to the inertia of matter, so it is likewise not due to an act of our will. Had this been the case, everybody would have chosen or made the very best of it for one's self. But it is known to all that neither our will nor our skill has any hand in the formation of our bodies. Consequently the diversified construction of bodies, which are the media of mental exertion, and therefore the sources of joy and sorrow, is due to the Divine Architect of the universe. But the high opinion we have of the sublime moral justice and character of the Universal Sovereign, cannot without blasphemy assign the variations in question to his mere will or freak of fancy. Since they are not due to his mere will, they must originate from the council of his will; and what is done in council is founded upon reasons. What else can these reasons be, on which the divine moral justice has been exercised, than our own actions? We know that we are subject to the rage of passions and the intensity of appetites, which commit great havoc on the peaceful kingdom of our intellect.

In such intellectual ruins we do those things which we ought not to do at all. The moral evil, thus brought on by our folly, receives appropriate moral retribution from the council of Divine will. But the moral evil or aggregate sin, for which the Divine justice has given us rewards and punishments from the very beginning of life, as exemplified in our existing circumstances, was not committed in the present life, which begins variously in individuals. The misery of virtuous, and the happiness of vicious persons are not due to the works of their present life. Therefore these works, the bases of Divine justice, must have been done before their present life. But it has already been proved that in the performance of actions the mind is dependent upon union with the body. Hence, the visible inequalities of intellectual and corporeal possessions being thus due to the works of pre-existence, the antecedent life of animals is proved beyond a shadow of doubt.

III—*It must be exemplified in nature.*

Our transanimation is similar to the changes we notice in the material world. The example of butterfly is already given in ocular testimony. The vegetable and the inorganic matter presents us with the same phenomenon. We see that nature throws up various forms at every moment, but out of the same materials. No new matter is ever created afresh. The quantum of existence remains exactly the same as before. Trees, after producing leaves and fruits for a certain time,

would into dust and form the plastic material for arising plants. The vegetables forming our food nourish our bodies, and then going out as excretion become manure or compositive stuff for new plants, that is to say, assume new forms after going through the various processes of decomposition and combination. Clouds are formed out of water rain down, and again become water. Mountains are reduced to dust by the action of rain and frost, and carried down by torrents and rivers to the bottom of sea, where they are again made mountains by aqueous and ignious agencies. Though configuration may be different at each change, yet the plastic substance, which supports these transformations, is essentially the same as ever. Chemistry, physics, and the like branches of natural science are the copious illustrations of the indestructibility and changeability of matter which, in fact, are their only foundation. Philosophers have filled volumes to prove that nature is eternal, and is unchangeable in substance but changeable in phenomenon. No particular form is essential to it. The same is true of mind. Just as material atoms arrange themselves in any form without losing their essence, so spiritual atoms enter the forms made by matter without any loss to their essential properties, only that the forms, which spiritual atoms enter into, are no longer called matter; but, owing to the peculiar effects produced in them by the action of spiritual atoms, they are termed animals.

Hence, we shall be born and die often and often. Birth and death are transitions from one

to another life. It has been already said that phenomena are transitory, but the substance which supports these phenomena, is permanent. Now, life is a time in which a certain series of phenomena takes place. When these pass away, life is said to be at its end. But when another series of phenomena begins to happen, another life comes into being. The substance, called, soul, remains permanent all this while. Thus our lives are states, and like all states they pass and re-pass over us like the changes of seasons over the face of the earth.

IV — It must be sanctioned by philosophy.

That the doctrine of transmigration is taught by eminent sages and philosophers all over the world, and especially in India, the centre of ancient learning, can hardly be doubted. Among many learned ancients, may be mentioned, for the sake of example, Jaimini, Gotama, and Confucius in the East, and Zoroaster, Pythagorus and Plato in the West. The reader is referred to their works for verification. In our times Maharshi Dayanand Saraswati, the modern luminary of ancient learning and the founder of Arya Samaj, has triumphantly maintained the doctrine of metempsychosis in the face of all the priests of the world. He expounds it in his Introduction to the Vedas and Satyarth Prakash (light of knowledge).

V — It must be proved from history.

Almost all the ancient nations, for example, the Indians, Chinese, Chaldeans, Medes, Assyrians,

Egyptians, Greeks, and Druids believed in it, as can be shown from their history. The fact is well known that it can be ascertained from any school teacher of history.

But certain religious sects of comparatively modern time teach to the contrary, viz. that we are born but once. However, as they advance no proofs beyond the questionable authority of their sacred books, they can not be believed by the persons who walk in the light of reason. Now, the question is whether or not some tenets of these people of faith either disprove themselves or indirectly confirm our theory. Their system of faith teaches that this world is a place of trial. Here it is naturally suggested what the use is of this trial. It must be for the benefit of either the trier, i. e. God, or the tried, i. e., animals. If God wishes to know the nature of his creatures, —for there can be no other object of trial,—he thereby shows his ignorance; because, if he already knows, this trial is useless. But an ignorant God is no God at all: the true God being omniscient. Therefore it cannot be for the benefit of God. Then it must be for the good of creatures. But this requires several trials; for it is already said that the mind, which actuates all animals, is capable of great improvement and degeneracy, and that, being immortal, there can be no counting of its stages of progress or retrogression. Now, all these stages require to be tested. If the examination ends partially, the mental capacity of great modification is superfluous. But we know that in nature nothing is

superfluous. On the contrary, everything is necessarily intended for some purpose or other. Hence, the mind must be examined many times. As the place of examination is this world *ex hypothesi*, it must, on that account, appear on earth as many times. But it is never found here except in union with some body. Hence, it must incarnate again and again.

