Central Hindu College Lectures III.

HINDU IDEALS

For the use of Hindu Students in the Schools of India

ANNIE BESANT, F. T. S.

From Notes of Lectures originally delivered at the Central Hindu College, Benares

BENARES & LONDON
THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING SOCIETY
1904

PRINTED BY FREEMAN & CO., LTD.,
AT THE TARA PRINTING WORKS, BENARES.

CONTENTS.

———:o:———

FIRST LECTURE.

EASTERN AND WESTERN IDEALS.

This course of lectures is intended to be of practical use to you who are students now, but who, in a few years, will be going out into the world, to take part in the fashioning of India's future. College life, rightly lived, should be a preparation for the larger life of the householder and of the citizen, and it is now that the influences which play upon you are moulding your characters and your future. The thoughts you think, the hopes you cherish, the struggles of the playing-fields, the studies of the class-rooms, the atmosphere of thought and opinion around you—all these are forces which shape your lives and colour your destinies. As a generation, you represent the future of India, and the fate of your Motherland will be in your hands to make or mar. I wish in these lectures to hold up to you Ideals which may help in guiding your conduct, in inspiring your lives, for India can only regain her rightful place among the nations when her children learn to un-

derstand her genius and to build for her feet a sure causeway.

But in this first lecture we are going to look at both Western and Eastern Ideals, for under the conditions of the present day we need to understand and to sympathise with both. The Divine Hand which guides the destinies of nations has brought the East and the West face to face in this land of India, and they are influencing each other more strongly than ever before they have done. In order that you may do your duty in the future, you must learn to understand something of the West, something of the feelings that move it, something of the Ideals that inspire it. And you must learn to see Western Ideals as the West sees them, and not as distorted by prejudice.

It is easier for the western man to know something of the East, than for the eastern man to know something of the West. The Englishman travels all over the world, he visits every land, he dwells among all peoples. If he is reasonably intelligent and sympathetic, he can learn the way in which the various nations look at the world, and discern the currents of opinions, the trends of thought. But for the Hindu this is not so. By a most unfortunate modern superstition—happily diminishing, and soon, I trust, to disappear—he is bound within the limits of his own land and shut

out from the great world that lies beyond. Very very few Hindus know anything of the western nations, save what they can learn from books. None of you, perhaps, will ever breathe the English air, or feel the throbbing pulses of English life. Yet England and India are so closely bound together, that it is of vital moment that each should understand the other, that you should understand the English, that they should understand you. And it is with this purpose in view that I would speak to you of Western Ideals, and try to help you to see how they have moulded western life and thought.

Young Indians, looking at the luxury and splendour of western civilisation, its mastery of natural powers, its rich and varied resources, sometimes lose their heads altogether, and casting away all their old Ideals, they try to become wholly western within and without. This is one extreme.

Others think that the East is so superior to the West that the West can teach it nothing, and, knowing but little of either, they plume themselves on their ancient glories and the memories of a splendid past, and look with youthful contempt on the methods and experiments of the West. This is the other extreme.

What we need here, as elsewhere, is a middle course, the " golden mean," the wisdom which while prizing the past, is yet willing to learn from the present ; which, while it remains predominantly eastern, assimilates all that is best in western thought and character ; which, while guarding its own distinctive nationality, yet draws from other nationalities what they have of value, and weaves into its own eastern fabric the golden and silvern threads brought from other lands.

For this, we must try to see the Western Ideals as they appear in western eyes, in their attractive and inspiring aspect. A difficulty for you is that you do not see the Englishman at his best here, but only too often at his worst. Indians going to England bring thence a far fairer and far gentler view of the English character. They find Englishmen hospitable, courteous, friendly, pleasant ; they see them as they are, instead of as encrusted with officialism. Official relations here, the feeling of the governor and the governed, blind each side to the good qualities of the other, and prevent a frank understanding. The outer shell of each is all that the other sees, the surface not the heart. The Englishman, quick in speech, prompt in action, often imperious in manner, is regarded by the Indian as domineering, harsh, tyrannical. The Indian, by immemorial habit courteous in manner,

soft in speech, conveying a disagreement by suggestion rather than by explicit words, is regarded by the Englishman as timid and hypocritical; his suavity of manner is deemed servility, his suavity of speech is thought to be deception. Both see only the surface, and do not pierce below it; the noble qualities hidden under the cold bearing of the one, under the polished gentleness of the other, are not seen or felt, and the two live side by side with a great gulf between them. I would fain build a bridge to space that gulf for you, who in the days to come will be working with the English in the service of the common Empire.

Before we study the Ideals, let us see clearly what is meant by an Ideal. To begin with, an Ideal is an idea, and an idea is a thought. But an Ideal is something more than a thought—it is a fixed thought, a fixed idea. The ordinary every-day thoughts that float in and out of your minds —thoughts about your studies, your games, your professors, your fellow-students—these drifting changing thoughts are not Ideals. They come and go, but an Ideal is a fixed idea seated enthroned in the mind. Moreover, this fixed idea must be one that guides conduct, that shapes life, before we call it an Ideal; for his Ideal is that fixed thought to which a man conforms his life. We see everything through the ideas that remain con-

stantly in the mind. As one of you might take a piece of blue glass, and another might take a piece of green glass, and, looking at a white wall, one of you would see it as blue and the other as green, so do we see the world through the coloured glasses of our fixed ideas. Hence constant misunderstandings arise between perfectly honest men; each can only see matters through his own coloured glass. And this is pre-eminently true of our Ideals, our most fixed ideas of all.

Yet further: an Ideal is more than a single fixed thought; it is an assemblage of fixed thoughts, grouped into a single, but complex, conception. And this group is the highest conception of the type represented, that the thinker is able to form: the Ideal is his best conception, his most perfect picture, of the type of which he is thinking. Take, for instance, the Ideal of a soldier, and see how you form it. If you describe a particular soldier, you speak of his height, his colour, his race, his courage in battle, his loyalty to his country, his obedience to his commander, his faith to his comrades, his endurance of hardships, his steadfastness in defeat, his mercy in victory. Now how much of this belongs to the Ideal of a soldier? Not his height, his colour, his race, for these vary with each man or each country; they are mere accidents, and have no part in the Ideal. But he

must be brave, loyal, obedient, faithful, enduring, steadfast, merciful: these qualities are all present in our Ideal of a soldier, and in proportion as a soldier shows them, he approaches our Ideal of what a soldier should be.

In this way, in forming an Ideal, we separate what is accidental from what is essential, and, throwing away the former, we make our Ideal out of the essentials alone. Thus an Ideal means the group of fixed ideas which constitutes a type.

Into this type no qualities enter which do not belong to it as a type. We do not build into our Ideal of a soldier the qualities that belong distinctively to the husband, the trader, the statesman, the man of letters. The ideal *soldier* may be a bad *husband*, and he may know nothing of trade, of statecraft, of letters. His deficiencies in these respects do not affect him as a soldier, and hence do not touch the Ideal of the soldier. An Ideal gives the perfection of the type only, and all is disregarded that does not affect the type.

Let us now see how the Ideal should influence conduct. Every wise boy or man makes for himself an Ideal; he finds out what he wants to be, and sets that before him as an object to be gained. Having decided what he wants to be, he sets to work to see what qualities are demanded for excel-

lence in this particular thing that he wants to be; and out of these qualities he shapes his Ideal, the perfect type of that which he desires to become. Then he tries hard to cultivate these qualities in himself; he thinks about them every day, and he tries continually to practise them in his ordinary daily life. This clearness of view saves him from much waste of effort and much loss of time. It is all the difference between a man who knows his road and walks steadily along it, and a man who, not knowing it, runs down every bye-way and side-path, and is constantly obliged to return on his steps and make a fresh start.

Suppose that one of you wants to be a soldier, and he sets before himself as his model the Ideal of the soldier as indicated above. Every morning, on finishing his Sandhyâ, he should think over the qualities that make up his Ideal, and should resolve in his mind: "I will try to-day to show these qualities." He must be brave; in the school hours, if he makes a mistake, or commits a fault, he must say it out courageously, and not seek to evade discovery; he must be loyal and obedient, upholding his College and defending it if attacked, and he must obey his parents and teachers; he must be faithful to his word among his fellows, and must train himself in simple frugal living, avoiding luxury and sloth; when defeated in games or in class he must be cheer-

ful and resolute; when a victor, he must be modest; and he must ever use his strength to guard those who are younger and more helpless than himself. In this way he will build into his character the qualities that make the Ideal Soldier, and will be ready, in his manhood, to serve with honour and glory in the army of his country.

Success in the world depends upon forming an Ideal in youth and in striving to conform to it the character; the nature and quality of the success depend on the kind of Ideal that is chosen. The great men in history have been men who made up their minds in their youth as to their path in life, and who bent all their efforts to prepare for its treading.

Now nations have Ideals, as well as individual men, and these national Ideals wield a tremendous influence over the characters and the destinies of the nations. These national Ideals are largely created by the thinkers of the nations; or, to speak more accurately, the thinkers voice these Ideals, which are already "in the air," which are lying hidden in the nature of the people, unknown, unrecognised, until the thinker, with the piercing gaze of genius, sees the latent thought, and speaks it out articulately to the world. Further, these Ideals create, and are then nourished and strengthened by, public opinion, the accordant thoughts of many

minds ever strengthening their power. And yet again national Ideals have their root in the specific nature of a race or of a people, in the dominant characteristics and tendencies which have come to the front in due course of evolution, and become embodied in one or another nation. In the orderly development of Humanity, guided by the Divine Will which is the force behind evolution, certain qualities are ready to grow at certain times. There are times and seasons for the growth of the various parts of human nature, as there are times and seasons for the growth of fruits and flowers. Nations embody special characteristics, and the Jîvas—the souls—which are ready to develope these characteristics are guided by karma to take birth in those nations. These characteristics will find their place in the Ideals of those nations, and the Ideals will be suitable to attract and evolve them in the people. It is these which, as already said, the thinkers intuitively recognise, and lift them up on high so that all may see and acclaim them. Every child born into the land is irresistibly influenced by the national Ideal, as his body is irresistibly influenced by the national climate. Born under the hot sun of Southern Europe, a man is olive-skinned, dark-haired, dark-eyed ; born in the chilly northern lands he is fair-skinned. light-haired, blue-eyed. The climate colours the body ; the Ideal colours the mind. And

a man can no more escape the one than he can escape the other; physical and mental surroundings alike affect his nature, and he breathes in thoughts with his mind as he breathes in air with his lungs.

Western Ideals have changed very much during the last century and a half. During the Middle Ages the social system in many of its leading features strongly resembled the system here, callings being largely hereditary, the lines of cleavage between classes being very strongly marked, save that the priestly order was recruited from every class. From the middle of the eighteenth century, changes which had been long beneath the surface came rapidly to the top. In England the feudal system decayed by degrees; in France it fell with a crash under the shock of the Revolution; but whether by slow decay or by sudden fall, it came to an end ere the nineteenth century was born. The evolution of man in the West brought on a rapid growth of the lower mind, the mind dealing with concrete objects, the reasoning, questioning, scientific mind. You know that ahamkâra, the I-making principle, produces the mind, and this mind, in its lower, separative form, sees difference everywhere. As this developed, the man's sense of his separateness, of his own personal "I am I," increased. "I am myself;" "you are yourself;" "this

is mine;" "that is yours;" these feelings of the personal self grew and flourished exceedingly. And as this growth proceeded, the underlying tendency moved some of the keenest minds in the West to formulate this sense of I-ness, of My-ness, into an Ideal, the Ideal of the single, independent man, man in isolation as a self-reliant, self-dependent being, the single man standing by himself, with a right to exercise all his powers for his own advantage. He was conceived of as alone, as a solitary human being, and the whole fabric of society was looked at from this standpoint, the standpoint of "the Rights of Man."

But how can society be formed out of a number of these separate, isolated units? *Le Contrat Social*, *The Social Contract*, of Jean Jacques Rousseau, was the answer.

"Man is born free." He possesses himself. None has any title to his obedience. None may command him without his own consent. He has a right to take whatever he can, to hold whatever he can. The strong hand, the strong brain, is its own justification; "might is right." But the strongest must at one time or another become weak, may occasionally be ill, must decay into old age. The strong, depending only on his strength as oppressor, becomes in his weakness a victim, and craves protection. Hence the "social contract." It was sup-

posed that a man gave up some of his natural inherent right to do as he pleased, in exchange for protection in the rest of his rights. He would not take from others by force when he was strong and able to do so, if others would protect him in the enjoyment of his possessions when he was weak. Thus laws arose: "thou shalt not murder," "thou shalt not steal;" in return, "thou shalt not be murdered," "thou shalt not be robbed;" or, "if thou art, thy murderer or thy robber shall be punished." Mutual agreement, from this standpoint, is the basis of laws. No man may be ruled, except by his own consent. No man may have part of his property taken from him, as taxes, except by his own consent. This is the foundation of the democratic theory of society and of government. A man robs you; you have the natural right to knock him down and seize the stolen goods; under the "social contract" you send for the policeman.

Even among the veriest savages the exercise of all the rights conceived of as inherent in the natural man would make any family or tribal union impossible. Some rules, admitted as binding by all, are necessary for any life in common. Within the family, within the tribe, at least, murder and robbery must be forbidden.

This Ideal of man, an independent being clothed in his rights, took hold of the minds of

the western world during the last third of the eighteenth century. The "Rights of Man" formed the basis of the Declaration of Independence which created the great Republic of the West, and tore the American colonies from the Crown of England to erect them into the United States of America. The American Constitution is based on the Rights of Man. The French Revolution raised a similar banner, inscribing on it the Rights of Man, and under this banner it worked and fought, and raised its Republic, and this Ideal fired the hearts of its conquering troops. In England, also, the same idea took root, and Thomas Paine's famous *Rights of Man* became the battle-cry of the English democracy. Slowly and surely its main ideas became incorporated in the political systems of the nineteenth century.

This is the western Ideal, the strong, free, independent, self-reliant man, in whom Rights are inborn, inherent, given by God, or by nature, over whom none has any title to tyrannise, none any title to control. It is the triumph of Individualism, the apotheosis of personal Liberty. The love of Freedom pulses in every heart; Freedom is the life-breath of the people. You need to understand the attraction of this Ideal, if you would understand the passionate enthusiasm it rouses in western breasts. To an Englishman, an American,

a Frenchman, tyranny, oppression, are intolerable outrages; they insult his personal dignity, his self-respect, his pride of self-possession. He has no patience to argue with them; they are against his deepest instincts, his overmastering beliefs; they are not to be reasoned with, but to be resisted at all hazards.

Now let us see what virtues have grown out of this Ideal of Liberty, this Ideal of the strong and free man.

First, in relation to Christianity, the religion of the West. This religion, given to help the western evolution, had a strong tendency to individualism, which had increased with the advancing centuries. The Christ had become more and more a separate individual, standing apart from humanity, so that He helped the sinner by substituting Himself for him instead of by a unity of life with him. He became the sinner's substitute, bearing the penalty of his sins, and the atonement became a legal contract instead of a spiritual union. False as was this view, looked at in its later legal presentment, the essential truth of the original teaching made it the root of many virtues. A passionate gratitude to the Christ arose in the hearts of men, who saw in His sacrifice on their behalf an act of gracious voluntary love. He had a "right" to perfect bliss, but He incurred suffering and death for

the love of man. Out of this passionate gratitude grew a longing to do Him some service in return; and since He had need of nothing, being God, the gratitude flowed out in service to the poor and suffering, of whom He had said: "Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me." From this, the building of hospitals all over the lands, wherein the sick could be tended; orphanages for destitute children, asylums for the helpless aged arose; hundreds and thousands of men and women of gentle birth and gentle breeding went to live among the poor and the degraded, nursing the sick, teaching the ignorant, succouring the helpless; the "Brothers of the Poor," the "Little Sisters of the Poor," carried help with their own hands into the filthy hovels of the wretched. What this meant of personal sacrifice you can measure, if you imagine Brâhmaṇas going forth to live among Chandâlas and Pariahs, nursing them with their own hands, giving personal service without disgust and without pride. To such self-devotion and compassion gratitude to the Christ gave rise.

Another group of virtues, those of public spirit, patriotism, and the like, grew out of the Ideal of the free and independent man, the individual embodying rights. The citizen enlarged his sense of My-ness from his own personal possessions, so as to

include a larger ownership, "*my* town," "*my* country." He became a good citizen, eager to improve his town, to give parks, public libraries, public advantages of all kinds, feeling pride in the thought, "this is *my* town." He became a good patriot, thinking of his country's welfare, his country's safety, his country's glory, feeling pride in the thought, "this is *my* country." This sense of possession in the country, the self-identification with the native land, has enabled England to plant her colonies all over the wide world without loosening the bonds of Empire, and in far New Zealand and far Western Canada, colonials, who have never trodden English soil, feel the proud sense of possession in the little Island set in northern seas, and with their children speak with moistened eyes of "home."

Personal dignity, self-respect, the sense of honour, of justice, and all the allied virtues, have also their root in this Ideal of the strong and free man. It inspires to courage, to endurance, to resistance of injustice and oppression. It is a militant Ideal, and produces the military virtues, shaping strong and virile characters, men of will and of energy, natural leaders in action. It gives birth to men of action rather than to Sages and Philosophers.