In human schools the examinee is tested at each step of his progress. If successful, he is awarded certificates for the various degrees. But if unsuccessful, he is allowed as many chances as he likes, till he successfully passes in the prescribed test, when he commences another. If man is so just, how is it that God has not even the equal amount of justice? Men are consigned either to paradise or to hell, according to their belief or disbelief in their system of faith. Thus we see that these people cannot do without the union of body and soul; and here we find that souls enter and go out of their bodies four times, (twice in the world and twice at resurrection), which are really as many births and deaths. Is not this a crude form of transmigration?

Moreover, these faithful people make a great mistake in the manufacture of their dogmas of faith. The body, which has died once, will die again, what though it may be renewed with the waters of life. Because the order of God is that all bodies, composed of protoplasmic and azotic elements of no mutual affinities, as nitrogen and oxygen are, cannot retain stability for a long time. Also, "as the result of the large numbers

of atoms which enter into the composition of organic bodies, we find that substances of this class are singularly unstable—the stability of all chemical combinations, even amongst inorganic bodies, generally decreased number of atoms associated in the compound of much larger aggregations of atoms than inorganic, are proportionately more unstable; and this instability is increased by the fact that many organic substances contain nitrogen, an element feeble and of undecided affinities.” Thus the supposition of resurrection, when carefully examined, is either absurd or corroborates the doctrine of transmigration, by which all souls often and often put on new bodies, which naturally decay, till they are sufficiently purified to enter the ineffable beatitude of God.

VI.—It must be necessary.

One of the objects of transmigration is the purification of souls to qualify them for the attainment of salvation, which is their return to God, after being once separated from Him. For this purpose the soul alone is competent; for the matter, which cannot reach even the soul, can much less go to God, the still subtler substance than the soul. But souls cannot approach God in all states. To do so, they must be perfectly pure. Unless they are completely holy and hal- lowed, they cannot obtain God by any means. Therefore those souls which have not requisite qualifications, must return to some world, where alone merits or demerits are acquired; and as these are feasible only in company with some kind

of body, which does not and cannot last long from the nature of its component elements, souls must appear and reappear in bodies, till they are wholly purified so as to get access to God, the treasury of intelligence, holiness, and happiness.

But it may be said that those souls, which are not qualified for either heaven or hell, are sent down to purgatory, the place of purification. Well, as purgatory is one and uniform, it is not fit for purifying all souls, not two of which, we notice in the world, have equal and same impurities. Various kinds of impurities require various kinds of purification. To take a concrete example, suppose we have some pieces of metal, wood, earth, and cotton. Now, everybody knows that we cannot use one kind of purificatory process in cleaning them all. To clean them, therefore, we must rub the piece of metal with powder, plane the piece of wood, burn the piece of earth, and wash the piece of cotton with alkali. So we require as many purgatories as there are people in the world. But they are not. Therefore we must return many times to worlds.

VII—It must be possible.

That the repeated unions of body and soul do not militate against the laws of nature to destroy their possibility, is sufficiently demonstrated from the reality of such unions at the present moment. Nor are they inconsistent with our notions of God's creative powers. If God cannot unite our body and soul together as he has actually done at present, his omnipotence is gone and with it his

godhead too, giving room to chance ; for, it is chiefly the characteristic of chance alone that it can produce things but once ; whereas, design repeats what it once produced. Thus the impossibility of transmigration results in chance, which is another name of atheism. Further, since the nature of soul does not depend upon the construction of body, it is not impossible for soul to enter into any body, which may be a convenient accommodation for it ; only that it is metamorphosed into an animal. If it be urged that it cannot enter into a certain body, it is therefrom plain that the body, which it cannot enter into, is not suited to contain it. Hence, the capacity of body being the measure of soul, it becomes material, and therefore perishable, which has been proved to be impossible.

But the impossibility of our permanent residence in hell or heaven is evident from the nature of our bodies, which have been scientifically proved to be very unstable. Here it may be said that we shall receive new bodies, which will last for ever. Well, first, this is opposed to the purport of resurrection, which raises the same bodies or constructs them with earthly materials ; secondly, all, besides God and soul, is matter, the material of bodies. Now, the nature of matter is so far ascertained from its known primary characteristics, that we can confidently affirm that it is phenomenally changeable in the whole universe. Therefore heaven and hell together with our new bodies, which are all made up of material things, as can be proved from their description, will pass

away in longer or shorter time, and we shall have to go out of them and come back to worlds again.

Some people say that after death all souls return to God. But this is impossible. To be one with God requires the perfection of our spiritual purification ; and the world affords indubitable proofs of the inequalities of man's intellectual purity. Therefore souls can not indiscriminately return to God.

VIII.—It must be sufficient in explaining the order of things in the world.

That knowledge and ignorance, pleasure and pain, want and plenty, and celebrity and obscurity are disproportionately distributed in the world, will, I think, be admitted without any doubt. Now, the question is, What is the cause of this disproportion ? If we accept the supposition of our having but one life, namely, the present life, which, according to it, absolutely commences from our birth, we are not satisfied ; for we then expect exactly equal distribution of happiness among all from the high character of God's moral justice. This supposition, when brought to bay by argument, recoils on the mere will of God, and so virtually accuses Him of injustice instead of acknowledging its ignorance. Therefore we must discard it altogether. If, on the other hand, we examine the doctrine of transmigration, we find that it sufficiently explains the said disproportions on the ground of people's works. Try the experiment in some such way. We see that every energy, which is exerted, is followed by a corre-

sponding result. For instance, running perspires us ; exercise helps digestion ; a bundle of sticks thrown into fire raises the temperature of our house ; a slight strike in an organ produces a sound ; study brings happiness to the student ; charity delights the donor and the receiver ; and so forth. In short, whatever we do, produces some result sooner or later. Sow in rainy season, reap in spring. Labour in boyhood, enjoy in manhood. Educate your son while you are in vigour, and he will support you in your old age. Then how can people's works of whole life result in nothing ? To say that they are awarded with residence in heaven or hell, is equal to saying that all works, however various in amount and quality, are equally rewarded or punished. We see that various kinds of energy, produce various kinds of result. The farmer's labor produces corn ; the carpenter's, furniture ; the smith's, tools ; the potter's, earthenwares ; and so forth. Assert them into good and bad, and you will get degrees in them. Then how can our various innumerable works produce the same result ? Hence our various works will bear various fruits. And this is what we find in the world ; and this is what the doctrine of transmigration teaches, viz. what we sow, that we reap.

Here it may be asked how we can do works before our birth. Certainly it is a paradox to unthinking persons. If we think, we shall find that whatever is in existence in the present moment, was never in non-existence in the past, nor will it ever be so in the future time. Take a con-

crete example. The house you sit in, was in mines before its erection. The chair you sit on, was once growing in the forest, before the carpenter shaped it into its present form. These thoughts you read, existed in my mind. Before I got them, they had existed in my teacher's mind. In short, there is no absolute beginning of things. Hence we existed before our birth. If it be said that our soul is made at birth, it is asked of what material it is made. If it is made of the will of God, then the will of God is our pre-existence. And if it is made of nothing, then it should be nothing still; for, nothing cannot be converted into anything. Do anything what you like with a cypher, you will always get a cypher from it. In fine, existence comes out of existence, non-existence from non-existence.

But we know that our soul is in existence. Therefore, according to the above incontrovertible law, we existed before our birth. Since mental activity is our essential property, and this activity is the cause of our works; we, therefore, were doing work before our birth. It has been proved that our soul being a vital force, acts in our body to do works; for a force, which does not act, and has nothing to act on, is a non-entity, which in the case of our soul, is contradicted from its actual being. Thus, before our birth we were in life, which is denominated from its essential characteristic of activity or the performance of works and the present state of things is the necessary consequence of their pre-existent coefficients. Such is the import of the doctrine.

of transmigration. It is now necessary to answer some of the important objections to our thesis.

We are asked to show the dead person come back to the world. To this we reply that they greatly err, who put such questions; because they implicitly make the body assume the same form again and again. Our body is constantly changing from birth to death. Its old materials waste and are ejected. It gives out effluvia at every moment. Each motion of ours is made at the expense of equivalent loss. This loss is replenished by food, which adds new particles to our body. Thus it is in constant growth and decay. Our present body is not the same as our mother brought forth. Much less, therefore, can we expect the same body after death, when it is completely changed and reduced to its elements.

Besides, we do not act exactly with mechanical regularity, for we are not *stent* machines, which are moved from without, but being self acting forces modify external forces according to our desires. If we act like machines, it will be hard to prove the existence of soul in us. Hence, our acts must differ, and consequently our body, which is the reward of acts as proved before must also vary. Wherefore after death the same body cannot be expected by us.

Also, it is urged with great force that we have no memory of our previous life. To answer this, we must dissect memory to examine its extent of capability. Now, memory is either voluntary or involuntary. The voluntary memory is called

recollection, and the involuntary remembrance. Firstly, we cannot recollect our previous life, because we cannot concentrate our attention to it; and without the concentration of attention nothing can be recalled into mind. In our worldly state, on the contrary we are possessed with distraction, which is one of the characteristics of the weak mind. When the mind is distracted, it cannot rivet its attention to any object, but takes flight with lightning speed from object to object. The result is, that nothing can be thoroughly known. That this is our present mental state, one can hardly doubt.

To train the mind to concentrate attention on a given object, is the subject of "yog" or the science of mental abstraction. This science was very successfully cultivated to its perfection by our ancients, and its advantages are shown in their scientific deductions, which still defy the most adverse criticism of logical ingenuity of modern times. In the treatises of "yog" mentions are made, that there were such persons, who could know how many lives they had lived, and how many more they had to live in order to effect their emancipation from terrestrial bondage to obtain salvation or union with God. It is no wonder that the people of modern times, whose mind is deeply engrossed with material pleasures, should not recollect a thing which requires the complete abstraction of mind from the corporeal covering. But this circumstance, viz., the want of recollection cannot destroy the above argument in favor of transmigration.