Inevitably, in the course of this evolution, the vices which are "the defects of the qualities" must

appear. And so you find the Englishman too often arrogant, imperious, contemptuous of others, forcing his way in disregard of the opinions and the feelings of others. "I stand for myself," "my nation is above all other nations," "my ways are the best ways," "all civilisation but mine is barbarism." The habit of looking down on all other countries, and carrying their own ways everywhere with them, have made the English as a nation much disliked. The Englishman too often mistakes rudeness for honesty, and bad manners for independence. None the less has his strength the promise of the future in it, and, when refined and polished, it will sway the world.

Let us now consider the Eastern Ideal and its results, and for "eastern" I will take "Indian" as most concerning us here.

Now, beyond all possibility of doubt, this Eastern Ideal is embodied in the one word Dharma, Duty. This Ideal arose out of the religion, the fundamental teaching of which was unity. There is but One Existence, in which all beings are rooted. However varied the appearances, however different the forms, they are but branches from a single trunk. "All beings have root in Me." From this naturally followed the view, that each man was but a part of a whole; he was not isolated, he was not independent, he was a portion

of a vast interlinked and interdependent order. He was not born free; he was born into numerous obligations, and by the very fact of living he was constantly adding to his debts. The happiness of the whole and of each of its parts depended upon the harmony and due integration of those parts. Humanity, together with all animals and all immovable things, made a single whole, and each unit, entering into the composition of that whole, was subordinate to and existed for the use of that whole. No man exists for himself and for his own separate ends; he exists for all and for the common ends. A finger does not exist for itself and by itself; it is part of the body, and exists in the body and for the use of the body; it is evolved to take food, for the good of the whole body; to hold a pen to express the thoughts of the mind; to guide a tool to carry out the will of the Jîva. A finger that wanted to be free and independent would be a monstrosity, an absurdity. So with man; he is an organ in a great body, and exists for the use of that body. To think otherwise is ignorance, is the illusion of separateness; it is separateness diseased, gone mad. Hence the Ideal of the Hindu was the Man Dutiful, the man who recognised all his obligations and lived as part of a greater whole, not as an independent being.

The Hindu, looking at a man, did not ask:

"What are his rights?" and on the answer build a Society by social contract. He asked: "What are his duties?" and accepted the plan of Society formulated by his Ṛiṣhis with the object of securing that each man should do his duty as the rational expression of social Dharma. He recognised as the foundation of that social system the orderly distribution of social functions according to the qualities of the persons composing it, the fourfold organisation of castes, each with its own duty. The dharma of the Brâhmaṇa was to teach; the dharma of the Kṣhattriya was to protect and preserve order; the dharma of the Vaishya was to gather wealth and to distribute it rightly; the dharma of the Shûdra was to serve. Nothing is said about the rights of each caste, for each man obtains his rights when all around him discharge their several duties. There is no essential difference between rights and duties: they are the same thing, but the thing is regarded from two different standpoints; the one says: "This is mine; I claim it as my right;" the other says: "This is yours; I render it to you as my duty." But the *attitude* is wholly different, and hence the results are different; for the first is aggressive, combative, tends to separateness; the other is yielding, peaceful, and tends to unity.

The virtues that spring from the Ideal of

Dharma are all based on this sense of obligation, and are branches from the root of Dutifulness. A man loses sight of the demands he might make on others, and considers only what he owes to others. He looks at his position in relation to another, and sets himself to discharge completely the obligations of that position.

A striking illustration of this may be taken from the story of Bhîṣhma, the very incarnation of Duty throughout his whole life. In whatever position he might be, he strove to fulfil perfectly the duties of that position, and we never see in him any trace of the wish to demand that others should do their duties to him. Bhîṣhma had arrived at man's estate, and he observed a shade of sorrow on the face of Shântanu, his father; the father did not make the son his confidant, nor seek solace from his love, but rather sought to hide his grief from all. The quick affection of the son, however, saw the unspoken trouble, and, eager to relieve and cheer, he sought the cause, and discovered at length that his father had seen and loved a maiden, daughter of a fisherman, but that the fisherman had refused the royal suitor, because he would not promise the succession to the throne to a son that might be born of the fair girl. Mindful of his duty to his son Bhîṣhma, Shântanu had refused to make a promise so unjust, and had retur-

ned to his palace, sad at heart. No word spake Bhîṣhma to his father, well knowing that Shântanu would not accept the sacrifice of his son; but to the fisherman he went, and asked for his daughter Satyavatî as the bride of Shântanu. "Take her yourself," said the man in answer, "so shall her son succeed you on the throne." "As my mother have I thought of her," quoth Bhîṣhma, "and never therefore may I approach her with husband's love." "Her son must reign," said the fisherman, obstinately, "and you are the heir of Shântanu." Without a pause Bhîṣhma, intent on filial duty, answered back: "I yield the throne; this maiden's child shall rule as our King." "'Tis well; but when your own son grows to manhood, he will dispute the crown with the child of Satyavatî." "Nay, that shall never be; for here I vow that never will I take a maid in marriage; sonless I will live and die, and so shall the royal heritage securely pass to the son of this my mother." Thus did Bhîṣhma yield for loving duty's sake all that men hold most dear; the crown that hovered o'er his brow he struck aside; the joys of husband and of father he cast away in the full flush of stalwart manhood; he did not ask: "Has my father any right to such a sacrifice?" but, taking life's best joys with both hands, he laid them at his father's feet, a son perfect in duty, and finding in that duty his highest joy.

Now some western people take offence at this story, and say that Bhîṣhma should not have given up his right to the crown, his right to the happiness of married life. And they say that Shântanu had no right to accept his son's sacrifice. So far as Shântanu was concerned, he had no say in the matter. Bhîṣhma had made his vows before his father knew what he was doing, and the vows once made could not be broken. But Bhîṣhma's action shocks the Ideal of Rights in the western mind, and it cannot see the beauty of the son's utter devotion, of the perfection of filial duty. The eastern mind, permeated with the Ideal of Duty, sees in Bhîṣhma the ideal son, and would never dream of regarding his sacrifice as a fault.

Another important result flowing from the Ideal of Duty is that the failure of one of two parties in a relation to do his duty does not excuse the other from doing his. While there should be reciprocity to make the relation perfect, yet duty must be done even to the undutiful. In this view lies great safety for the family and the State, since the discharge of duty by the dutiful party may prevent the bond from being broken, whereas with the Ideal of Rights the failure of one to recognise the rights of another leads to the repudiation by the other of his share of the bar-

gain. Thus a wife is not absolved from her duty to a bad husband, nor is a mother absolved from her duty to a bad son ; a husband is not absolved from his duty to a bad wife, nor a son from his duty to a bad mother. The duty must be fully discharged, no matter what may be the unworthiness of the other party to the relation ; for why should I fail in my duty because another fails in his ? He will answer to karma for his breaches of the law, and I need not make the common situation worse by adding to them other breaches.

So also, according to the Hindu Ideal of Duty, subjects are not absolved from their duty of loyalty because the King may fail in his duty of protection. And this for the reason that wrong is short-lived if met by right instead of by wrong. All the laws of the universe work with the dutiful man, and carry him to assured triumph ; the sufferings of the oppressed undermine the throne of the oppressor, and failure in duty can only hinder the sure reaction with which the law strikes the evil-doer, and sweeps him from the path of the righteous. To do duty is to be in accord with the divine working, and who can let or baulk the Will by which the universe exists ?

How have these two Ideals of Rights and of Duties fared in these modern days, and what changes have come over them ?

In the West a profound change of attitude has come over the modern mind, and this change is largely due to the influence of scientific thought. As Sir Oliver Lodge has lately shown, the whole tendency of modern science is towards unity. As it has plunged more and more deeply into nature, it has caught glimpses of the unity underlying the diversity. Moreover, the idea of evolution has shewn humanity as springing from a common stock, and has caused society to be regarded as an organic growth and not as the result of an artificial contract. It is seen that men can only exist by virtue of the protection extended to them by others; "man is born free;" but what does this mean? he is born dependent for his very life on the good offices of those around him; a free baby would fare but ill in the world. To suit the theory of the social contract, all the men who made it must have been born grown up. Science shows that all are born into *conditions*, and that to those conditions each must adapt himself or perish. Nature does not recognise independence; her laws compel obedience, or, in default thereof, slay the resister. The law rolls on unfailingly and crushes all who oppose.

Out of the recognition of the common stock has grown the recognition of a common aim, and the sense of community has given birth to Altruism.

Since all individuals share a common origin and a common destiny, each should help the other, and thus progress by mutual assistance instead of wasting strength in struggle. A strong man, adding his strength to the feeble strength of a weak man, makes with him a more powerful combination than if part of his strength were used in crushing the other. Altruism gradually widens out to embrace all as members of a single family, and the noble type of the philanthropic altruist arises, who sees all things from a common standpoint, and says: "You and I together," no longer "I alone." Hence a whole crop of measures which regard society as a great family, in which youth and weakness serve as a claim to protection instead of as an invitation to wrong. Hence free education for the children of the poor, co-operation instead of competition in the supply of social necessities, laws to limit the oppression of labour by capital, and countless other altruistic efforts. The growth of the public conscience, the sense of public duty, become more and more marked, and are triumphing over the older selfishness of individualism. The Ideal of Rights, which made a strong character, is becoming overshadowed by the Ideal of Duty, which will lend gentleness and sweetness to the strength, and the keynote of the teaching of Mazzini, the apostle of Liberty in Italy, was that the people should learn

to do their duties rather than claim their rights.

Now while the West has been changing its Ideal by a process of widening out, until duty stands higher than rights, the East has been endangering its Ideal by a process of narrowing in, and has contracted more and more the area of its field of duty. The slow decay of spirituality has led to this among many other lamentable results, and with the loss of the sense of unity, duty has become ever more restricted. The sense of family duty is still very strong, but where is that of public duty, of national duty? Only a few, only a small minority, have any practical idea to-day of duty to the public, to the country. The wide idea of spirituality having decayed, the wide sense of public duty has followed it. Where are now the men "intent on the welfare of the masses," as in the olden time? we see wrongs committed in our midst, and people say: "What business is it of mine? why should I interfere?" Where is the sense of unity which feels a wrong done to one as a wrong done to all? Where the impulse to spring forward to help a stricken stranger, as though he were a brother by blood? Each one who sees an injustice, each one who hears of wrong, should feel in his heart: "When any wrong is done to my brother, it is done to me; his wrong is mine, my strength is his."

My sons, do you think that this Central Hindu College was built only to turn out graduates, to send out into the world successful vakils, brilliant judges, polished intelligences and clever litterateurs, but men indifferent to their country and careless of the common good? I tell you, nay! We who are raising it, who are bringing labour, time, self-sacrifice, to found it surely and to build it strongly, we are doing it for the future of India, for the raising of her people, for the redemption of the Motherland. We are working here to make men of public spirit, men of patriotic devotion, men of noble character, men of lofty aspiration; to send out again into India men who are "intent on the welfare of the masses," and who see in her teeming myriads younger brothers to be guided and helped, not helpless crowds to be plundered. Not for glory, nor for wealth, nor for fame, nor for power, nor for rule, would we have you, our students, study, nor your young hearts aflame. But we would have them worship a great Ideal, we would have them fired with a splendid ambition—the ambition to win the glory of protecting the weak, of helping to feed and raise the poor, of lifting India high among the peoples of the world, of shewing out in life the Ideal of Duty which sees in the nation but a single life.

———:o:———

SECOND LECTURE.

THE HINDU STUDENT.

The first thing that strikes a man who looks at Hinduism as a whole is the order that marks the Hindu system. Everything in it follows in due succession, each season has its own fruits, each stage its own work. It is orderly with the orderliness of nature. As seed is sown, as it grows and ripens, as it is harvested, as it is ground into flour for the making of bread, so is a like succession seen in human life as ordered by the Ṛishis, who gave to India her social and religious polity. The successive stages follow each other in due and natural order. The sowing is in the student life wherein the seed of knowledge is planted; the growing to maturity and the ripening is in the life of the householder; the harvesting is in the Vanaprastha stage, wherein active life is over; the grinding to make bread for human feeding is in the life of the Sannyâsî, whose work is wholly for others, not for himself. All should follow in due order, and no confusion of this order should be seen. The arrangement of the âshramas, as made by

the Ṛishis, was intended to secure this due order, so that each stage of life should have its due results, and steady evolution might be made, the four âshramas representing the natural order of growth in human life.

To-day we are to study the first âshrama, that of Brahmacharya, which covers the life of the student.

This first âshrama is, of course, preceded by infancy. For that no rules are laid down, for all that is needed during the first seven years of life is freedom, and full opportunity for growth. Nourishment, tenderness, liberty in all that is not harmful, encouragement to make its own experiments with the strange new world around it—these are the needs of the little child. He is only getting ready his future instrument, and that work is quite enough for the time. Modern medical science endorses this view of the little child; and the latest biological discoveries justify the wisdom of the ancient rule which left the young child unfettered and free from study to the tender caressing care of the mother and the soft nurturing of the home. During the first seven years of life the brain is not ready for study; it is composed of cells that are not linked together into groups, as they are in later life, and these do not offer the material basis needed for study and reasoning.

During these early years the cells are hard at work, under the stimulus of the impressions pouring in from the outer world, and they send out tiny root-like growths, which link them together into groups. These groups form the physical instruments for mental faculties, and until they are formed and well established, the brain ought not to be used for study. It cannot be used effectually, and it ought not to be used at all. Therefore the Ṛishis, knowing all this, laid down no rules for study till early childhood was over. There is pressure enough on the baby brain in any case—the new things of family life, of the home, of the strange outer world, provide sufficient stimulus for it. See how busy a little child is with its ceaseless questionings, its open-eyed wonder, its restless movements. And the less interference there is with the tiny creature the better. As far as possible there should be no coercion, and interference should be avoided as much as possible. Some little guidance to aid physical development may be given, and sufficient supervision to turn aside serious bodily harm. Any necessary check should be given very gently, so that no sense of being thwarted and hindered should arise in the child. Where there is too much restraint in childhood, where there is undue repression of the abounding exuberant life, timidity and shyness appear, even fear and distrust. Hence

mischief in later life, when the child may need to turn to the parent for advice, for protection.

This merry, irresponsible gaiety of childish life comes to an end with the important samskâra of the Upanayana, the giving of the sacred thread. This samskâra marks the close of infancy, and marks the beginning of the Brahmacharya âshrama. Control and restraint begin with this, in the place of the joyous thoughtlessness of the earlier years, and these are fitly symbolised by the thread—the thread or cord which binds. Henceforth the restraint of outer control and of self-control must discipline the life; these are necessary for the training of the instrument which has been prepared in the careless liberty of childhood. And the thread says more than general restraint; it is a triple thread, and we see in it a reference to the triple control enjoined by Manu: control of the mind, control of speech, control of action. To invest with the thread is to say: "Henceforth you must learn to govern your mind, to govern your speech, to govern your actions." The careless freedom of childhood belongs to the body, it is the freedom of the animal; now the child enters on the truly human life, the life of self-mastery and of self-control. If he is for a time to be in subjection to others, this is but to help him to become master of himself; the tender plant is guarded and supported until it is strong enough to

battle alone with the storms of life.

Then a mantra is given, the sign of the beginning of the religious life; it reminds the boy that he is no longer an irresponsible member of the physical world, but that he has to come into touch with the subtler superphysical worlds to which his true life belongs, with Devas, with Îshvara, the Supreme. It is the mark of the link between the Jîvâ and the Paramâtmâ, the link which, by the aid of religion, will be found to be identity of nature.

Moreover, the boy now passes under the control of his teacher, and learns that he must leave the play of the household for the study of the Guru. He is given the stick or wand, symbol of danda which controls, and also symbol of self-protection against external dangers. In the old days, the student had to beg daily for the food which supported himself and his teacher, and the memory of this is still kept alive in the ceremony of giving the sacred thread. The stick and the begging both remind the young boy of the nature of the life on which he is now entering—a life of simplicity, of frugality, of endurance, of the hardships which train and strengthen the body. Thus the ceremony outlines the âshrama now to be entered.

There are four things which may be said to embody the main ideas of the life of the Brahmacharî

Service, Study, Simplicity, Self-control. This sentence should be the motto of the Hindu student, and should guide his daily life.

Sometimes in England the phrase is used "the three R's," and by this is meant the elements of education, Reading, wRiting, and aRithmetic. To teach "the three R's" is to give a child elementary education. So we might call the elements of the Brahmacharî's life "the four S's"—Service, Study, Simplicity, Self-control. This is a convenient way of helping the memory, and to make the four S's sink deeply into the mind, never to be forgotten.

Let us see just what these four S's mean.

Each refers to a particular branch of education, and each of these branches of education belongs to a particular division of the constitution of man.

SERVICE is the duty owed to God, to the Guru to the Parents; and it leads to the unfolding of the spiritual nature which grows only by service, by self-surrender, by self-sacrifice; by outpouring, which lives by giving and not by taking. This spiritual development is aided by religion.

STUDY is the application of the mind to the external world for the gaining of knowledge; it develops the intellectual nature, trains the mind, and evolves its faculties.

SIMPLICITY characterises the virtues which are most needed in the student life; it indicates what should be the student's habits and ways of living, and covers the development of the moral nature.

SELF-CONTROL is here the mastery of the body, the guidance, training and management of the body, so that it may evolve into a useful and capable instrument, a good servant for life's work.

Thus Service, Study, Simplicity, Self-control, refer to the four divisions of the nature of the human being.

Look at yourselves, and you will see these four divisions of your nature quite clearly.

You have a physical body which you can see, and you know it is a part of your nature. You have to learn to master this body while it is young and plastic, and while the task is comparatively easy. Later on in life, this task of mastering the body becomes very hard; when the world's business presses on a man, he needs his body ready to his service, for then he has little time to devote to its discipline and its training; moreover, in manhood the body is far less plastic, less malleable, than in youth, for habits have become fixed, and they are difficult to change. While the body is still growing it can be more easily trained, for it is flexible and amenable; just as you might train a young

horse to serve you, so should you train your body.

If you observe yourselves, you will see that the body is only a part of you; you have what are called feelings—emotions, passions, appetites. Sometimes you lose your temper; or you feel a wave of love or of hate sweep through you; or you feel contented or discontented, proud or humble, full of energy or slothful. These emotions form a most important part of everyone's nature, and they make up the second great division of the human constitution—the emotional nature.

Thirdly, comes the mind, that in you which thinks, which reasons, which remembers; this is called the intellectual nature, and each one of you knows it as a part of yourself. You cannot live without observing, without reasoning, without remembering; every day and all day long the mind is busy.

But even when you have noted the body, the emotions, and the mind, there remains yet something which is none of these; it is yourself, the deepest you, that owns the body, the emotions, the mind; this is the Jîva, the Spirit within you, and this may be called the fourth division of the human constitution—the spiritual nature.

These four parts of the boy's nature, then, must each be dealt with in a complete education, and it is this complete education that the Brahmacharî

needs, if he is to be in reality as well as in name a youth fashioned on the Ideal of a Hindu student.

Let us take them each in turn.

The unfolding of the spiritual nature is to come by SERVICE, the service of God, of the Guru, of the Parents. The service to be rendered to God by the student is worship, the worship of Him from whom he draws his life. It is He who is manifested in the nature amidst which he lives, who shines out in the sun, who pours down in the rain, whose will gives the seasons in their order, whose life is the fertility in the soil. It is He from whom flows all that makes life possible—love, affection, the joy of thought and of intellectual vigour, the bounding pulse of youth, the glowing exuberance of vitality, these are all the good gifts of God to man. How ungrateful then is he who takes all but renders back nothing in return. Truly does the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ* say that he is a thief who receives all Divine gifts and yields nothing in return. In worship we pay our debt by gratitude and by love; we can give nothing worth the giving, for all is of His gift—"of Thine own have we given Thee"—and it is but a poor and paltry return for all the riches we receive. Yet so it is that the Spirit Universal values the love of the separated Spirits that are but the sparks of His flame, and loves to be loved of men:

As though the sun should thank us
For letting light come in.

Another part of our service is religious study, called sometimes the debt we owe to the Ṛiṣhis; and this is incumbent on all the twice-born. The study of the Vedas is as much the duty of Kṣhattriyas and of Vaishyas as of Brâhmaṇas. It is compulsory on all; only the Brâhmaṇas may *teach* the Vedas, but the three twice-born castes are all equally bound to study them. This is clearly seen in both the ordinances and the practice of the olden time; for we read of Râmachandra, of the Kurus and the Pâṇḍavas, and of many other Kṣhattriyas, being all versed in the Vedas. This universality of study is indeed necessary, because only by a sure knowledge of spiritual teachings can men find at once the foundation and the sanction of morality—*Unity*. Religion alone teaches us that we are all one, that we are parts of a single whole, and without this fact of Unity there is no sure foundation for morality. Likewise is the fact of Unity the sanction of morality, for it gives the reason why we should be moral, it shews the necessity of morality. Suppose that a lawyer, eager to win a case in which success will bring him fame and money, sees that a dishonest practice will ensure success. The moralist says to him: "You should refrain from that action." He answers: "Why? I shall gain there-

by fame and money, and these mean happiness to me; why should I not do it?" Simple morality can give no adequate answer. But religion steps in and says: "You should not do it, because you and he whom you seek to injure are really one and the same. You cannot injure him without injuring yourself. The loss will inevitably come back to yourself; you injure your own life."

In history we see that wherever religion decays, the sense of unity gradually disappears, and men disregard the good of the Country and the State in the hunt after their own separate interests: whenever that occurs the State suffers, and then the individuals also begin to suffer. No matter how clever a man may be, however brilliant his intelligence, however strong his will, he cannot succeed if his nation be degraded and down-trodden. There is not scope for his genius, there is little reward for his efforts. Misery to all means misery to each, and while God is God this must remain so. Men are bound together by virtue of His nature, shared in by all, and from this there is no escape. Only as the law of Unity is obeyed can even individual happiness be secured. Thus the teaching of religion is necessary for the welfare of the nation.

Hence the Brahmacharî must worship, and must study the sacred books.

Service to the Guru has lost its old meaning in

these modern days, yet the Hindu student should remember that he owes to his teachers not only obedience, but also affectionate respect and trust. He should avoid harsh criticism of them and all unmannerly behaviour; it should be his pride to be orderly in class, courteous in his bearing; he should not entertain suspicions of the teacher's good-will, nor resent the discipline he may impose. Service to the Parents should also form part of the Brahmachari's life; in the house he should be the help, the joy, of Father and Mother, and serve them with the body which they gave.

We now come to STUDY, what in modern times is called the secular part of education, though in reality nothing is secular, for all is God-pervaded, and all right thought, all right desire, all right action, is in truth part of the Divine service. All these are worship in the wider sense, when done with the motive to serve God and man.

If I asked you: "Why do you study?" some of you would answer: "In order to pass our examinations." True, but only a small part of the truth, for the passing of examinations is neither the reason for, nor the object of, study. The degree gained by an examination is merely a mark that a man has reached a certain standard of knowledge. In England, there is a way of stamping all gold and silver articles, when they come up

to a certain standard of purity, and this stamp is called a hall-mark; it is an authoritative statement that the article bearing it is good gold or good silver, and not base metal made to resemble the precious ones. No English-made gold or silver article is genuine which does not bear this hall-mark. Now an examination which ensures a degree, or a certificate of some kind, is merely a hall-mark; it shows that the youth has come up to a certain standard; it has no value in itself; its only value is in what it guarantees. The gold does not gain its value from the hall-mark; the hall-mark is placed on it because it is already valuable. And so the knowledge does not gain its value from the examination; but the examination marks it as having a certain value. The passing of the examination should be a proof that the student possesses a certain amount of knowledge; but only too often to-day the hall-mark is stamped on base metal, for the knowledge has been gained by cramming, by the teacher giving notes and the student writing them down and then committing them to memory; for education has been identified with the passing of examinations, and thus has been deprived of its real value.

I ask another: "Why do you study?". His answer is: "Because I want to gain knowledge." A better answer than the former one, and yet only

a part of the truth. For knowledge which is imparted by one person to another, received by the pupil from the teacher, mere memory-knowledge, is not the main object of study. Too many boys' heads are like empty vessels into which statements about facts are poured by teachers, and the boys empty out the statements again in the examination-room, and the heads are left with very little in them.

The real object of education, that at which every true teacher is aiming, and for which every true student is working, is to draw out, train and discipline the faculties of the mind, those faculties that the boy will want to use when he comes to be a man. And right education is not the cramming of the boy's memory, but the evolution and training of his powers of observing, reasoning and judging. In arguing about the best subjects to teach in school, men often speak as though the one important matter were the use in after life of the knowledge given. Truly, that is to be thought of; but we should also consider the value of a subject as yielding mental discipline and as stimulating mental evolution, for the well-trained mind is like a keen instrument, fit for the execution of work.

You are not here only to pass examinations or to absorb your teachers' knowledge; you are here

to develope all your faculties, spiritual, intellectual, moral, physical, so that hereafter you may use them in the service of God and man, to the credit and honour of your country, your families, and yourselves.

If you understand this, you will see why so much stress is laid here on the *kind* of intellectual training that is given; you will understand why you are taught to observe for yourselves, instead of only writing down notes about the observations of others; why you are asked to reason, and draw your own conclusions; why there is so much practical as well as theoretical teaching; why modelling is taught to the little boys, making them observe and distinguish differences. Much of your success in your future life depends on your being able to observe keenly, and to see differences between men and men, things and things. Is this man trustworthy? Are these circumstances favourable? The man, who dreams through life with his eyes half shut, loses half his opportunities. You can learn how to decide only when your faculty of accurate observation has been cultivated.

So also with the faculty of reasoning. In learning mathematics and logic, you are not learning matters which in themselves will be useful to you in later life, except in certain specialised professions; but you are learning to reason, to detect

errors in reasoning, and to draw correct conclusions from the facts before you. Unless you gather this fruit from your mathematical and logical studies, this part of your education will be a failure. As a pleader, a doctor, a government servant, a merchant, for instance, you will not work out mathematical problems or teach logic; but to reason correctly and draw correct conclusions, to detect flaws in your opponent's reasoning, these things are necessary for the pleader, and the faculties which do this are evolved and trained by mathematical and logical studies. And so with the other professions. The educated man differs from the uneducated not only in the extent of his knowledge, but in the evolution of his faculties and his power of applying them to any case that presents itself.

It is true that the method of practical, instead of only theoretical, teaching is much more difficult for you, and infinitely more difficult for your teachers than the cramming system; but on the other hand it is far more interesting and far more effective, and leaves the student, at the end of his college career, eager for more knowledge instead of disgusted with study. And it means all the difference between a useful and a useless man, between a man who drags through life half-developed and one with his faculties alert, serviceable to himself and to his Country. You may teach a

blind man by reading to him, by talking to him, but put him in the road by himself and he is helpless, he cannot gain any knowledge of his surroundings; how much greater the boon if you can cure his blindness, can give him back his eyesight; then he can use his own eyes, and gain information for himself. This is what we are trying to do for you; we would not have you go into the world as blind men, dependent upon others for your guidance, but as men with open vision, clear-eyed, far-sighted, able to guide yourself and to guide those who are less fortunate than you are. Your education is to open your eyes, to train your faculties, so that they may be at your disposal in later life, and may grow and be strengthened therein by the struggles, the successes and the failures of the life of manhood. Such is the difference between true and false education in the department of the intellect.

We now come to

SIMPLICITY, which we may take as the symbol of the virtues belonging especially to the life of the Brahmachari. It is sometimes said, and rightly said, that virtues are right emotions made permanent; I have not time to fully explain to you this relation between virtues and emotions, but can only very briefly shew you the main idea, in order that you may see what is meant by the

statement that virtues and vices grow out of right and wrong emotions, so that moral training means a training and a development of the emotional division of man's nature.

If you love your father or your brother very much, you do of your own accord, without being told, anything that you think will make them happy. But you do not do the same for a stranger, because you do not feel the same love for him as you do for your father or brother. Now suppose that you see a stranger in need of help, and you do for him what you would do for your father or brother in a similar case, you are then showing towards him from *virtue*, the same actions which you would show to your father or brother from *emotion*. The virtue of kindness prompts the same help to the stranger that the emotion of love prompts to the relative. Therefore we say that a virtue is an emotion made general and constant; "a virtue is the permanent mood, or mode, of an emotion." One other thing you should also know, that there are only two root-emotions in the world—Love and Hate. All the emotions are branches springing from one or other of these two roots. Virtues grow out of the love-emotion; vices grow out of the hate-emotion. Moral education consists in stimulating the love-emotion, and cultivating the virtues that grow out of it;

and in dwarfing the hate-emotion, and eradicating the vices that grow out of it.

Let us now see what virtues are most necessary in the Brahmacharî. Obedience stands first, and you should understand why so much stress is laid on this in the Shâstras. In the first place, the younger is not as wise or as experienced as the elder, and his lack of knowledge of the world, and of people and of things, would often place him in difficulties and dangers if he were left unguided; he would ruin his health, injure his mental faculties, and lay up for himself many miseries in the future, if he were not helped and protected by the advice of his elders. Obedience enables him to gather the fruits of his elders' experience. Moreover, obedience to rightful authority is the foundation of a noble character. Submission to the law, dutifulness and loyalty as a citizen, spring from obedience cultivated in youth. There is no good citizenship possible unless the virtue of obedience is strongly rooted in the character, and a turbulent disorderly youth does not lead to a dutiful and noble manhood. Still further, only those who have learned to obey are fit to rule; those who have not learned obedience are sure to be tyrannical, unjust and unfair. Such men, when they come to rule, do not realise how their orders may injure and oppress, how they may seem to those

who have to obey them. One who is unable to look at the matter from the inferior's point of view is apt to be imperious, harsh and inconsiderate. The student who has himself been under obedience knows how the inferior feels when orders are given by the superior. Hence, when his turn comes to give orders, he is considerate, thoughtful and kind. He remembers: "I loved my superiors who were kind to me, and disliked those who were harsh; for the one I did all I could, was eager to please them, and even in their absence I acted as I knew they would wish; for the other I did as little as I could, only trying to avoid punishment. I want my subordinates to like me, to do their work heartily and ungrudgingly, in my absence as well as in my presence; so I will be kind and considerate, and will be careful how I rule." Therefore learn obedience now in your student-days; otherwise in your manhood you will be unfit for responsible offices, you will make bad masters, bad superiors, bad rulers.

Another virtue that the Brahmacharî should cultivate is physical and moral Courage, and the latter is even more important than the former. If you do wrong, or if you make a mistake, do not try to hide it by a spoken or an acted lie. The acknowledgment of error in boyhood means strength in manhood. Frankness, openness, these appear in

every manly character, and without moral courage no true greatness is possible. For greatness means seeing further than others, and being able to stand alone—aye, and to stand not only alone but against strong opposition. A boy who developes moral courage in his school and college life is one who as a man will become a tower of strength in his community, and who will be regarded with honour, confidence and trust, and who may grow to be a true leader of men.

Endurance is one of the virtues of the Brahmacharî, and the simplicity which is the note of his character directly conduces to the evolution of this virtue. The Brahmacharî must not indulge in lazy, slothful, luxurious habits; he should not long for a soft bed, for an easy seat, for a variety of dainty dishes. Now why not? Look round you and you will see. Contrast the boys who are fond of these things and who are lazy in their habits with the boys who are indifferent to luxury, who are alert and agile. The latter grow up strong, healthy, manly, able to endure, and enjoy in their manhood splendid health and vigorous vitality; the former grow fat, heavy, slow, and are a prey to all kinds of diseases even in early manhood. A certain amount of hardship should characterise the student stage of life; for while the body is growing luxury is absolutely harmful to

it. The vital energies are building up the body, and they flow to the parts that are exercised ; if the boy is idle and gluttonish, they remain chiefly in the digestive organs and their neighborhood, and build quantities of adipose tissue, commonly called fat, and this fat clogs the organs and prevents them from working properly, and gives rise to all kinds of diseases. Whereas, if the body be kept active, these forces flow to the muscular system and make it very strong and hard and flexible, and vigorous health pervades every organ. The luxurious boy's future life will be diseased and brief; so heavy is the penalty exacted by Nature for sloth in youth.

It is not that your elders wish to force hardship on you, as grudging you any pleasure, but because they wish that your bodies should be built up in the best way, that muscle and nerve should be developed, that which will last and will stand you in good stead throughout your future life. A little hardship now means health and pleasure in the long years before you, and they well know that, in your glad and healthy manhood, you will thank them for the restrictions which prevented you from sowing in your youth the seeds of ill health.

For this reason, also, we lay so much stress in the Central Hindu College on games. For in

games the moral character is trained as well as the body, and the two act and re-act on each other. Games teach the players to act together, thus a rousing a feeling of union and of duty to comrades. The member of a team who plays for himself only, who thinks only of showing off his own skill, his own strength, is no good; the boy who plays for the side, for the common object, who co-operates with the rest of the team, he is the good player. What would you think of the goal-keeper who, to shew his fleetness of foot or strength of kick, should run out among the forwards and leave his goal unguarded? He would soon be thrown out of the team, and a player put in his place who thinks first of his side and not of himself. In life, this sense of being part of a whole, of working for the whole, means the success of the Country, and the lifting of it up in the scale of nations; a Country becomes great when its citizens put its honour and welfare first and their own success second; the patriot loves his Country better than be loves himself, and rejoices more when his Country is honoured than when his own name is in the mouths of men.

Games harden and strengthen the body: you may be rolled over, knocked about, bruised, even seriously injured, and by these struggles you gain strength and endurance and courage. You should

look on this as part of your training for the struggles of life, for though you may not have physical tussles there, the qualities that carry you through these will carry you through the many troubles of worldly life. When blows of misfortune and grief fall on you, you will bear them bravely and will not be afraid. And you will gain that dogged perseverance which wins against heavy odds, wearing out by its tenacity the strength of its opponents. It is said to be one of the characteristics of the Englishman that "he never knows when he is beaten." Napoleon is said to have complained of the battle of Waterloo that he had won the battle several times, but that the English did not know when they were beaten. And in the end, they won. That splendid tenacity spells success.

Control of temper is taught on the playing-fields; every good player has to learn to play with good temper, and to curb the passionate uprush of anger that surges through him when he is, perhaps over roughly, pushed or flung aside. To take a defeat calmly and without resentment, to lose neither heart nor temper when overborne, these things strengthen the moral nature, give a fine polish to the character, temper it to mingled force and sweetness. In these and in other ways the playing-field is a true school of manners and of

morals, and serves as an admirable preparation for the future game of life.