Secondly, our remembrance is guided, by external objects. In a journey the objects in our way remind us of many things of house and home ; although there is no necessary connection between them. But in the case of metempsychosis the objects of our previous life are annihilated ; for, they are only a phenomenon, and not a substance. By the time we are born again even in this world, our friends and relatives must also pass away. So there can be nothing to excite our remembrance. It must, by the bye, be borne in mind that transmigration does not teach that we are reborn in the same locality and instant that we die in. Hence remembrance is an irrelevant objection.

Generally, the memory of a thing is different from the thing itself. If we cannot recollect or remember that we once saw a person, it cannot disprove the fact of our perception, as the person perceived asserts that he was once seen by us. Such facts are of daily occurrence.

Again, memory, to use the mathematical language, varies directly as the intensity of consciousness, and indirectly as the length of time. If the consciousness of a thing is dim and the time of it long, there is scarcely any memory of it. But, on the other hand, the intense consciousness of a short time quickly revives things in mind. However, if a passion intervenes between the actual perception and the recollection of a thing, and that passion is such as has reached its height, it is sure to obliterate all notions of the

thing perceived from the surface of memory. For instance, if a man, who has done us many good services, which can be recollected in the moment of calmness, happens to quarrel with us, it is a fact that no memory of the past comes to pacify us. Now, in the case of transmigrations, the two lives, viz the past and the present, are separated by death and birth as well as an indefinite interval between them. And it is known to all that pain is highest when these changes take place. Hence, all memory of lives is effaced from the mind. The reason is a source of our thankfulness to God. By a wise provision of Nature the greatest pain is always followed by a swoon, in which the most excruciating pain is suffered with great heroism or perfect apathy. It sometimes so happens that a swoon is preceded by a peculiar state of mind, in which pure perception of objects remains, while all pain or action departs from the body. But this stupefaction, for so it is called, does not last long; it is soon followed by an overwhelming swoon, in which all the senses are, as it were, reduced to dead matter, and nothing can be recollected or felt. In such states it has been observed that previous things are totally forgotten. Therefore in the case of birth and death, than which no pain can be greater, and before which any swoon may be called a conscious state, we can never expect the chain of our thoughts to be unbroken.

Also, memory is greatly dependent upon the state of body, so much so that some have been led thereby to confound it with the material effect

of mechanical organism. For instance, in ill-health it is greatly reduced. In long fastings, such as quadragesima or lent, all memory of the past entirely disappears. This has been tried in the case of learned men, who could not reproduce their learning in such states. Then how can we have memory when the body is reduced to elements ?

Again, in the life we cannot recollect the things of infancy. Oftentimes in examinations the things learnt almost by heart cannot be exactly reproduced. This being the case, to talk of the memory of things, removed from us by an indefinitely long time, is quite useless. Therefore the want of memory is no argument against the fact of a thing.

There is another fact connected with memory ; namely, that could we recollect our works of pre-existent lives, and consequently foresee the natural evils resulting therefrom, we should have been doubly unfortunate. Our joys would have been lessened, and sorrows increased. Therefore our lot would have surpassed the intended bound, and at last the end of Providence been frustrated. These unnecessary things are kept off by our want of memory. Suppose we could divine that so and so would kill us, for we killed him in some antecedent life. This would act in us like a constant incubus, paralyze all our pleasures, and probably bring death itself prior to the time it naturally falls due. Thus it would mar the justice of God. So our want of memory is a piece of good luck.

It is said that transmigration cannot purify souls, for nobody knows that he suffers from such and such sins of previous life so as to avoid the repetition of them. Now in reply to them, suffice it to say, that it is the only way to purge souls of sins. Though the particular actual knowledge of sins of previous life is generally impossible from reasons already given, yet the general inferential knowledge of them is in the understanding power of all from the natural connection of cause and effect. For instance, every body knows that punishment is the result of crime. So let him avoid crime that he may not suffer punishment for it. Our instinctive delight in virtue and abhorrence of vice are faint glimmerings of our remembrance of previous life. But even people's recollection of sins of previous life would not have prevented them from the repetition of them, seeing that in their present life they are again and again punished for these repetitions of crimes. Recollection would rather blunt their moral sensitiveness. When we see that crimes are punished in this world, where justice exists almost in name, how can then we expect that the Universal Judge whose body is justice, and whose judgment is truth, will overlook our works at his formation of us? Therefore, the present state of things and the moral justice of God, which constitutes transmigration, sufficiently teach sensible persons what to do and what not to do.

In conclusion let us enumerate some advantages that recommend the doctrine to our accep-

tion. (1) It maintains the justice of God ; for it teaches that we get what we deserve. (2) It is a source of general happiness ; for it opens salvation to all without the distinction of creed or color. (3) It inspires us with love for God, for it teaches that God is ready to receive us. (4) It guards us from sins ; for it shows by existing things that our sins shall not escape punishment. (5) It helps our progress to perfection ; for it gives us many chances for amendment. (6) It proves our immortality and the quickness of God's justice ; for it says that as soon as man dies he is sent away to the state in which he can reap the fruits of his works. (7) It well divides eternity ; for it distributes our lives over its immensity, as contradistinguished from another absurd division of it into a life of three score and ten years in one part and a blank of countless millions of years in another part. (8) It accounts for the mercy of God ; for it permits the most sinful man to qualify himself for heaven, notwithstanding his repetition of wickedness. (9) It fulfills our desires ; for whatever we cannot get in one we get in another life. (10) It satisfactorily explains the unequal distribution of happiness in the world ; for it regards it as the necessary consequence of people's various works of anterior life. Hence, let us accept metempsychosis as the fundamental law of theodicy.—*Amen!*



GOD'S INCARNATION.