SELF-CONTROL, the control of the mind, the senses and the body, covers indeed the physical training and discipline of the body, but is so closely interwoven with morality that the physical and the moral everywhere overlap. The most important item of this Self-control in the Brahmacharî is that which has ever been implied in his very name—the preservation of absolute continence. In the old days the student was given over to his Guru, and lived with him during the whole period of tutelage, so that he could not enter on the household life until he left the Brahmacharya âshrama. When he returned home, then, and then only, was he allowed to take a wife. This rule was based on the soundest physiological and moral reasons. During adolescence all the vital powers of the youth are needed for the up-keep of his developing body. Especially are they needed for the building up of his brain and nervous system. If they are prematurely used in marriage, in fatherhood, it means the weakening of the whole system, the impoverishment of vitality, the premature decay of vigour. The whole life suffers by the premature entry into the marriage state. In order to be a true Brahmacharî, more than abstinence from marriage is necessary; the

thoughts must be clean, else the preservation of bodily purity is impossible. Absolute chastity, absolute continence are necessary. If these are disregarded, the penalty is loss of health and strength in early manhood, when vigorous vitality should be at its highest. Contrast the appearance of two young men, one of whom has broken his Brahmacharya vow, while the other has kept it. The victim of premature marriage, or of secret vice, is pale, listless, languid and heavy-eyed; while the youth who is pure is freshly coloured, alert, active, brilliant-eyed, every look, every movement, telling of health and strength.

Now this fourfold scheme of education that I have put before you, this life of Service, Study, Simplicity, and Self-control, is the ancient Âryan scheme of education, as you may see for yourselves in the Itihâsa. Look at the life of Shrî Râmachandra in His student-days; you will see Him performing His Sandhyâ daily and studying the Vedas; you will see Him becoming versed in secular knowledge, in all the branches of learning needed for His princely work in life; you will see Him shewing out all moral virtues, obedient to His parents and teachers, loving to His brothers, careful of the welfare of all around Him; He is said to have been "intent on the welfare of the masses," ever studying the good of the people;

and lastly you will see Him trained in all manly exercises, in the use of weapons, in the evolutions of soldiers, in the management of horses and of elephants. Each division of education is seen in His training. Similarly with the Kurus and Pâṇḍavas in later days: each branch of the four-fold education is sedulously cultivated.

The most successful modern nations are following the same lines to-day, as we may see if we look at England and at Germany. At Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Winchester, every boy is summoned to prayer at the beginning of the day and is made to know his Bible—the Christian Scriptures. He is given moral lessons; the virtues are inculcated which will make him a good citizen, a useful member of the community. When he kneels in the chapel at public worship—for it is the Christian custom to gather in church or chapel for general prayer, not for individual worship as in the Temples here—he has before his eyes, on strips of brass that run along the walls, the blazoned names of boys who once knelt where he is kneeling, and who later, in many a hard-fought field, strove and died under their country's flag, died that England might be safe and mighty, giving their lives in glad surrender for England's name and England's cause. Thus the boys, at the time when their emotions are most keen, are inspired and stimulated by the ex-

ample of their predecessors, and mingle in their memories of sacred moments the thoughts of patriots and explorers and statesmen who wrought mightily for their native land. Thus arises a noble emulation, a patriotic ambition, and thus the schools become nurseries of the heroes of the future. This is how the Englishman is trained to become proud of his country, proud of his nationality.

I want to see Indian youths inspired with a similar sentiment. Is there less to be proud of in India than in England? Have you not a history that stretches back scores of thousands of years ere England was heard of? Have you not in your past heroes as gallant, soldiers as brave, statesmen as able, patriots as noble, as stud the storied past of England's isle? What can she point to with pride in the tale that lies behind her, that you cannot match, overmatch, in India's glorious roll? I want you, after you have left this Central Hindu College, to write your names high in the history of to-morrow, as your ancestors wrote theirs in the history of yesterday. Do not indulge in mere vanity over the past, and plume yourselves on an ancestry starry with mighty names. A great ancestry shames a base posterity, and is to it a reproach and not a glory. I want the past to be to you an inspiration not a boast. I want you to feel: "Our ancestors were great, then we must be great also;

they did noble deeds, and such deeds we also shall strive to do. They held the name of Âryâ-varta high ; we shall endeavour to raise it and hold it higher. " Empty pride of ancestry is vanity. You will only prove yourselves true-born if you live again as your sires lived. They are but base-born who wear their fathers' names, but do not manifest their fathers' virtues. Act, then, so that future generations may see that you remember the heroes of the past. Be you heroes in your turn, living heroism in these days, and not dreaming over the heroism of the past. Live so that your names may shine in the eyes of your posterity as do the starry names of old. Let the Ṛiṣhis, looking down on India, see that you are the descendants of their minds as well as of their bodies ; let them be able to say : " These youths are worthy of the inheritance we bequeathed to them, and they will hand on enriched the legacy they received from us."

——:o:——

THIRD LECTURE.

THE HINDU HOUSEHOLDER.

This morning we are to consider the Ideal of the Hindu Householder. It is remarkable that Hinduism stands alone among the religions of the world, so far as I know, in marking off the household life in a clear and definite way, and in giving it its own specific rules, duties and virtues. All religions lay down rules for human conduct, and serve as guides to righteousness of life. But they do not deal with the householder as householder, nor impose upon him special duties, outside those general laws of right conduct which are insisted on for all alike. Hinduism, however, takes the household state as one of the four âshramas, and outlines the duties that belong to it as clearly and as definitely as it outlines those which belong to the other three, the Brahmacharya, the Vânaprastha and the Sannyâsa.

This definiteness enables us to grasp very clearly what is wanted in the ideal householder, and thus a man can place before himself the image to which he is to strive to conform his life. When

only a general law of conduct exists it is apt to be so much too lofty for most that it comes to be disregarded by nearly all, and the lack of special application leaves it floating in the air over the heads of men. General rules are not enough for the effective conduct of life, and the Ṛishis, therefore, wisely laid down specific rules for observance in the great stages of human life.

Another remarkable thing about the Gṛihastha Âshrama is the immense stress that is laid upon it, the immense importance that is given to it. Over and over again we find in the Shâstras statements affirming the supreme value attached to the household life, as we shall presently see. In this Hinduism differs somewhat from Christianity, as held by the great majority of its adherents. Among the Roman Catholic and the Greek Christians celibacy, following the dictum of S. Paul, is regarded as a higher state than that of marriage, since the celibate can devote himself, or herself, wholly to religious matters, while the married man, or woman, must needs mix much in the matters of the world. This division between the sacred and the secular is alien from the spirit of Hinduism, which sees God immanent in everything, and teaches that He can be as truly served in the home as in the jungle. "He who, established in unity, worshippeth Me abiding in all beings, that Yogî

liveth in Me, whatever his mode of living."[1] It is part of the general orderliness of Hinduism that each human power has its own place in human life: celibacy belongs to three out of the four âshramas, those of youth and old age, but for manhood in its prime, life in the world and lived for the benefit of the world is the normal rule. There may be, indeed, exceptional cases, but they are rare. This difference in the view of a religious life is largely due to the fact that ordinary Christianity has lost sight of the fact of re-incarnation; the Christian thinks that he has but one life, the present one between cradle and grave, and that on this life his everlasting fate depends; hence the life in this world is not regarded as valuable in itself, but only in its bearing on the future; the life most wisely spent is that which is made only a preparation for the future, and "the religious life" is the one which is wholly devoted to that preparation. In Hinduism, the man knows that he returns to this world many times, that he spends here life after life, and he regards this life as important because it is the training-ground of the soul, the field in which he unfolds his divine powers; this is the world out of the three worlds in which the seed is sown, the harvest whereof is reaped and eaten in Bhuvarloka and Svargaloka. From this life, also,

[1] *Bhagavad-Gita.* vi. 31.

must he ultimately reach Nirvâṇa. Hence this life looms large in its importance—here is the evolution of the Ego, here must the bonds of the heart be broken. It is not a very brief space which decides an everlasting future, but a part of a long life, lived in the three worlds in definite and repeated succession.

Another doctrine that influences the views taken of the household life by Christianity and by Hinduism arises from the fact that the sense of a fundamental duality pervades the one, and the sense of a fundameantal unity the other. Christianity drew from the later Zoroastrianism the idea that the world is ruled by two opposing Powers, one good, the other evil, God and Devil. This view separates life into two parts, one in which God is served by self-denial, and the other in which the devil is served by self-indulgence. The first is the life of the spiritual man; the second that of the carnal man. Hence by a natural transition, the life of the carnal man was regarded as evil, and the lower nature as a foe to be slain.

Now it is profoundly true that the lower nature should be subordinated to the higher; that as a master it is dangerous, nay fatal to spiritual progress. But it is to be ruled, not exterminated; it is not of itself evil. It has its own rightful place in the divine economy, and is to be purified and en-

nobled for heroic living. Enjoyment, pleasure, the joy of life, the vigour of manhood, these are good not evil; they are of divine ordination, from the Hindu point of view. The idea that happiness is, in some way, wrong or dubious, in some way grudged to man by God, is found very largely in Christianity, especially in countries in which Puritanism has held sway. Happiness grasped at without regard for the happiness and comfort of others is certainly wrong, but when happiness as such is condemned a twisted and mistaken asceticism results. The sourness of Puritanism is irreligious not religious, and clouds the world that God has made so fair. It largely colours the Teutonic type of mind—the German, the English, the American. God is thought of as though He were jealous of human happiness instead of being the source of it. But in Hinduism "Duty, Pleasure, Profit" is the phrase in which the right life of the world is summed up. Dharma, Duty, certainly comes first and is to rule the whole life; but Pleasure not contrary to Dharma, Profit not contrary to Dharma, these also are recognised as rightful parts of human life. And this is the maxim for the life of the householder. It is to be full of duty, duty faithfully discharged; but it is also to be redolent of pleasure—pleasure in conjugal love, pleasure in parentage, pleasure in the little ones that fill the

household ways with laughter. This natural happiness is as much God-given as strenuous labour and heroic death, and this should fill with its glow and beauty the righteous household life.

In this life of duty, pleasure and profit the householder is to find his opportunities of self-culture; he is to train himself, he is to be trained by the circumstances of life. In the student-life he was trained and disciplined by others: now his training and discipline fall into his own hands. He profits and learns by life's events, its joys and, sorrows: these stimulate the evolution of his powers and herein lies the importance of household life.

I have said that Hinduism regards the household life as of supreme importance. "The four separate orders spring from the householder." [1] "As all creatures live supported by the air, so the other orders exist supported by the householder. Of all these (âshramas), by the declaration of the Veda the householder is the highest; he verily supporteth the other three. As all streams and rivers flow to rest in the ocean, so all the âshramas flow to rest in the householder." [2] It is the supporter, the maintainer, the preserver of the other three âshramas. The whole business of the world is carried on by this. The conduct of the world depends on the right leading of the household life. The

[1] *Manusmṛiti*, vi, 87. [2] *Ibid.* iii, 77, 89, 90.

Brahmacharî contributes nothing to the turning of the wheel of life ; he has to be fed, clothed, sheltered, educated, and to all this he can contribute nothing. The Vânaprastha spends his days in sacrifice, in meditation ; he helps the world in the mental region not in the physical, and for his physical sustenance he depends on the householder. So is it also with the Sannyâsî. None of these can live save as they are supported by the Garhastha. All depend on him for the preservation of their physical lives and without him their lives are impossible. Hence, it is said that on this âshrama all the other âshramas depend.

The household is the centre of the State, and the householder the centre of the house ; hence he is the representative of Vişhṇu, round whom the universe revolves. Vişhṇu has been called the great Householder, for what Vişhṇu is to the universe the householder is to the nation. He is the preserver, the maintainer, the supporter of all. So great, so noble, is the life of the householder that lies before you, according to the Hindu Shâstras.

When should this life begin ?

It should begin with marriage. When the young man weds a wife, he becomes a Garhastha. And this he can only do, according to the ancient rule, when his student-life is over. During the student-life he lived with his teacher, and under the

teacher's control. It was only when the period of instruction was finished, when the symbolical bath had been taken, when he had returned home, that his parents gave him a wife, and he became a householder. Under the joint family system he did not, it is true, become quite independent ; the transition was gradual, and the guiding hand of the father was not wholly withdrawn. Still he had to practise ruling his own part of the household, as children were born to him and his own family circle grew up around him. And later, when the elder saw his grandchildren around him, and his son no longer in need of his supervision, he then passed on into the Vânaprastha Âshrama, leaving his son as the sole ruler of the household.

It is true that in modern India much confusion has arisen, both from the marriage being interpolated into the life of the student, and from the almost total disappearance of the third and fourth âshramas from Indian life. But public opinion is beginning to turn against premature marriages, and to recognise that the mixture of the two stages tends to confuse both. When the student stage is over, the young man, after a youth of absolute continence and purity, full of vigour and vitality, with virility unwasted by premature marriage and parentage, should enter joyfully into the household life. He comes robed in ideal chastity, pure to a pure wife.

with mind pure as body, thoughts clean and unpolluted. And he comes also to his new kingdom with habits of obedience to rightful authority, and fitted thereby to exercise authority, fit to take up his new responsibilities and duties. And the first subject of that kingdom is the girl-wife, taught to look up to her husband as her Guru, subject indeed, but also his friend and counsellor, to wield with him the authority over the household, to reign in her husband's house. But we will not here consider the wedded life, for the Ideal of Hindu Marriage is to be studied on another occasion. Here we need only note that he has to learn how to rule, for in his kingdom there will presently be children and servants, and in many cases there will already be youngers, the brothers and sisters, to whom he owes something of help and guidance. He must be a kind and considerate sovereign, if he has learned aright the lessons of obedience.

He comes from the Brahmacharya Âshrama also imbued with the idea of service, and trained to render it ungrudgingly. As a Brahmacharî he learned to serve God, his parents and his teachers ; now a wider circle of service expands around him ; he is to serve all who come within his reach in this world and the next. According to the fundamental idea of Hinduism, added power means added duty, and hence taking up the responsibility of the elder to the

younger, of the ruler to the ruled, means the rendering of service to them. Service was one of his duties as a Brahmacharî, and it now expands to be the predominant idea of the householder, whose whole life is given to the service of all around him. The claims for help come in from all sides, and to all he has duties. And in the discharge of these certain virtues are especially needed, as we shall see in a moment.

The household life belongs, of course, to all four castes, and many of the duties will vary with the caste. As the caste is higher, the duties become heavier, the burdens greater, but the discharge of duty lies equally on all. The Brâhmaṇa's special duty is sacrificing, teaching, counselling, and in the ancient days he helped the other castes, especially the Kṣhattriyas, in playing their several parts in the national life. The Kṣhattriya's special duty lies in ruling, protecting, guiding, administering, and this demanded the most complete self-sacrifice, the whole safety of the State, its guarding alike from invasion from without and from disturbance from within, depending on his diligent discharge of duty. The Vaishya's special duty is to secure the commercial greatness of the State, and the material prosperity and wealth of the nation depend on him. This makes him in a special sense the type of the householder, who holds the household together

supplying all its material wants. The Shûdra's special duty lies in material service, as the foundation of the nation. All these enter the life of the householder according to their castes, and these will come before us as we study the Ideal of the Hindu State. But the householder, quâhouseholder, may be said to play the part of each caste in his household : for as a priest of the household he is as a Brâhmaṇa ; as protector of the household he is as a Kṣhattriya ; as provider for the household he is as a Vaishya ; as servant of the household he is as a Shûdra. Everywhere in noble human life we see service ; and the householder incarnates service. The householder does not live primarily for himself, but for the family. Pleasure, indeed, he is to have, as we have seen, but first comes duty. The hardships of the student-life have made his body strong and enduring, and he is fit for the strenuous household life. With such a body he can fully perform his duties, and is then ready for the pleasures which sweeten the householder's daily life.

He must have a strong character, otherwise he will not be an ideal Garhastha. There is too much tendency in modern India to lay stress on the softer virtues and to ignore the sterner, but the presence of the sterner virtues is vital for the national welfare. I note in the reports of debating clubs how much the lads' thoughts run to the softer,

the more passive, virtues. They discuss "Love," "Tenderness," "Compassion," "Forgiveness," and so on; well and good; but these form only a part of the character, and the sterner virtues must not be forgotten. Justice, strength, vigour, defence of the right—these are equally needed. The peace and order of the household demand these from the householder; he must prevent injustice being done, must be firm and impartial, enforcing right order, able to blame as well as to praise, to rebuke as well as to encourage. The young ones dispute; he must decide justly, impartially. The servants quarrel; he must firmly repress the disorderly, and decide fairly between opposing parties. A weak man at the head of a household means discomfort, discontent, disaster. The rule must be firm as well as kind, steady as well as considerate. Herein the householder is helped by the habit of self-control obtained in the student life, and the self-restraint he then exercised now enables him to become a just and a clear-sighted judge.

Let us now turn from these general considerations, and see what are the special virtues needed in the Ideal Householder. The general outline is now clearly seen; let us note the characteristic virtues, without which no man can represent to any extent the Ideal. These may be

said to be seven in number, and they stand to the life of the householder as Service, Study, Simplicity, Self-control, stood to the life of the student. They are: DILIGENCE, SELF-RESTRAINT, RIGHTEOUSNESS, COURTESY, HOSPITALITY, TENDERNESS AND PROTECTION. Each of these gathers up into itself a whole group of virtues, and each is fundamental for the Ideal Householder.

The day in which these are to be his prominent characteristics begins with the offering of sacrifice, for the Five Sacrifices, in their inner meaning not in their dead letter, should colour and sanctify the household life. The sacrifice to the Devas is not merely the offering of Homa, the performance of Sandhyâ, or other outward ceremony, though these are good: but the co-operation of the human with the Deva race for the due maintence of natural order—the orderly succession of the seasons, rain and sunshine each at its appropriate time, the wintry cold, the summer heat, all these largely depend on this co-operation between Devas and men. We read in the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ* that Devas and men should nourish each other: "nourishing each other ye shall reap the supremest good."[1] In the old days, when the order of nature was disturbed, the question ever asked was: "Has the King failed in his duty;

1 *Bhagavad-Gîtâ*. iii. 11.

has any caste broken its Dharma? has any man overstepped his due limits?" Failures in natural order were put down to irregularities on the part of men. Many of the difficulties in modern India grow out of the dislocation of the right co-operation between the Devas and men. Famines, plague, natural disorders of every kind are due to the neglect of the harmony enjoined by the ancient teachers. Men now regard themselves as the sole owners and masters of the world, instead of being, at the most, part-owners, and truly regarded, being servants of Îshvara, of whom both Devas and men are ministers. The second sacrifice, that to the Ṛiṣhis, places on the householder the duty of daily study of the Vedas, or of some other sacred and profound book, so that he may in the early morning come into touch with some great mind, and profit by the contact. The value of such contact is not sufficiently appreciated; it calms and soothes the mind, surrounds it with a serene atmosphere and shields it from worry and anxiety, strengthening it to meet the inevitable troubles of the daily life. Even a few minutes of such quiet study brings the peace of the greater mind into the lesser.

The third sacrifice, that to the Pitṛis, should not be the mere pouring out of water to a few personal ancestors, but the grateful recognition of the debt owed to the immeasurable past, and the feeling of

responsibility owed to the immeasurable future. In this long chain of innumerable generations each householder is a single link, and he must remember that if one link be weak, if he himself be weak, that wondrous chain in past and future may in him be broken or defiled. The fourth sacrifice, to men, is paid by the householder in the hospitality shewn to the guest, the alms given to the beggar. And the fifth sacrifice, to the lower beings in this and in the next world, is fulfilled when he feeds the helpless creatures round him, who represent the whole. He must remember that round his household no animal must suffer hunger or cruelty ; the starving dog or cat, the over-driven horse or over-loaded bullock, leaves a stain of wrong-doing on the life of the householder, who is responsible to Îshvara for these helpless ones, placed in the hands of men for training and for growth in evolution.

Thus fortified by sacrifice, he is to practise the virtues of his Âshrama.

DILIGENCE. This virtue implies ready and active application to every duty of life, the prompt attention to the work of the hour, so that each task is fulfilled at its appointed time. The householder, with his multifarious duties, has special need of the virtue of diligence, for sloth, inaccuracy and procrastination will render the whole household disorderly and confused. He must be ready to

meet each moment's claim; he must not put off any work at its due season; if accounts are to be looked to, he must not be reading; if it is the time for looking after his children, he should not turn to other work. In his outside vocation, the same virtue should rule the working hours; if he be a subordinate, he must work as hard when his superior's face is turned away as when he is present, for he works from duty and not from fear of blame or from desire for praise. He must ever remember that the wheel of life is kept turning by the unwearied labour of Vishṇu,[1] and as His representative he must also labour unwearyingly. But his diligence will be continually interrupted and disturbed, if he have not the virtue of

SELF-RESTRAINT. Already, in the Brahmacharya Âshrama, he had cultivated this virtue, and his practice then is of the highest value now. For in the household life there is the due exercise of the senses, and this fact makes it all the more necessary that the mind should exercise control over the senses. Temperance, not celibacy, is the note of the householder, and temperance is often more difficult than abstinence. As is said in the well-known passage in the *Kaṭhopaniṣhat*,[2] the

1 *Bhagavad-Gita* iii. 22-24.

2 *Loc. cit.* iii. 3-6.

senses are the horses and the mind is the reins; the horse guided and controlled by the reins in the hand of the rider is useful, but if the reins should break, or should drop from the slack fingers, the horse becomes dangerous both to his rider and himself. So also Manu points out the danger of allowing even a single sense to escape from the control of the mind: "If one sense of all the senses leaks, then understanding leaketh through it, as water from the leg of the water-skin."[1] No more graphic illustration could be given of the way in which understanding disappears when even one sense is allowed to escape from control; if there be but one hole, the soundness of the remaining part of the water-skin availeth nothing. Most necessary also is the control of speech. The householder is the king of the little household kingdom; he orders, advises, controls all, and none may order or control him. If the younger speak sharply to each other, he, the head, can say: "Speak softly;" but if his own tongue be sharp, if his own speech be ungentle, there is none who may say to him: "You should curb your tongue." Hence it is imperative that he should himself exercise due restraint of speech, that he should be gentle and considerate, because he is responsible to none save to Îshvara. And the self-restraint must be within as

[1] *Manusmṛiti*, ii, 99.

well as without; it is not enough to put a seal upon the lips, to curb the tongue, to check the angry speech. If his mind be disturbed, his temper irritated, his inner serenity ruffled, he cannot be fair, just, unwavering. Many little quarrels occur in the household; children quarrel; servants quarrel; all turn to the head for just decision. If he be irritated, if he be partial, the peace and order of the household will be destroyed. Into the householder flow all the troubles of the household—troubles of wife, of children, of younger brothers and sisters, of servants. All the streams of trouble flow into him as the rivers flow into the ocean. And as the ocean remains unchanged, no matter how many rivers flow into it, as it swallows them all up, as it sends its waters to form clouds, and, retaining the bitter salts for itself, yields only the pure water which falls again as fertilising rain, so must the householder do with all the household troubles. He must let the streams of troubles flow into him, must retain in himself the bitterness and the harshness, and send out only the pure waters of peace and soothing calm to fertilise the household life. On his strong serenity will be built the household peace, and to preserve this serenity, self-restraint is necessary.

RIGHTEOUSNESS must distinguish him in all the relations of life, and this implies the doing of

each duty as it arises, without over-doing or under-doing. It implies accuracy, exact justice, impartiality, balance, the recognition of the claims of each, the loyal fulfilment of every obligation. Where righteousness is found there dwells Lakshmî the Devî of Prosperity, but unrighteousness drives Her from the abode which it pollutes. Once Indra and Nârada saw the Devî Shrî riding on Garuḍa, and asked whence She had come and whither She was going. Then Shrî, who is Lakshmî, said that She had been dwelling with the Daityas and Dânavas, and that She ever attached Herself to those who were righteous; they had been self-restrained and truthful, charitable and contented; they had discharged faithfully every duty, and had showed compassion to the weak; they had maintained right discipline and due order; they had followed virtue and injured none. But their conduct had changed and they had fallen away from righteousness, and had disregarded their duties; hence had Shrî abandoned them; for prosperity cannot remain where righteousnes is banished.[1] But where righteousness is embodied in the householder, in that house Lakshmî resides.

In the old days COURTESY, urbanity, was a most marked virtue among Hindus. In modern days in the West—and the same idea is affecting

[1] *Mahâbhârata*. Shânti Parva. ccxxviii.

many in the East—the value of gracious manners and dignified address is comparatively disregarded. People seem to think that roughness and even rudeness are trivial and superficial errors, and that they should be excused as "mere faults of manner." Really they go far below the surface and imply bluntness of feeling and blameable indifference to the feelings of others. Moreover they are signs of weakness, for the weak man blusters and is rude in order to conceal his inner fear that he will not be respected or obeyed. The strong and confident man can afford to be courteous, being sure of his own strength and of his power to enforce obedience if necessary. He does not need to assert himself by rudeness. Tennyson has put well the true significance of courtesy in his *Idylls of the King*. You remember how Queen Guinevere "had fled the court," and was sitting in the holy house of Almesbury with a little novice, who, childlike, questioned her about the court, unknowing that she was the hapless Queen. And she asked who was the most nobly mannered man of all? was King Arthur or Sir Lancelot the more gracious? And the Queen answered :

> Sir Lancelot, as became a noble knight
> Was gracious to all ladies; and the same
> In open battle or the tilting-field
> Forbore his own advantage ; and the King

In open battle or the tilting-field
Forbore his own advantage ; and these two
Were the most nobly mannered men of all ;
For manners are not idle, but the fruit
Of loyal nature and of noble mind.

The nobly mannered is the nobly minded. In the nobly mannered man there is nothing mean, grovelling, base, cowardly. The outer courtesy is the sign of the inner grace. Do not, then, be misled by the foolish modern idea that manners are unimportant, and may safely be neglected. The ancient Hindus were models of courtesy, suave in speech, gentle in manner, greeting friend and foe alike with soft words and smiling lips. Courtesy is the high polish taken by strong and clean metal ; the bar of steel may be known by its polish from the base alloy.

HOSPITALITY, again, was one of the antique virtues, and it persists to a marked extent among the Indians of to-day. Still the guest is as the master of the house, coming at his own will, staying for his own time. Still is recognised the stringent obligation to treat the guest as a Deva. In the West the guest is invited, and the invitation implies a certain friendliness ; he is asked, as a rule, for a specified time ; he must be careful not to "overstay his welcome." But in the East the arriving guest, though oft a stranger, came with full certainty of welcome, and he was regarded as one who bestow-

ed, rather than as one who received, a benefit. He offered the opportunity for the discharge of one of the most sacred duties of the householder, the duty of hospitality, and hence was benefactor rather than benefitted. Did not Manu write: "Grass, room, water, and, fourthly, a kind word—these are never wanting in the houses of the good".[1] The householder must feed the guest ere he feeds himself, and many are the stories told of the straits to which men reduced themselves in fulfilling the duties of hospitality. Who does not remember the story of the mongoose at Yudhiṣhṭhira's famous sacrifice? And list to the story of the pigeon: a fowler had captured his tender mate, and had then taken refuge under the tree in which the wedded birds had built their nest. As he lay there, he heard the pigeon lamenting his partner's fate, and the encaged mate also heard it, and cried aloud to her dear lord that the fowler, storm-driven, was in hapless plight, and, having taken shelter beneath their tree, now was their guest. Then the pigeon asked the fowler what service he could render, and, on hearing he was stiff with cold and rain, he gathered leaves and sticks, and lighted them with a charcoal fragment from a neighbouring hut. Then asked the fowler for food, and the pigeon, having nought to give save his own slender body, flew into the

1 *Manusmṛiti*. iii. 101.

fire and offered his own flesh as food for the unbidden guest.[1] The modern reader will say, with a sniff of contemptuous disdain: "Extravagant and foolish is the tale." And yet it embodies in most vivid fashion the idea of the service due by the householder to the guest, and thus impresses on the reader's mind the duty of uttermost hospitality.

Great stress is laid in the Shâstras on the virtue of TENDERNESS, a virtue so necessary in the householder, surrounded by youngers and weakers, so vital to the happiness of the household. The necessity of tenderness is impressed on the mind in many significant phrases, the weak being regarded as having a claim, by their weakness, to the privileges yielded to age, to rank, to wealth. When Manu lays down the rule for making way for those met in the street, he naturally orders that way should be made for a King, for a bridegroom, for one in a carriage, for a man over ninety years of age; but note the tenderness of the thought which underlies the directions: "for a sick person, for one who carries a load, for a woman."[2] So also when the householder, intent on the duties of hospitality, is preparing to set food before his household, see the tenderness of the thought which regulates the order in which food is to be given.

1 *Mahâbhârata*. Shânti Parva. cxliii—cxlix.

2 *Manusmṛiti*. ii. 138.

"Let him feed newly-married woman, young maidens, the sick, and pregnant women, even before his guests."[1] Tenderness to the weak and the helpless is the mark of the really manly nature, and happy is the household at the head of which stands a man who is tender as well as strong.

Such a man will shew out the virtue of PROTECTION, that truly royal virtue which every householder must manifest. He must be the lover, the friend, the counsellor of all in the household, the one to whom all turn instinctively for help, for comfort, for refuge, whether in sorrow or in sin. The sweet sure shelter of his arms must ever be open to those dependent on him; they must be able to flee thither, as to a refuge, in all the storms and troubles of the world. The householder must be to his household a strong wall of defence, guarding it from all attacks of evil, shielding it, as far as is possible, from all distress and pain. On him must beat the icy winds of harassment, on him must fall the scorching rays of burning anxiety, in order that under the shelter provided by his love and strength the young plants that have in them the promise of the future may grow and thrive uninjured.

Such is the Ideal of the Hindu Householder, the Ideal of the life that lies before you, the Ideal

[1] *Manusmṛiti*, iii. 114.

which you, in the future, to some extent should fulfil. Prepare then for it now, my sons, so that in the course of a few years you may be ready to enter it, and to live it not unworthily. To such high destiny are you called, to build the households that build the country. To such high service are you bidden, to be in the future the fathers of a greater India. And I end on the note struck in the earlier part of the lecture; Viṣhṇu is the Great Householder; what Viṣhṇu is to His universe, that let the householder be to the Nation.

——:o:——

FOURTH LECTURE.

THE HINDU MARRIAGE.

The progress and prosperity of every country depend upon the Ideal of Marriage which dominates the thought of the people, and on the extent to which that Ideal is carried out in conduct. The relation of the sexes is the root relation which lies at the very foundation of society, and on the home is builded the whole fabric of social order, social purity, and social peace. Hence any changes in the Ideal of Marriage existing among a people are changes which should be made with the utmost caution, with the utmost deliberation and forethought. But, on the other hand, since marriage touches each individual life, and makes or mars the happiness of each life, care and deliberation and forethought are exceptionally difficult to obtain. Hasty and ill-considered proposals are put forward to meet patent and painful difficulties, and too often the adoption of a proposal, made to meet a local trouble or a few special cases, would mean far-reaching disaster and much multiplied miseries. The younger members of the

community are particularly liable to be swept off their feet by such proposals; youth's enthusiasm, one-sidedness, want of experience in the varied departments of life, all combine to cause the hasty acceptance of "reforms" which would do away with obvious sufferings, and the boy does not stop to ask whether these "reforms" would also entail sufferings even greater than those which they remove. The social order is an organism of many closely inter-related parts, and the change of one fundamental portion implies the dislocation of all the rest. For any effective and beneficial changes to be made in marriage-laws, ripe and wide experience, balanced judgment, clear vision, and absence of passion are supremely necessary. Ill-considered changes will give serious shocks to the whole social fabric, built on and conserved by marriage.

I shall try to show you the bearing of the Ideal of Marriage on social happiness and prosperity, on individual character and evolution; and also the bearing on that Ideal of some modern "reforms" and ideas; so that you may be able to grasp more fully all that marriage means, and all that depends on it, and thereby may be able to form a sober and sane judgment on this hotly-debated problem in modern India. For you will have to face this problem a few years hence, and do your

part in solving it. God grant that you may help to solve it in a way that means India's salvation, and not in a way that means her undoing!

Let us consider first the relation of the two sexes to each other.

Looking at this in the widest possible way, we see in man and woman the two halves of humanity. That very phrase points to the true relation between them; the two sexes are not identical, they are not antagonistic, they are complementary. The tendency in the West has been to throw them into antagonism, to make them competitors, the one against the other, in the battle of life, rivals for employment, rivals for wages, rivals for fame and power; the "Rights of Woman" have been opposed to the "Rights of Man," and there has been fierce discussion, hot war of pens and words, much anger and much bitterness, contemptuous sneers from the one side, passionate outcries from the other. And yet the sexes are not antagonistic, and neither can reach its highest without the co-operation of the other. Truly complementary are they, each supplying what the other lacks, each giving that in which the other is deficient, and together making up the perfect whole. Each "half" is necessarily incomplete; it cries out for, it demands, the other, and the whole only appears when the separated halves are linked in one. This is a fact

in nature, and that which we find in nature is a divine revelation; that which is against nature is against the divine law, and is foredoomed to failure. Whoever may urge it, whatever arguments may support it, nay, though it be claimed as part of a scripture, that which is against nature is false, and is destined for destruction. For nature is the outer manifestation of God, and the principles underlying nature are the divine thoughts, the divine will.

That the sexes are complementary to each other is proclaimed by nature in plant and in animal as well as in humanity; it is a natural fact, sung by every bird that carols to his mate, seen in every flower that dances in the breeze. And this universal truth in nature is proclaimed in the Hindu Shâstras, is the basis of the Hindu Ideal of Marriage, permeates Indian thought as expressed in Hindu literature. Brahmâ, in creating, divides his own body in twain, and one half is male, the other female. Throughout the great hierarchies of the ruling Intelligences male and female are seen; beside each Deva is enthroned the Devî. And they are fundamentally and essentially one whole, for is it not said in the *Devî-Bhâgavata* that when the Shaktî turns towards the world she is Mâyâ, and when she turns towards the Lord she is seen to be Himself.

Thus has Hinduism ever seen man and woman, fundamentally one being in two different forms, and this idea forms the basis of the Hindu Ideal of Marriage. Quarrel, dispute, antagonism are unthinkable, inconceivable, unnatural. Can the heart and the head contend, the right hand fight with the left?