The expression means God's "assuming flesh or taking a human body and the nature of man." Its Sanscrit is *avata*, which signifies God's descent. Thus there is very little difference between these two significations. It is a very popular doctrine. It sways the faith of the majority, not only of the Indians but also of the Europeans. Hence, it is a doctrine which well deserves our attention. As it is a rule with us not to take things at second hand, it is worth our while to examine it before we accept or reject it.

At the outset of our inquiry into the doctrine of God's incarnation, three questions crop out in our mind. (1) What is God? (2) How does He keep on the communication of self? (3) Is there any necessity for such a supernatural intercourse? Let us consider them in order.

With regard to the first question, that is to say, the knowledge of God's nature, attributes, and ways of action, two sources are open to us, viz, the observation of the external world and the intuition of our own heart.

Well, what does the world say of God ? In it we find that things constantly appear and disappear. The sun, for instance, shines upon the ocean the water of which is consequently heated and evaporated. Vapors thus formed ascend and form clouds, which burst forth in torrents of rain, upon the earth and cover its surface with verdure. In this phenomenon all the circumstances, viz. the shining of the sun, the heating of the ocean, the evaporating of water, the forming of clouds, the falling of rain, and the springing up of verdure, form a series of events, each of which depends for its existence upon the presence of the other preceding it, and are called by philosophers the succession of causes and effects. In the above example the growing of verdure is the effect of rain-fall, which is therefore its cause. In like manner, each succeeding event is the effect of one preceding it, and each preceding circumstance is the cause of one following it. In this way, if we extend our observation to all the objects of the world, we leave their plurality behind and ascend to their unity : thus in the above example, the various circumstances there enumerated gradually lead us to their one cause, viz. the sun. We may actually never reach that unity of causes of the things of the world ; but the confidence, thus gained in our daily experience, is tantamount to almost actual knowledge, derived from the inference, of causality. The cause of our inability to reach the unity of all causes, which is called God in religion, is very clearly explained by the imagination of a poet in the following lines :—

League all your forces then, ye powers above,
 Join all, and try th' omnipotence of Jove,
 Let down your golden, ever lasting chain
 Whose strong embrace holds heav'n and earth and main ;
 Strive all, of mortal and immortal birth,
 To drag by this the Thunderer down to earth ;
 Ye strive in vain ; If I but stretch this hand,
 I leave the gods, the ocean, and the land ;
 I fix the chain to great Olympus' height,
 And the vast world hangs trembling in my sight,
 For such I reign, unbounded and above ;
 And such are men and gods compared to Jove.

What the poet argues to show, is that the chain of material causes and effects reaches to God's throne, or more clearly, reveals His power but not His actual person. However, what we want to prove, is nearly done, viz., the observation of things around us points to One Great Cause, which, in religion, is called God.

Further, the same observation presents to our view the beautiful order and disposition of things, their mutual adaptability, their efficiency in accomplishing the end of their existence, their indestructibility, and their preservation ; and indelibly impresses upon our mind the infinitude of the Divine Architect's wisdom and power. Thus, the knowledge of God we acquire from our experience of the external world, is this, besides being the First Cause, He is omniscient and omnipotent.

Now, if we turn to our mind, we come to the same conclusion. We ask ourselves, for instance, if we have any hand in our appearance upon the

earth. We are conscious that we have none. Is it we that have constructed the body? We know that we have not its complete knowledge at all, much less we know its construction. The uncertainty of our tenancy of it sadly humbles our pride of greatness, and makes us confess the existence of a superior, nay, infinitely superior power to ourselves. This infinitely superior power is no other than what we call God in religious language. Such is the knowledge of God our unassisted reason picks up from experience and intuition.

To show that this knowledge of God tallies with the teachings of our Holy Scriptures, the following two *mantras* or verses are quoted from the sacred Vedas and Upanishats and rendered almost literally.

*Na tasya pratima asti yasya nama mahady-
ashah ;*

*Hiranyagarbha ityeshā ma mat kinśid ityeshā
yasman na jātah ityeshah :—Yajur, XXII 3.*

There can be no image, no match, and no likeness of the Infinite Spirit, the All-pervading Supreme Being ; whose invocation consists in the obedience of His commandments revealed in the Holy Vedas, in the practice of virtue, and in the adoption of truth ; whose eternal protection is asked by people in prayer ; who is the rest and support of the universe ; and who is consequently never born of any creature.

* The Deity is glorious—shining in soul and space, formless—illimitable, filling all, existing inside and outside, unborn—free from the necessity of assuming flesh—unchangeable—eternal, unencumbered with passions—respiration—glands of action—organs of the senses, holy, all-wise, absolute—underlying both mind and matter. Now, let us apply our knowledge of God, acquired by unassisted reason and confirmed by divine philosophy, to the examination of the incarnation doctrine, which brings us to the consideration of the second question, viz.—How does God come down to the earth ?