When we look at man and woman physically, we see the divergence in structure and yet the unity of type. Physically, mentally, spiritually, they differ each from each, and in the blending of the two, balance, equilibrium, is found. Thus in man the muscular system is more largely developed than in woman; on the other hand, the glandular system is more largely developed in woman than in man. The different part played by each in the reproduction of the species demands this difference in the physical constitution, and it cannot be changed, till women cease to be mothers, and men fathers. With this differing physical development is connected a different emotional and intellectual development. In woman emotion prevails over intellect; in man intellect over emotion. Woman is quick, intuitional, receptive; man is cautious, logical, resistant. If such differences be looked at from the standpoint of separation, antagonism will appear. Woman will think man slow, stupid, cold, heavy; man will think woman hasty, irrational,

illogical, impulsive. But join the two together in loving co-operation, and each helps the other; the one is restrained from headlong decision and action, the other is stimulated and often finds in woman's swift intuitions an indication for reason. If then we want a complete view of, and complete action on, any subject, we must take man and woman together, not apart. Together, wisdom and right balance may be obtained; together, they can judge accurately, and act wisely, with due consideration for human nature, aud a full understanding of human needs.

This completion of the one by the other is fully recognised in ancient Hinduism. If in the household the man is priest, so also is the woman priestess. For the due performance of the household ceremonies, the wife must be beside the husband; together they are consecrated for special sacrifices; everywhere they are side by side. Man and woman together perform the highest religious functions, and so also in the household. The celibate cannot perform such rites, for the wife is needed as ministrant. The custom in ancient Egypt was similar, and none of the higher and more sacred religious functions cnuld be performed by the male priests alone. Indeed, in Egypt they went even further, for there the woman was regarded as more

spiritual than the man, and in religious matters the husband was subordinate to the wife. In various occult ceremonies the presence of the woman was absolutely necessary, and if the male priest were not married an aged woman was made his companion in the function.

In later times, the growth of an undue and unnatural asceticism caused woman to be very differently regarded, and though Christianity is the most grievous offender against womanhood in this respect, we cannot acquit later Hinduism of similar fault. The ascetic, who had not really conquered his lower nature, and who had put on prematurely the ascetic garb, regarded woman as his most dangerous enemy, as the lure from the ideal he desired to reach. Both Hindus and Christians have applied to woman the most opprobrious terms as the tempter of man, the evil spirit that allures him from celibacy and asceticism. Perhaps it is fair to remember that in all these cases the writers were men, and blamed the woman rather than their own moral weakness and their own unbridled nature. May be, had women written of their trials, the same harsh terms might have been applied to men. The man who is trying to attain to Yoga naturally sees in woman the embodiment of the delights of sense which he is trying to evade. So might the woman, the would-be Yogini, see in

man the chief obstacle to her success, save that the senses, as a rule, are not as violent in the woman as in the man. Thus from the higher point of view, in spiritual things woman is seen as a potent help; from the lower, she is a snare.

Manu, on this matter, speaks with an uncertain voice, for while there are many passages in which he extols woman, and yields to her the loftiest position, there are a few in which he takes up the ascetic view of her as the tempter of man. Thus he declares: "Manu assigned to women...impure desires, wrath, dishonesty, malice and bad conduct," and yet he says that there is no difference between wives "who are worthy of worship and illuminate their homes," and the Devî of fortune.[1] The statements are flatly contradictory. I do not know how the orthodox Hindu explains these passages; for myself I regard some of the passages as interpolations, obviously shewing the temper of a later day, when the woman as the embodiment of sense temptations was regarded as the great enemy of the ascetic, the creature whose very nature was evil, and who must ever be kept under strict restraint, lest she should work havoc on helpless man. But Manu strikes a nobler note when he writes: "Women confined in the house under trustworthy and obedient servants are not really guarded, but those

1 *Manusmṛiti*, ix, 17 & 26.

who, of their own accord, keep guard over themselves, are truly guarded." [1] And Hindu women have proved in all ages, from Sîtâ and Damayantî downwards, that they need no guard save their own high honour and spotless chastity, invulnerable amid a host of foes. Is it credible that a nation with such ideals of womanhood, pure and brave, should now condescend to the zenana ?

What then is the Ideal of Marriage founded on this general view of the relation of the sexes to each other? Manu says: "Thus much even is a man: his wife, himself and his offspring; Brâhmaṇas say thus also: 'The husband and wife are known as the same.'" [2] Marriage is a unity; out of twain one is made; they are no longer two but one. The perfect man is not the Jîvâtmâ in the male body only, but the wife is included in him. Moreover of the wife it is written: "There is no difference whatsoever in the house between Shrî and the wife, who is the mother of the children, who brings good fortune, who is worthy of worship, the light of the home. Of the bearing of children, the protection of those born, the continuance of the world-process, woman is evidently the only source. Children, religious ceremonies, marital happiness, heaven for one's ancestors and oneself, depend on the wife." [3] "To be mothers were

[1] *Manusmṛiti*. ix. 12. [2] *Ibid*. 45. [3] *Ibid*. 26-28.

women created and to be fathers men,"[1] and hence all women must be honoured and treated with loving respect. "Women are to be honoured and adorned by fathers and brothers, by husbands, and also by brothers-in-law, who desire much prosperity. Where women are honoured, there the Devas rejoice; but where they are not honoured there all rites are fruitless. Where women grieve, that family quickly perishes; but where they do not grieve, it ever prospers. Houses which women, unhonoured, curse, those perish utterly as though blighted by magic."[2]

The relation of the husband and wife is to be lifelong. From the Devas a man receives a wife and he must ever be faithful to her: "Let mutual fidelity continue until death; this is the summation of the highest law for husband and wife."[3] Lifelong fidelity, complete unity, is the Hindu Ideal of Marriage.

Further, the husband is the Guru of the wife, her spiritual preceptor, and he owes to her the duty of right instruction, of constant aid in treading the paths of the higher life. Alas! too often, in modern India the husband has grown sceptical and materialistic, totally unfit to lead his wife to spiritual knowledge. Rather, indeed, has the Hindu Dharma found its refuge in the heart

1 *Manusmriti*. 96. 2 *Ibid*. iii. 55-58. 3 *Ibid*. ix. 95, 101.

of India's women, a sure temple whence it may never be driven. Mutual regard, mutual honour and respect is the Ideal; the husband gives protection, the wife reverence and obedience, and each gives to each faithful affection, counsel, aid, in all the varying circumstances of life. As the head should guide the heart, and the heart inspire and stimulate the head, so should it be with true man and true woman united in marriage.

While such is the Ideal of Marriage as set forth by precept, illustrations of this Ideal are found plentifully in the Purâṇas and Itihâsa. Let us take that most shining example of all, Shrî Râmachandra and Sîtâ. Smooth and joyous are the early married days, and they lead the wedded pair onwards by flowery paths till they stand on the steps of the throne. The blow falls on Râmachandra, and the decree of exile has gone forth. Little recks fair Sîtâ, to whom the forest-dwelling seems but as a merry change of scene and mode of living. She assumes as a matter of course that her path lies beside her husband's, and notice the astonishment, the refusal to believe, growing into passionate repudiation of the bare idea of separation, and then into insistent urging, as the grave sad face of the beloved tells of the impending parting. How the eager words trip over each other as she pleads, as she refutes the idea that she cannot

bear uninjured the hardships which must environ him. Thorns would be soft as linen. dust as sandal, grass as blanket, roots and leaves as nectar if he, the beloved, were with her. "Do thou accept my prayer, whose heart is wholly thine, knowing not another, ever clinging to thee, resolute to die if left by thee." "O Râma, thy company is heaven and thine absence hell. Let me die at once if thou forsakest me. I cannot bear this grief for one brief moment; how then shall I live without thee for fourteen years?" [1] When, moved by her tender pleading, her husband yields the permission to accompany him, how swiftly returns her happiness of heart, how she gaily tosses away her jewels and her royal robes, careless of all her rich array since the jewel of her heart is left to her, and hers the only eyes whose shining is not dimmed with tears as the peerless son of Dasharatha treads his stately way into the forest, shorn of all regal pomp, bark-clad and locks dishevelled. And Sîtâ was as strong to stand alone in sorrow as she was tenderly clinging when Râmachandra was beside her. See how she faces death, and thrusts back the dishonour which is more than death, as she stands a captive in the fierce presence of Râvana of Lankâ, and of his yet fiercer Râkshasîs; no weakling this, no feeble sentimental lover, but strong and brave,

[1] *Shrî Râmachandra*, 53, 54.

her fortitude as splendid as her purity; "As the rays of the sun belong to him, so am I Râghava's alone." And so patient and withal so proud, that she will not accept escape by Hanumân's gently tendered service; Râma alone shall deliver her; if he rescue her not, she will remain a prisoner.

Sîtâ stands out supreme, in truth, yet is she by no means solitary, for round her throng fair women, only less great and sweet than she; Damayantî, tenderest of wives, seeing in Nala's waywardness and misfortunes only fresh food for love; Sâvitrî, whose dauntless courage won back her husband from the gripping noose of Death; Shakuntalâ, forgotten and deserted, but keeping faith unstained and love unbroken; Draupadî, flung from palace into bondage, bending her proud neck to the yoke of love—all these sweet names sound out like notes of music, bringing to the memories of all that hear them the soft melodious strains in blended harmonies, that sing of perfect wifehood, strong and sweet and pure.

Sometimes this perfection in the wife is mated with equal perfection in the husband, as witness Râmachandra's deathless love, Satyavân's nobility of nature, Yudhiṣhṭhira's patient and forbearing strength; sometimes a weakess in the husband brings out into stronger relief the wife's stainless devotion, and she adds the forgiving tenderness of

the injured mother to the soft yielding of the wife.

The women of those older days were not only the petted delights of their husbands, the bright radiance of their homes, they were counsellors, advisers, in the hour of difficulty and of peril. Draupadî advises with Yudhiṣhṭhira; Sîtâ gives to Râmachandra prudent timely counsel; Gândhârî comes into the open Sabhâ to remonstrate with Duryodhana when all others have failed to persuade and to restrain. In the ancient days there was no zenana, no imprisonment of the woman in the house. She was not confined within four walls as now, but shared her husband's wider interests, his larger life, and so was fitted to be the mother of noble sons, fitted to be their counsellor in difficulty, their comprehending refuge in distress.

There is one phenomenon met in Indian story which startles and shocks the modern mind, and which truly, in later days, became an abuse, though its relation to the ancient Ideal is easily to be traced—the phenomenon of Satî.

Verily is it a crime to compel a wife to sacrifice herself herself on her husband's funeral pyre, but the full admission of this need not blind us to the origin of the custom, nor to the occult truth that underlay it. For it has a side other than that which modern eyes have seen, and which is hidden, partly

because the occult fact is not known, partly because the feeling which prompted the Satî of ancient days is now so rare.

In the perfect realisation of the Ideal of Marriage, the lives of husband and wife became so intertwined that any separation of them was *impossible*; as the ivy twining round the oak becomes one with it, and when the oak falls the ivy falls with it, so was it with the two lives made one. When therefore the husband died, the wife died also, not by outer compulsion but by inner will-power; a self-generated fire, result of stainless chastity and perfect love, broke out within the body of the wife who willed to tread the path of Death with her beloved, and thus the body was consumed. Strange, truly, to modern ears, and yet those who know that the body is full of electric currents and that electric currents obstructed generate heat of glowing red and of white intensity, may have an inkling that there is nothing impossible in the theory. Hindu students may remember how Damayantî, threatened with outrage, sent forth from her pure body a flame that consumed the hunter. There are hidden forces in Nature whereof men know but little, and at the mention of which they jeer, although the many strange discoveries of modern science should, by this time, have taught caution to those who base

their scepticism merely on ignorance of the secrets yet hidden in Nature's bosom. A few such instances of devoted wives in ancient India, who died by self-generated fire—rare as such instances were and must be—gave rise to the feeling that a perfectly devoted wife would not survive her husband; and then some, who were true lovers but who wielded not the power to awaken the hidden fire within themselves, died voluntarily beside their husbands' corpses in the ordinary flame; and then, by slow degrees, such death came to be regarded as not only admirable but of binding obligation on a truly devoted wife; and then, enforced, became a crime. It is remarkable that in Râjputâna this custom was followed as an ordinary rule by the proud Râjput dames, careless as their husbands and their sons of life in comparison with honour untouched, unstained. From time to time we read in Râjput story how when the warriors donned the saffron robe, that meant fighting to the death against the foe, death rather than submission, then their wives and mothers, no less lovers of the land and of liberty than they, would, some of them, die fighting on the field of battle, while most, wending in long procession to some appointed place, would surround a vast burning pile with music and with song, and plunge into the flames, one by one, meeting their warriors on the other side. No Râjput

dying, pierced with myriad wounds, had aught of fear for the honour of the women of his house, for he knew that they had passed before him, and were awaiting him to give him glad welcome on the other side of death. Strange, verily, in western eyes is such a story, and yet it is only the generalising of a feeling that has made the Englishman, in direst strait, keep the last bullet of his revolver for the heart of the wife he loves. Where, in warfare, woman's honour is not safe, noble women will prefer death to shame, and in a warrior race such voluntary deaths, in the last strait, will become general, and then spread by the force of sympathy and proud emulation. Such were the two roots of the custom of Satî.

We will now consider some of the questions affecting the Ideal of Marriage, with which you will have to deal in a few years' time. You do wisely to consider these, so as to prepare yourselves for your future duties as citizens, who must deal with these questions for the good of their country. But do not make up your minds hastily; rather study and deliberate.

What about the purdah system? Do not fall into the error of supposing that this is either ancient or universal. In many parts of India, as among the Maharâshtras, there is no purdah. In the south, ladies are not thus hidden away. The

system is strictest among Bengâlis and up-country people. The purdah system is a relic of semi-barbarism, and is found among those who inherit it by tradition from ancestors engaged in constant warfare, in which women were the spoils of the conqueror, warriors in continual unrest and turmoil both from within and without; thus it came down in Islâm, not from the religion, but from the terrible social conditions in Arabia amid which Islâm was founded, and from the wild raiding tribes of Turkestan and other Asian districts, who formed the conquering, invading hosts of Musalmâns. Purdah was necessary among them, to guard the women from outrage even in times of comparative peace, and has persisted after the need for it had gone, among their civilised descendants. It became necessary also for self-protection, among the peoples whom they conquered, and thus spread in India. A social custom, thus founded on necessity, is apt to continue when the necessity has passed away, and as it was adopted only by the higher caste women—the lower classes of women being unable to adopt it, owing to the needs of their daily lives—it became also a sign of social position, and thus obtained an even firmer hold. The chief opponents to its abolition are now the women, not the men. They naturally shrink from the abolition of purdah, regarding seclusion

as essential to modesty and as a sign of respectable social position, and it will take time and use to reconcile them to the idea of change. Indian men often desire the greater freedom of women, but find themselves checkmated by the steady, persistent, resistance in the home. Herein, as elsewhere, education will open the way.

The spread of English education—a fact which has to be faced, whether it be liked or disliked—cannot leave Indian women unaffected. Daughters of English-educated fathers, wives of English-educated husbands, mothers of English-educated sons, how can they remain unaffected by it? It enters into their homes; it moulds the minds of those who are dearest to them and who influence all their thoughts; it colours the stream of household life. Above all is the relation of husband and wife affected by the English education through which the boys have passed, and which has too often affected their religious belief and impaired their moral character. How shall he be a Guru, who has no belief and no religious knowledge? How shall he guide the steps of his wife on the spiritual path, who does not tread it himself? Moreover, the English thought has affected his whole mental atmosphere, and he looks on the world with eyes other than those of his ancestors. He demands some response, some sympathy from

his wife, some interchange of thought, some comradeship of ideas. And she, how can she give it—she whose thoughts are hemmed in by so narrow a circle, and whose inborn spirituality is hindered and dwarfed by the cramping of the mind, and the practice of childish forms of worship, repellent to the English-educated man, forms that, at most, he can regard with a good-natured tolerant compassion, only saved from contempt by tenderness. Moreover, in many improvements that he desires to make, in educating his daughters, in placing later the marriage age of his children, in decreasing the expenses of household ceremonies, which often load him with debt for years, he is hampered by the narrow ideas of his wife. If, then, the Ideal of Marriage is to be preserved, the future wives of India must be educated, and thus enabled to share their husbands' lives as they did in ancient days. But what is the education needed? Is it what is called the "higher education of women" in England?

Education is intended to fit the student for the life that lies in front, and must be judged by its usefulness to that life. The higher education of women in England has arisen from the economic conditions prevalent in England, and if the conditions there and here are totally different, the education ought not be the same. A few Indian

girls, here and there, may desire the ordinary University Education, but for the mass of girls a very different training is needed. In the West tens of thousands of women have to earn their living under competition with men; men and women compete for the same work, and struggle against each other in the labour-market. Women undersell men, in the competition for employment, because they can live upon a smaller salary, and the middle class threatens to repeat the story of the manual labourers. There the husband's earnings ceased to be sufficient for the support of a family, and the wife became an additional bread-winner; the absence of the wife from the home entailed the neglect of the children, and thence followed the next steps, the baby-farm and the infant-school—both blots on civilisation. From this neglect and evil sanitary conditions arose the frightful infant mortality among the poor, so that in towns half the children died below 5 years of age. The competition between men and women, spreading upwards, reached the educated classes, and girls of gentle birth were compelled to earn their living. But reasonable living meant skilled work, and thus arose the cry for higher education for the girls. They were taught like boys, because when women, they had to compete with men. The education was not directed to the making of

better wives and mothers, but to the making of women-doctors, women-lawyers, women-clerks, women-professors. Whether this be good or not is a question for each nation to decide, and on the decision the national destiny will turn. It is for you to think whether you wish to see these economic conditions repeated in India, to see large crowds of women competing with men for bread.