We have seen that the holy texts make an open disavowal of God's incarnation, which teaches that God is frequently born of woman. This doctrine is supported by almost all modern religious books such as the Puranas and many ditauis. So we have been brought to a puzzling dilemma. To extricate ourselves from it, we must refer the question to profane arguments; for the mere authority of books will not do in the present state of things. As we have been to profane arguments and Holy Scriptures to get a clear notion of God, so we must go to our profane arguments and modern religious books to realize the idea of God's incarnation.

As regards the Puranas, the books of modern religion, the doctrine of incarnation is so clearly taught therein that a bare statement of the doctrine does away with the necessity of quoting any particular passage from them. It is well known

that the Bhagwat makes Krishna and the Bhasha Ramayan, Ram to be the incarnations of God. So, as far as the authority of these books is concerned, the matter, viz., that God descends to the earth, is as plain as that fish is not man, or day is not night. Let us, therefore, go to profane arguments to settle the question.

Now, the attributes of God, as enumerated above both in holy texts and our inferences, militate against the conditions of incarnation, and make the thing altogether impossible of occurrence. For instance, the doctrine of incarnation makes the Formless assume the human form, the Unborn be born of woman, the Unchangeable change his mind and body, the Immortal suffer the agonies of death, the Infinite limited by the boundaries of the body, the Omnipotent unable to cope with weak and insignificant man his own creature, the Omniscient ignorant of the designs of his murderers or any kind of knowledge, the Eternal transitory, the Holy soiled with vile passions, the Self-shining stand in need of sunlight, the Self-existent depend upon food for his life, and the Upholder of the universe reside in small villages! Can any thing, O Reader, be more absurd than this monstrous doctrine of God's incarnation? How can the finite—the human body—contain or inclose the infinite—God? Is it not the same to say that a part contains the whole? God is omnipresent and all-pervading as proved above. There is no place in the universe, where He is not present. How can then we say that He

comes down to the earth? Was he not present there before? The doctrine first implicitly denies his presence and then brings him down. I think it is believed by all that God is the governor of the whole universe, where nothing is done without his knowledge. Now, it is asked to whom he did make over the charge of the innumerable worlds, when he came down to the earth, which is scarcely bigger than a mere speck in the chart of heavens: for the appointment of proxy is the assertion of two infinite divinities. Thus we see that the incarnation doctrine of the Puranas is opposed to both our reason and the Holy Vedas. Hence, we should not hesitate in abandoning it all at once. For those who still require some authority in giving up the thing unsupported by the Holy Vedas and the human reason, the internal monitor of God, let the following couplet suffice, as it comes from Manu, higher than whom there is no authority on the Aryan law or Dharma Shastra in the decision of ambiguous matters.

श्रुति स्मृति पुराणानां विरोधो यत्र दृश्यते

श्रुतेस्तु तत्र प्रामाण्यं तयोर्द्वेषे स्मृतिर्वरा ।

It means that when the Vedas, the Dharma Shastra, and the Puranas contradict one another in any matter; the authority of the Vedas should be accepted in preference to that of the rest; and when the Dharma Shastra and the Puranas alone are consulted and found contradictory, the authority of the Dharma Shastra should be preferred to that of the Puranas. Therefore we

have no hesitation in saying that the doctrine is a pure fiction, being unsupported by the Holy Vedas and Dharma Shashtra. So much for the two questions, viz., what is God, and how does He descend to the earth ?

Let us now briefly consider its necessity. With regard to this we ask—What is its object, and can it be not accomplished otherwise ? As respects the object, people put forth various ends of God's descent. They are mentioned in the following Sanscrit distiches from the *Gita*.

यदा यदा हि धर्मस्य खानिर्भवति भारत
 अभ्युत्थानमधर्मस्य तदात्मानं सृजाम्यहम् ।
 परित्राणाय साधूनां विनाशाय च दुष्कृताम्
 धर्मं स्तथापनार्थाय संभवामि युगे युगे ।

They mean that when religion is hated and irreligion is loved, God incarnates himself to protect the virtuous and to destroy the vicious.

The Bible says that Eve in her longings ate an apple and also gave it to her husband Adam, who likewise did eat it (Gen. III 6). Since they who were the progenitors of mankind, were forbidden of God from eating the fruit of Eden, their place of residence, they committed a sin, which, being against the Infinite God, is therefore infinite ; that is to say, all mankind, who are the children of Adam and Eve, have sinned and con-

sequently, deserves damnation. But God, who loved mankind, and who knew that they would be unable to make infinite atonement for infinite sin, came down to the earth in the form of Jēshū Christ, and killed himself on the cross at Jerusalem, and thus absolved those persons from the infinite sin who might believe that Jēshū Christ was God and also the Son of God.

As to the Puranic reason for bringing God down to the earth, it is sufficient to say that God is present everywhere. He can therefore punish any one He likes, without assuming flesh, just in the same way as He now produces and destroys things. Our religion is the precepts of the Vedas, which are the theorems of knowledge, and which are impressed upon the structure of the universe. The Vedas, for instance, say that fire burns and is useful to all in general. Now none can destroy this quality of fire by any amount of hating. Hence our religion is eternally protected. Therefore, the protection of religion being the end of the incarnation of God, its necessity is done away with, by the eternal preservation of religion. In our own days the Vedic religion was altogether abandoned and repudiated by all people; but its intrinsic truth actuated the refined sense of Swami Dayananda Saraswati to preach its renewal; and we now see how rapidly it progresses among the people, and that without the necessity of God's incarnation.