If not, you will need to formulate an education for women suitable to the requirements of the country and to the lives which lie before your daughters. Those girls are to become wives and mothers, heads of large households, whose health and comfort will depend upon them. Here still "the home is woman's kingdom," and the Queens have to be educated for the proper discharge of their duties.

First should come, in education, reading and writing, and a literary knowledge of the vernacular; then sufficient knowledge of Samskrit to enable them to read some of the wonderful old writings in the original, instead of in inadequate translations: then a fair knowledge of English, that they may not be out of touch with their husbands' lives, so largely influenced by the West. Next should come a sound knowledge of arithmetic, needed in household management; instruction in the laws of hygiene as they affect a house, the healthy conditions

which should surround all the members of the household ; knowledge of the nutritive values of foodstuffs ; some elementary knowledge of physiology, of simple hurts and remedies, of household medicines, of "first aid" in accidents, of nursing ; science, as applied to household life, in fact, should form this branch of their education. And then some art ; it may be music, now so surrounded by evil associations, so that youths, seeking it, are oft misled ; or painting, or fine needlework, or any other attractive pastime, adding to the grace and beauty of the home. Thus would a girl receive literary, scientific, artistic, education, and with this would be interwoven the religious and moral instruction which sweeten and purify the character. Such an education would give to India the women that she needs to save the Ideal of Marriage.

But all this means delay in marriage, the remitting of marriage to a somewhat later age, a change urgently demanded for other reasons. To make the transition gradual, the betrothal might be but slightly retarded, while the second marriage should not take place before 14. The continuance of the education of the girl after the betrothal would also do something to relax the purdah system, and to widen the life of women. The retardation of marriage, abolishing child-maternity, would save India from the physical decay which is the worst danger

menacing her national life, and would check the diseases and the premature deaths of infants, that are the penalties attached by Nature to the disregard of her sacred laws. The mother should be able to teach and train her children, to guard their health, to supervise their nurture, and this the ignorant child-mother cannot do. Such wise and tender mothers alone can bring forth noble and great sons and daughters, needed for the improvement and the redemption of the race.

Another question bearing on the Ideal of Marriage that you will have to settle is that of Widow Re-marriage. The pressing nature of the question, and its peculiar difficulties, are due to the prevalent custom of child-marriage, and with the abolition of this the worst difficulties would disappear. During the first fourteen years of life, the death-rate among boys is higher than among girls, and the likelihood of widowhood is increased for every girl whose bridegroom is under this age. Some may say: "It is the girl's karma;" true, but one of the acting causes in such a karma is the ignorance of those under whose guardianship she has been born, and as we remove the ignorance we change the karma; the results of early marriage are part of the collective karma of the nation, shared by all souls born into it, and that collective karma is modified by the changing

forces at work in the nation. We can, then, get rid of the evil of child-widowhood by abolishing child-marriage.

Much capital is made by laying stress on the ascetic accompaniments of widowhood—shaving the hair, having but one meal a day, the laying aside of ornaments. When these things are imposed by force on a girl-child, they naturally rouse a sentiment of revolt, so incongruous are they with what should be the gaiety and grace of girlhood. The revolt is aroused by the incongruity and by the compulsion, not by the fact of the ascetic life, for this has ever been regarded with reverence. "As she wishes," says Manu, "let her be abstinent, feeding the body with pure flowers, roots and fruits.....until death let her be patient, calm, controlled and chaste."[1] It is a voluntary, not a compulsory abstinence, and such widowhood has ever compelled the admiration of the world. But it belongs to womanhood, not to childhood. Above all, in India, asceticism has ever been highly honoured, and the marks of the ascetic are marks of honour, not of degradation. It is true that modern luxury and love of the body shrink from these bodily austerities, but they must be judged from the Hindu standpoint, which regards them as honourable, not from the western, which looks on

1 *Manusmṛiti*, v. 157, 158.

them as degrading. "Widows are ill-used." That cases of ill-usage occur is probably true, but as a rule the widow is treated with love and care. Is it an argument against marriage in England that some wives are ill-treated? And certainly there are very many more cases by far of brutal treatnent of wives in the lower classes in England, than of brutal treatment of widows in the corresponding classes here.

Apart from individual cases, and from the lowering of the general Ideal of Marriage by the re-marriage of widows, there is one point of view from which the whole question must be regarded. There are more women than men in the country, and the re-marriage of widows means either polygamy—with all the degradation and misery it entails—or else the non-marriage of maidens. Every widow re-married means a maiden unmarried, and why are these less worthy of sympathy than the former? The proportion of the sexes cannot be changed. In the West, where widows re-marry, thousands, hundreds of thousands of girls remain unmarried. Vast numbers of these remain unmarried from choice, and become nuns, sisters of charity, nurses, teachers, discharging functions absolutely necessary for the well-being of Society. Society could not exist without this great army of noble, devoted women, who out of

sheer love to God and man turn aside from the joys of the household, and dedicate themselves to the service of the young, the sick, the suffering and the poor. They lead a strict, ascetic life, for the most part, abandoning all luxury and softness, and wear a special dress, ugly and unbecoming, which marks them out, and which serves as a protection from all lightness of treatment or insult, being the badge of the servants of humanity. Widows should form the corresponding class in India, available for the countless services needed by the suffering and the friendless. We need orphanages in India, where the helpless children orphaned by plague and famine, may find refuge; they fall into the hands of Christian spinsters now; far better they should be cared for by Hindu widows. We need girls' schools, and whence are to come the teachers? they can only come from widows, free from household duties. We need nurses for the friendless sick; where are they to be found, save among widows? Here are careers full of usefulness, full of peaceful happiness, full of gentle womanly service, India needs her widows for such labours, so that she may save her little ones and her sick from the great army of Christian women, self-sacrificing and good indeed, but who pervert the youthful mind, and mould the whole life into alien form.

Beware how you undermine in the hearts of

Indian women the sacredness of marriage and the glory of the life of sacrifice. High have they held their Ideals through innumerable ages, and cherished love of husband as a spiritual force, and not simply an earthly joy. Beware how you represent to them carnal pleasures as more alluring than spiritual, and the life of ease and delight as more attractive than the life of self-obligation and of sacrifice. If India so to be saved by her women, it will not be by women whose ideals are lowered. For nobility, and self sacrifice are enshrined in women's hearts, when the men's shrines are empty, and India's daughters still guard the Hindu dharma and the Hindu home.

I do not say to you ; Do not advocate widow-re-marriage. I only say to you : Understand what you are doing in the advocacy. If you prefer the western Ideal, then follow it, but do not imagine that you can tamper with Hindu Ideals, and still preserve India as a nation, and carve for her a future. The stones of the arches which support the edifice which is called a nation are not loose and unconnected, so that some can be pulled out and flung aside and others retained. They are interlocked each with its arch, and the pulling out of one loosens the whole arch, and jeopardises the building which it helps to support. Try then to understand, before you act : study, before you

decide. Then shall your action be wisely taken, and your decisions shall result in good.

——:o:——

FIFTH LECTURE.

THE HINDU STATE.

We are to consider to-day the Ideal of the Hindu State, and to try to realise what was the condition of a well-ruled Hindu State in the ancient days. In the preceding lectures, on Education, Household Life and Marriage, we were on fairly familiar ground. To-day the country we are to traverse is less familiar, and I shall therefore trouble you with a good many quotations, in order to shew you that the picture presented is drawn from authoritative documents, and not from imagination.

Liberty attracts the love of all thoughtful men, and Order is of the first necessity for a State; hence the harmonising of Liberty and Order is the object of every Government, of every statesman, of every patriot. The best type of State has naturally been discussed and striven towards in East and West in very different fashions, in consequence of the difference between eastern and western Ideals explained in the first lecture of this course. In the West, liberty has been gained by conflict, wrested from the mailed hands of Kings and nobles through

centuries of struggle, and out of the long battle against oppression and tyranny Democracy, the rule of the People, of the majority, was born. In the East, liberty was ensured to the individual by the careful ordering of society and the definition of the place and duties of each class by wise men; not by conflict but by rules laid down by legislators who were Ṛishis was liberty gained, and these wise men enforced righteousness, utilising their wisdom for the guidance of the State. This was Aristocracy, the rule of the Best, growing out of the eastern Ideal as Democracy grew out of the Western.

These two ideas of Aristocracy and Democracy have done battle with each other in the West, and the former has been fading out of men's hearts—albeit it is indigenous therein, man's instinct being ever to seek a guide and a ruler—because "birth" had fallen from righteousness, and claimed privileges more than it discharged duties. Hence privileges, separated from duties, became insults to the people rather than their shield and protection, and the failure of the should-have-been Best to rule righteously and unselfishly forced the growth of Democracy, throwing power into the hands of the ignorant, of those who were less far-seeing, less wise, than those who by birth, education, and fortune stand at the head of the nation. Hence, at present, the experiment of Democracy, for it is only

an experiment, and an experiment that does not promise to be successful, if we may judge by the paralysis of legislation which is marking the history of the "Mother of Parliaments," the corruption in the United States, and the narrow-minded laws which are being passed in the Colonies. We have there "class legislation" of the worst type, laws made by the labouring classes to suit their own immediate interests, without any regard to the good of the nation or the welfare of the Empire, laws to keep out all "coloured" races, to make a ring-fence round the land for the profit of its natives only.

All men must choose their Ideal Government, if they would not be mere hand-to-mouth politicians who see not into the future and live only for the day. The Idea lguides the choice of means, and prevents hasty grasping at immediate gain by the sacrifice of more lasting good. No statesman is really great who is without an Ideal, and legislates only for the moment.

In ancient India most of the States, regarded as units of Government, were small, and India was composed of a number of such small States. When there was an over-lord, in the old days, he ruled over a large number of Kings, and his lordship was recognised by the payment to him of tribute, while the vassal Kings carried on all the work of administration, each in his own State. Thus in the

Mahâbhârata, we read of the sending out of the Horse, accompanied by a warrior, who challenged the King of each State, and demanded tribute in his Ruler's name, and if refused offered wager of battle; the King sending out the Horse was ever a Sovereign of admitted wisdom and power, ruling a well-administerd State, and his crowning as Emperor, as Lord Paramount, was a great religious ceremony, attended by all the Kings, who thus admitted his supremacy. Now, however much the trend of modern opinion may be in favour of large States rather than of small ones, there are many undeniable advantages in the small unit of Government, and whatever advantages the large State may have, in matters of self-defence and peace, were secured in Ancient India by the raising of one man to supreme power, but only after he had proved himself worthy to wield it. Moreover great ability and wisdom were thus rendered inseparable from supreme authority. By this arrangement, the convenience of a comparatively small area of administration was secured, but when an exceptional man appeared, he was recognised by all and his supremacy was admitted; all the vassal Kings followed his banner if danger threatened the larger State, but they were not interfered with unless they shewed serious incompetence in administering their affairs. That

ancient idea seems to be reproducing itself in modern India to some extent, and it might be taken as a model of the happiest relations between a Paramount Power and a number of royal Houses, a form of Government suited to the genius of the people and fragrant with the memories of the past.

Looking over history both eastern and western, we find that the small State is not only best for administrative purposes, but that literature and art flourish in such communities, while statesmanship and administrative ability find therein rich soil for growth. The histories of Athens and of Middle Age Italy bear abundant testimony to this fact, as indeed does India herself, though, where the overlord is lacking, such States tend to slip into frequent wars among themselves. The golden age of literature and art in Italy was during the mediæval period, which is literally crowded with immortal names.

Such, then, was the condition of Ancient India—a number of comparatively small States, acknowledging from time to time a supreme Emperor. In each such State, the King stood out as the central figure, and no words were too strong to describe the dignity of the authority vested in him, and the duty of the allegiance owed him by his people. This complete authority, this perfect

obedience, are often condemned in modern days; but before we join in this condemnation let us consider what manner of man a King was held to be, as well as what was the obedience and honour held to be due to him. It is true that the authority of the King is described in no doubtful words. Manu says: "The Lord created a King for the protection of all, taking eternal particles of Indra, of the wind, of Yama, of the Sun, of Agni, of Varuṇa, of the Moon, and of the Lord of Wealth. Because a King has been formed of particles of these Lords of the Suras, therefore he excels all beings in splendour; and, sunlike, he dazzles all eyes and minds, nor can any one on earth gaze upon him....Even a boy King must not be despised as a mortal; he is a great Devata seated in a human body." And he is described as: "He in whose favour is Padmâ, Shrî, in whose force is victory; death dwells in his wrath, and he is formed of all splendours." [1]

But this ascription of glory goes hand in hand with a most exacting theory of kingly duty and responsibility, and, as we shall see, with the sternest warnings to the King who behaved himself is unkingly fashion. Truly there was no difference between God and a King, said Bhîshma, but he must shew all kingly qualities. "The happiness

[1] *Manusmṛiti*, vii. 3-6, 8, 11.

of their subjects, observance of truth, and sincerity of behaviour, are the eternal duty of Kings." He must be dignified, self-controlled, affable, deferential to the aged, splendid and liberal. His subjects should live in his kingdom like sons in the house of their father. "He is indeed a King whose subjects are engaged in their respective duties, and do not fear to cast off their bodies when duty bids; whose people, duly protected, are all of peaceful behaviour, obedient, docile, tractable, unwilling to engage in disputes and inclined to liberality." "The protection of subjects is the cream of kingly duties."[1] Utatthya, of the race of Angirâ, instructing the King Mândhâtâ, son of Yuvanâsha, said: "One becometh a King in order that he may uphold righteousness, and not that he may conduct himself capriciously. The King is the protector of the world, O Mândhâtâ! If he act righteously, he attaineth to the honours of a veritable God upon earth. But if he act unrighteously, he sinketh into hell. All creatures rest upon righteousness; and righteousness, in turn, resteth upon the King. That King alone is a true King who upholdeth righteousness. If he fail to chastise unrighteousness, the Devas desert his mansions, and he incurreth obloquy among

1 See *Story of the great War*. 219, 220.

men."[1] When Yudhiṣhṭhira asked why should one man, a man resembling all other men in appearance, rule over his fellows, exercising despotic authority, Bhîṣhma explained that at first there were no Kings, but when men increased and began to oppress each other a King was given, a celestial man, who set the Ideal for Kings. The King who does not to his duty is no true King, for a King is appointed for the sake of others and not for his own pleasure and glory. We shall see presently how much was demanded of the King.

But first, we must observe that there was something in Ancient India which was above the King —namely the Law. This Law had been given by Divine Men, Ṛiṣhis, and laid down the duties of Kings and peoples alike; it was placed in the King's hands for administration, but he could not change it; like the "Constitution" of a modern State, it was above the temporary occupant of the throne, and it had this immense advantage over its modern parallel that it was shaped by the wisdom of superhuman men instead of by the votes of a majority. The King held his place by virtue of this Law, and it was placed in his hands for its upholding; he was the enforcer of the Law, and the sceptre placed in his hand and the Rod of Authority, was a symbol of Daṇḍa, the compelling

1 *Mahâbhârata*. Shânti Parva. xc.