As to the Biblical reason for God's incarnation, let it suffice to say that Adam and Eve were not

the progenitors of the whole race of mankind ; for there were people and places upon the earth when Adam and Eve came down (Gen. IV, 14-42). Also, sin is not one of those diseases that are hereditary. It corrupts the sinner's mind only, who is therefore punished by God. As minds of all persons are different and are not born one of the other like material things, the corrupt mind of Adam and Eve has not come down in their descendants, even supposing all mankind to be descended from them. Again, it is a great injustice, if God punishes other persons than the real offenders. We do not see in the world that the temporal magistrate hangs the son for the murder committed by his father. If man is so sensible and just, how can we believe that God, who is infinitely wise, is so ignorant of the nature of crime and so unjust, as this wild and therefore blasphemous story of Adam's fall and Christ's incarnation would have us believe. Hence, it is altogether a fiction of the Jewish priests, and should be at once abandoned to our great good and felicity—*Amen* !

. TRINITY.

The most important doctrine of the Christians is what they call the Holy Trinity. It means the union of three persons in one Godhead ; viz., the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The three are one and one is three. They are, as it were, the sides of an equilateral triangle. This strange doctrine was first taught in the time of Constantine the Great, the founder of Constantinople who died in 337 of the Christian era. As Christian sects were multiplying at that time, and the settled state of the Christians enabled them to study Greek philosophy, which provoked many unpleasant doubts subversive of Christianity, it was thought advisable by " the effeminate Emperor of the Bosphorous," who was the great patron of the Christians, his auxiliaries in his struggle for the obtainment of the Roman Empire, that a council of the leading bishops should settle the religious disputes of the thinking Christians. Accordingly, he called a council at Nice, where through the learned influence of Athanasius, the Bishop of Alexandria, the above doctrine was formally promulgated in 325 of the Christian era. The English Christians, who now so insist on the belief of Trinity in their conversion of the Hindus, that without their unreserved and unqualified faith in it their conversion is thought useless, knew nothing of the matter that the Son was of the same substance with the Father before the seventh century of the Christian era. The followers of this doctrine, who are considered orthodox, are called the Trinitarians.

But there was another sect, which opposed the obtuse sense of orthodoxy. In the time of Constantine, the father of Christianity, Arius was the head of this sect. In his opinion there was as much difference between the Father and the Son, as between the heaven and the earth. At present, the sect, which does not acknowledge the deification of Jesus, is called the Unitarians.

Unphilosophical as the doctrine is, the Christians were not its original inventors. It was long ago believed by the Hindus in what they called Brahmá, Vishnu, and Mahesha,—the creative, the preservative, and the destructive principle of the universe. The Brahmins, who were masters of the human nature, thinking that the vulgar were unable to comprehend abstract truths and metaphysical doctrines, described them in highly allegorical and most fascinating language, which, like all other things of theirs, stands unparalleled in the history of literature. The result of their poetic imagery was the creation of three distinct gods of the above mentioned names. The Egyptians also had their trinities. Their venerable divinities were Osiris, Ptah, and Amun—*Eshwara*, *Sthanu*, and *Om* of Sanskrit respectively. Another was Osiris (*Eshwara*), Isis (*Ishani* or *Parvati*) and Horus (*Hara* or *Mahadeo*). According to the Egyptians, "Osiris was incarnate in the flesh, he fell a sacrifice to the evil principle, and after his death and resurrection, became the appointed judge of the dead." This is the origin of the Christian Trinity. But they took it not

from the Egyptians but from the Greeks, who derived most of their knowledge from the Egyptians. The Grecian sage Plato, unable to understand in his meditation on the ineffable purity of Infinite Spirit how from that Supreme Being the visible existence of course matter came out, was obliged to assume the existence of *logos*, which is translated into *word* by John the Evangelist when he says that in the beginning the word was with God. Now, this word is supposed to be Christ by the Trinitarians. Besides these, there are other trinities. The Tibetans believe in Kox, Qm, Pax. The Mahomedans, who deny the triune God of the Christians and whose religion is largely borrowed from the Jews and Christians, have also their trinity, which they express by Allah, Mahomed, and Gabriel. It matters little that the last two members are subordinate to the first member of the triad; for Allah sends down Mahomed just as the Father deposes the Son in Christianity, while, like Holy Ghost, Gabriel flies with errands between them.

² This curious doctrine will, no doubt, strike the thinking portion of mankind that how the educated Christians of the nineteenth century can construe in their mind the monstrous conception of three persons in Godhead, or, in plain words, three distinct and co-existent gods. Whatever may be the process, which can train their mind to conceive impossibilities,—for this is not the only one,—we find that the great doctors of learning sit down to think seriously of the flights of fancy of the ignorant primitive Christians, and try all their ingenuity to illustrate them by con-

crete examples. The following is the explanation of the doctrine in question by Dr. Murdock of Madras :—

“ There may seem to be a contradiction in saying that God is one and yet three. It may be asked, how can one be three and three one? This objection might be valid if the terms were understood in the same sense in each case. But an illustration will show that a living being may be one in one sense and three in another. Man is a unit, yet he consists of body, soul, and spirit. While the comparison is by no means parallel, and can, in no degree, assist us in comprehending the Trinity, it shows that it does not involve any contradiction.”

In this quotation the synonymy of soul and spirit destroys the simile of the Doctor, and reduces the compound of man to two elements of body and soul. It is only the similar abuse of language,—the preference of sound to sense,—the use of words of different origins but of the same meanings,—that leads men to the supposition of mere non-entities. In the case of biplicate man, what the soul thinks the body does, and what the body transmits of the external perception, the soul receives and cogitates upon. In short, the actions of both are the same or the counterparts of the one and the same thing. But in the Trinity the members are discriminated by virtue of their separate actions and existence. The Father creates the world, the Son teaches the religion. They both existed once separately, the

one on the earth and the other in the heaven.
And yet they are one !

To expose the absurdity of this fallacious argument suppose soul and spirit are two entities. Now apply this instance to illustrate the triplicate God of the Christians. When Christ was come down to earth, there must have been two folds only left God ; and when the holy Ghost descended as a peigon at Christ's baptism, then must have been three distinct folds or lamina of God then existing. Well, on the occasion of this separation of the three folds of God, or rather the decomposition of God into his three constituents, I ask, which of these Divine elements was the true Great God. Were the three parts living on their separation? If they were, their union was not necessary. Therefore it is not absurd to say that there are three gods according to christianity. They were united before the descent of Christ ; but ever since they have been three distinct beings. It was this ridiculous idea of God of the Christians, in other words, their belief in three gods, that yielded to the glorious unity of the Mohamadans. But if the three parts are essential to one another, their separation and the death of one, will necessitate the death of the remaining two parts. viz. God would die on the death of Christ, one essential member of the Trinity, which is absurd. Hence, the Christian theology either teaches the existence of three gods or the doctrine of atheism. But properly speaking, the latter is the faithful consequence of the Christian religion. For in the instance of the above doc-

tor, man cannot live on the departure of soul, as everybody knows from daily experience when one of the elements of man as told by the Doctor alienates itself, the whole man dies. He is then no longer called man but a corpse, which is either consigned to the dark chambers of earth to rot there or to the flames of fire to commit no further mischief. If the instance of man is an illustration of Godhead, the Christian God would die in the departure of Christ from the Trinity, which is therefore a perfect atheism in the strictest sense of the term.

The Christians chuckle at the Hindu idea of 33 crores of gods; but they ought to remember that this number is only a multiple of their 3 persons of the Holy Trinity. If a man can picture three god his imagination, can he not fancy a multiple, though a-largy multiple, of them? The Hindus give a very reasonable explanation of this numerous host of gods, corresponding to the angelic cohorts of the Christian God; but the Christians make quite a ludicrous figure in accounting for the existence of three gods. It is not we alone that denounces the detestable dogma of three infinite and co-existent gods; whether they may be called Brahma, Vishnu, and Mahesha; or Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; or Allah, Mahomed, and Gabriel; but the learned Christians, who do not want to prostitute their reason, the noble gift of God, to the filthy lucre of the world, the dread of whose loss conforms the orthodox or vulgar Christians to the tradition of their forefather, and makes them avow in words what is not in their hearts, have expressed their pious indigna-

tion in terms that at once penetrate into the hearts of sensible persons and demolish the fairy fabric of the co-existence of three gods. We shall close our remarks on this absurd dogma of Christianity with the words of Bishop Channing of America :—

“ We believe in the doctrine of God’s unity or that there is one God, and only one. We object to the doctrine of Trinity, that whilst acknowledging in words it subverts in effect the unity of God. According to the doctrine there are three infinite and equal persons, possessing supreme divinity, called the Father, Son, Holy Ghost. Each of these persons, as described by theologians, has his own particular consciousness, will and perceptions. They love each other, converse with each other; and delight in each other’s society. They perform different part in man’s redemption, each having his *appropriate office, and neither doing the work of the other.* The Son is mediator, and not the Father. The Father sends the Son, and is not himself sent, nor is he conscious like the Son of taking flesh. Here then we have three intelligent agents, possessed of different consciousnesses, different wills, different perceptions, performing different acts, and sustaining different relations, and if these things do not imply and constitute three minds, or beings, we are utterly at a loss to know how three minds or beings are to be formed. It is difference of properties, and acts, and consciousness, which lead us to the belief of different intelligent beings, and if this mark fails us, our whole knowledge fails. When we attempt to conceive of three Gods, we

can do nothing more than represent to ourselves three agents, distinguished from each other by similar marks and peculiarities to those which separate the persons of the Trinity; and when common Christians hear these persons spoken of as conversing with each other, loving each other, and performing different acts, how can they help regarding them as different beings, different minds? We do then with all earnestness, though without reproaching our brethren, protest against the irrational and unscriptural doctrine of the Trinity. To us, as to the Apostles and the primitive Christians, there is one God, even the Father. We are astonished that any man can read the New Testament, and avoid the conviction that the Father alone is God. We find the Father continually distinguished from Jesus by the title, "God sent his Son; God appointed Jesus." We challenge our opponents to adduce one passage in the New Testament where the word God means three persons, where it is not limited to one person and where it does not mean the Father."