Power of Law. Manu says: "For him the Lord of old sent forth His own son Dharma, or Daṇḍa, formed of the splendour of Brahmâ, the Protector of all beings ....Daṇḍa, he is the King and the Man, he the Leader, the Ruler, and he is known as the pledge of the righteousness of the four orders. Daṇḍa rules all the people; Daṇḍa also protects them; Daṇḍa wakens while they sleep; the sages say Daṇḍa is Dharma." And it rules the King as well as the people; "Daṇḍa, of brilliant splendour ...slays, with his relatives, the King who swerves from righteousness." [1] Kings must be modest, for "many Kings have perished for lack of modesty," and thus Vena died, and Nahuṣha fell, and others likewise.[2] Nor must Kings suppose that they can oppress their people with impunity; "The King, who from delusion, thoughtlessly harasses his kingdom, he will, swiftly with his relatives, be broken away from kingdom and from life. As by torment of the body the lives of the living perish, so perish the lives of Kings by the harassment of their kingdoms."[3] And listen to Bhîṣhma's solemn warning to Yudhiṣhṭhira: "The Creator created Power for the sake of protecting weakness. The eyes of the weak, of the ascetic, and of the snake of virulent

---

1 *Manusmṛiti*. vii. 14, 17, 18, 28.
2 *Ibid*, 40, 41
3 *Ibid*. 111, 112.

poison are to be regarded as unbearable. Do not therefore come into hostile contact with the weak. Thou shouldest regard the weak as being already ever humiliated. Take care that the eyes of the weak do not burn thee with thy kinsmen. In a race scorched by the eyes of the weak, no children take birth. Such eyes burn the race to its very roots. Do not therefore come into hostile contact with the weak. Weakness is more powerful than even the greatest power, for that power which is scorched by weakness becomes totally exterminated. If a person who has been humiliated or struck, fail, while shrieking for assistance, to obtain a protector, divine chastisement overtakes the King, and brings about his destruction. Do not, O Sire, While in enjoyment of power, take wealth from those who are weak. Take care that the eyes of the weak do not burn thee like a blazing fire... when a weak person fails to find a rescuer, the great Rod of divine chastisement falls."[1]

Moreover, the King was held responsible for any wrong done within his realm—as is, indeed, indicated in this passage—and this responsibility was direct and personal, and not to be shifted on to any one else, for it was for him to see that his ministers and his officers did their duty. High, indeed, was he lifted above all others, but great as was his

[1] *Mahâbhârata*, Shânti Parva. xci.

power so great was his responsibility ; it was to no idler nor trifler that the splendid loyalty of old was paid. For whatever unhappiness befell the people, the King was held responsible, for if he did his duty all others would do theirs. A Brâhmaṇa lost his son by untimely death, and bringing his dead body to the King, he laid it at his feet in piteous reproach ; and the King at once sought for the wrong he had permitted, which made it possible that, within his realm, a son should die before his father. Read the questions addressed by Nârada to the young King Yudhiṣhṭhira : Does he support the widows and orphans of those who have perished for him in battle ? is he easily accessible to all, as a father to his children ? has he seen to a sufficiency of tanks, and seed for sowing, and does he protect agriculture and trade and labour ? are taxes fair, and ministers above bribery? does he cherish, like a father, the blind, the lame, the dumb, the deformed, the friendless, and the homeless âscetics ? And we read that in consequence of Yudhiṣhṭhira's admirable discharge of his duties, " all the people became attentive to their respective occupations. The rains became so abundant as to leave no room for desire, and the kingdom grew in prosperity.....Inded, during the reign of Yudhiṣhṭhira, who was ever devoted to truth, there was no extortion, no stringent realisation of arrears

of rent, no fear of disease, of fire, or of death by poisoning and incantation."[1] Again, Nârada, in describing Shrî Râmachandra's kingdom, told how "disease and famine did not touch it, nor fire nor flood. Fathers did not lose their sons, nor wives their husbands, corn and wealth were everywhere, and no man feared hunger nor theft."[2] In His capital the roads were broad and well-watered, and the shops full of goods, the soldiers were well-behaved, and the Brâhmaṇas pure and learned; each was contented with his possessions, and there was none who was poor or unlettered.[3] And ere He mounts the throne, His father bids Him practise increased humility and constantly control the senses. "Acquaint thyself fully, personally and though others, with the state of thy kingdom; administer justice, and thus win the love alike of nobles and of people."[4]

So practical was this responsibility, that if a subject lost anything by theft, the King was bound to make good the loss from the royal treasury, since it was his duty to see that no thieves found harbourage in his realm. The King imposed taxes, and thus took from his people part of the produce

1 See *Story of the Great War*. 71, 72, 73.

2 *Shrî Râmachandra*. 4.

3 *Ibid*. 15, 16.

4 *Ibid*. 41.

of their labour; he was then bound to protect them in the enjoyment of the remainder of their property, and to preserve it for them intact. The right of access to the King by the meanest of his subjects was a highly prized privilege, and enabled any man to bring to his notice any injustice from which he might be suffering. Minute, personal attention was demanded from the King to the needs of his people.

Princes were brought up with this idea from infancy, and they were impressed with the fact that the royal office meant responsibility more than privilege. And the eve of His coronation is spent by Râmachandra and His wife not in feasting and games but in fasting and prayer. The welfare of the masses, the good of the people, that was the aim in life of the Ideal King.

In the old days, the succession of the eldest son to his father's throne was by no means a matter of course. He must prove himself worthy of the crown ere he was given his vast authority, and alike the father's choice and the people's ratification were needed to endorse the claim of birth. Sagara banished his eldest son Asamauja, because he ill-treated the people of the kingdom, and shut him out of the succession. King Yayâti chose his youngest son Puru as his successor, putting the four elder sons aside, because of Puru's higher mo-

ral charecter. Moreover, the approval of the people was asked before the heir was installed. When all the people gladly gave their permission, Yayâti installed Puru as the crown Prince. And list to King Dasharatha, as he tells his people his wish to place Râmachandra, his unequalled son, upon the throne: he describes his son's virtues, and his worthiness to rule, but bids them speak their minds, lest his fondness should be clouding his judgment, and say freely whether they approved his choice or not. Then the Brâhmaṇas, and the chiefs of the army and the citizens took counsel together, and unanimously agreed to accept the Prince as their King, and they told King Dasharatha to "speedily instal thy son, endowed with noble qualities, resembling the God of Gods, ever intent upon the welfare of the whole State." [1] Thus carefully was liberty guarded under the law of the Ṛishis, and the people, speaking in assembly, assented to the crowning of their future King. No slaves were they, these free Âryan people, but having chosen and sanctioned, they paid uttermost loyalty, and if their King betrayed them, they looked fearlessly for the stern judgment of the KING of all Kings.

All this should be remembered when the modern spirit looks askance at the ancient loyalty, and will see no divinity in a King, no divine right in

1 *Shrî Râmachandra*, 40, 41.

a Ruler. It was the loyalty of free men to a Man, of men too free to be afraid of their freedom being doubted.

But you may well be thinking: how could any man be able to bear so heavy a burden? How could he attend to all the details of administration? Here comes in one of the advantages of the comparatively small State, as against the unwieldy size of the modern kingdom. But in addition, the King was not left to do all this work unassisted, for as Manu says: "Even an easy work is difficult to do by one man; how much more, without a friend, to rule a wealthy kingdom."[1] Therefore must the King choose a Ministry of worthy men, and without their counsel he should not act: "Seven or eight ministers let him select, hereditary officials, knowers of the Shâstras, heroes skilful with weapons of noble descent, and wise in counsel."[2] One of these, a learned Brâhmaṇa, was to be the chief or Prime Minister, and with these he was to hold counsel, and having finally agreed with his Prime Minister, he should act.[3] In the *Mahâbhârata*, we find the following description of the Ministry: "Four pure and clever Brâhmaṇas well-read in the Vedas, having their teachings fresh in their minds: eight strong and armed Kṣhat-

---

Quoted from the *Mahâbhârata* in *The System of Government of Ancient India*.

[2] *Manusmṛiti*. vii. 55. [3] *Ibid*. 56-59.

triyas; twenty-one Vaishyas; three mild and pious Shûdras, regular in their daily prayers; and one duly qualified Suta, well read in the Purâṇas—these should be engaged as Ministers. The Ministers should be of the age of fifty, clever, void of jealousy and avarice, well-read in the Shrutis and Smṛitis"—there were three Shûdras among them—"humble, impartial, capable of settling disputes, and not addicted to hunting, gambling, and the kindred vices. Of these Ministers, the King himself should deliberate with a sub-committee of eight Ministers and settle rules. Then these rules should be proclaimed in the kingdom, and shown to all citizens. By such means you should always look after the well-being of your subjects."[1]

While the King could not change the Ancient Law, for the impersonal Law was the Head of the State, it was the duty of himself and of his ministers to apply its principles to the needs of the time, and to make, as said above, the necessary rules for such application. The King and his Council were thus the legislators of the State, acting ever within the limits laid down by the supreme Law. But these Ministers were not dependent on the votes of the people; they were appointed really and not only nominally by the King; and,

1 *Government of Ancient India.* 22.

while they deliberated with him and freely gave him counsel, it was he who acted, and on him the whole responsibility lay. Having deliberated, "let him afterwards begin to act,"[1] says Manu. Needless to say how much depended on the wise choice of these counsellors, for without them, the King was practically unable to rule: if he did not choose men who were wise and unselfish, honourable and pure, no efforts of his could undo the harm brought by unworthy ministers. We read of the ministers who surrounded King Dasharatha, that they were "devoted to their monarch, ever intent on his good, learned and modest, conversant with policy, self-controlled, energetic, gentle in speech, and 'never committing themselves to a lie from anger, or interest, or desire."[2] The books are full of stories of good and bad ministers, and of the prosperity or ruin of monarchs caused by their counsellors, as we see in the fables of the *Hitopadesha.*

For the purposes of administration the State was carefully divided, the village forming the administrative unit; one officer was placed at the head of the village, the village Panchayat working under him; these officers reported to the head officer of ten villages, grouped together as a district;

1 *Manusmṛiti.* vii. 59.

2 *Shrî Râmachandra.* 16-17.

then came successively larger areas, twenty villages, one hundred, one thousand. Each official superintended those below him, and made his report to the one above him, and thus the administrative machine worked effectively. And for maladministration the penalty was severe. "Let the King confiscate the whole property of those (officials) who, being evil-minded, take money from suitors, and let him banish them."[1] The pay of the officials was according to their rank.

The taxation was graduated and flexible. To begin with, it was levied in kind and proportional, so that when agriculture and trade were prosperous it was far greater in amount than when they were depressed; hence it never pressed heavily, and it was well understood that the maintenance of the labourer and his family was the first charge on the results of his labour; if the labourer were starving, all the higher classes were also in need. Duties and taxes were to be levied with consideration: "The King shall always fix in his realm the duties and taxes, in such a manner that both he himself and the worker may receive their reward. As the leech, the calf, and the bee take their food little by little, even so must the King draw from his realm moderate annual taxes."[2] The amount levied

1 *Manusmṛiti* vii. 114-124.

2 *Ibid.* 128-129.

varied according to the nature of the property taxed; one fiftieth of the increase of cattle went to the King, the eighth, sixth, or twelfth part of the crops, and a sixth part of various luxuries and of utensils. Traders paid a percentage on profits; manual labourers one day's labour in a month.[1] The levies of grain and goods of all kinds were stored in the royal treasure-houses, and in times of need were sold at low prices to the people, or even distributed gratis. In this way provision for bad seasons was made in the good, and serious famines were averted. Moreover it was customary for the peasant to keep always one year's store of grain in hand, in addition to the seed needed for sowing, so that he could tide over one year on his own resources; and in the questions before quoted, put by Nârada to King Yudhiṣhṭhira, it may be remarked that one of them enquired whether he was careful to see that the agriculturalists had sufficient store of seed for sowing. Lastly, the taxes being proportionate to the yield, they were light or even nothing in a bad year. If the harvest were bad, the tax was very small; if it failed, no tax was levied. The bad year did not hand on to the good year arrears of taxes to be made up, for it was not the *land* that was taxed, but the *produce* of the land. It was not that a tax that was due was re-

1 *Manusmṛiti*. vii. 130-138.

mitted, but there was no tax due to the King; the subject had no duty of paying when he had not earned. It was recognised that the welfare of the producing classes was necessary for the welfare of the State, and care was taken not to kill the goose that laid the golden eggs. Under this system all prospered, King and people, and the protection and good government of the King was well worth the proportion of the produce paid. And, as already said, if the King failed in his duty of protection, and a subject suffered loss by theft, he had a right to claim from the King the amount necessary to make good his loss.

In the days of old there was no competition, in the modern sense of the word; the heart-breaking struggle for existence was then not found, for Society was a well-ordered co-operation instead of a chaos of struggling atoms. Each man in his own place earned his livelihood as a matter of course, and earned it as a unit contributing to the general livelihood, the livelihood of the State. There was no competition for bread, for life; that came to a man as of necessity, in the orderly conduct of social business. People say that competition is necessary to progress, and that is true if by competition we mean that every man exerts himself to do his best: but it is false if it means that every man must work in a furious hurry, smitten

to exertion by the scourge of imminent starvation. Work done under that ever-uplifted scourge is badly done, and is never artistic. The emulation which stirs a man to produce a nobly planned and nobly executed piece of work is a useful stimulus where the creative force of genius, all-compelling, is absent. The longing for fame, the longing to excel, will for ages yet to come stimulate effort and direct energy: but the feverish activity of the struggle for bread needs to find its ending, for it is the slayer of high intelligence and of inspiring emotion. In the old days, if a man were an artist, it was for the King to provide him with all necessary for the carrying out of his art, and great houses vied with each other to obtain the privilege of housing and feeding men whose work was touched by Fancy and moulded by Imagination. No artist can work nobly where there is care for the morrow's meal, nor where forced to conform to the general taste in order to produce saleable articles. It is for the artist to form and elevate the public taste, not for the public taste to cripple and degrade the artist. Hence competition for bread, which makes the artist the slave of public ignorance and caprice, spells the destruction of art. Genius must be free, and in freedom give birth to its child, Art, else only ill-formed monsters will be bred in the prison-house of care. Desire to excel, then,

may stimulate the artist, but not desire to sell at a higher price than his rivals. Desire to produce greater beauty may lure him on, for this refines and purifies; but far from the artist soul be the longing to shape an object that will bring large price in the market-place, for that vulgarises and degrades. Moreover, an artist must have leisure: he must have time for that dreamful musing which is the warm growing-ground of Art, the atmosphere in which the creative fancy becomes fecund. No great work of Art can be produced in a hurry; the imagination must have time to play round it lovingly, adding the caressing touches that lend the last graces to the noble whole.

In the organised state of old work was well done, and competition for bread was avoided, by the ordered grading of Society, and the bringing up of the young in the ideas which marked out their life-duties, and so gave to the plastic mind of youth the trend suitable to the work to be done in maturity. From his earliest day the Prince was trained in the ideal of public duty and of public service: he was taught that his life belonged to his subjects, that as he existed by them he must also exist for them; from childhood he was taught to see in the kingly office the most burdensome and exacting of all public offices, to see in the diadem the limit of ease and pleasure, to see in the sceptre

the rod which punished licence, his own first of all. Government was for the protection of the people, not for the enjoyment of the Governor; such was the ideal of ancient India. The Ruler existed for the sake of the people, not the people for the sake of the Ruler. "The welfare of the people" was the only justification of kingly power.

And so with each caste. The Brâhmaṇa from childhood was taught that his wealth lay in his wisdom, his authority in his learning and his purity. If his life were hedged in by restrictions, it was not for the sake of pride and privilege, but in order that he might, unspotted by the world, be the channel of help and blessing to the world. He was to be the teacher, then he must be learned; the priest, then he must be pure; the counsellor of the King and people, then he must be wise, compassionate, and free from all personal ambitions, all desire for gain.

The Kṣhattriya was taught from his childhood that his duty was to guard, to protect, to preserve order and to defend his country at the cost of comfort, ease, age and of life itself. He was a soldier by birth, heir of all splendid traditions of heroic deeds, of lives poured out for defence of the weak, for country's honour and for women's safety. How much better was this than the modern systems of forcible conscription or of vol-

untary enlistment. The conscript, torn by force from all he loves, shrinks from the career into which he is thrust, and a weeping village follows to its boundaries the young reluctant youths who march unwillingly away. Voluntary enlistment draws, for the most part, from the lower types of the labouring class, the failures in civil life, the rough ne'er-do-weels of the village; only by sharp discipline are they shaped into the soldier, by years of strong constraint. But the Kṣhattriya boy, accustomed from childhood to regard his life as belonging to the people, born to the career of arms, grew up chivalrous, knightly, proud, and generous, a soldier from birth to death.

So also with the trading and commercial class. To gather wealth by all fair and honourable industry, and then to use it generously and rightly for all useful and charitable objects, was the lesson instilled into the Vaishya boy from his earliest days. He was the purse of the poor, the steward of the national household, and on the strong rock of his industry and rectitude the fabric of national prosperity was securely built.

Thus also was the Shûdra taught his duty of honourable service, of patient unwearied labour for the helping of all. He was the very foundation of the nation, the broad basis of the national pyramid.

Such was the ancient Ideal of the State, wisely ordered, wisely administered. Each class had its own place and its own duties; and as the organs of a body discharge their own duties, so did the organs of the body politic discharge theirs. It is said of King Dasharatha's kingdom, that the Brâhmaṇas were pious, virtuous and learned, "ever abiding by truth, high-souled, and resembling mighty ascetics." The Kşhattriyas were well-skilled in the use of weapons, but would not oppress "persons lorn, or abandoned, or hiding, or fugitive." The citizens were well-to-do, and each was "contented with his possessions"; they were of good character, pure and clean in mind and body, and hence no man and no woman was seen devoid of grace or beauty."[1]

Some say: All this is only a poet's ideal; no such State as we read of was ever really found on earth. But even a poet only creates out of materials, out of what he knows, and such descriptions are only found in poets who are writing in the midst of great civilisations. The poet may idealise, but he can only exaggerate details: he cannot sculpture without stone. And there are some who know that these "poet's dreams" were really lived on earth, and that States fairer and happier than the modern ones flourished under the

1 *Shrî Râmachandra*, 15, 16.

guiding hands of the Divine Kings. The great traditions of Kingship came down from those true Rulers, and the "Golden Age" is not all a poet's dream.

Now what is the purport of this lecture? It is intended to suggest to you, who will have part in the future shaping of India, the lines along which work will be most fruitful, will bring about the most beneficial results. At present, those who think of the political future of India are, for the most part, intent on producing a bad copy of western forms and methods, instead of striking out a line suitable to Indian genius and congruous with Indian history. Western civilisation, based on struggle and on the assertion of rights, is striving to emerge from a political and economic chaos into some kind of order. Why should eastern civilisation, based on peace and on the enforcement of duties, gratuitously fling itself into the whirlpool from which the West is endeavouring to escape? Far rather should you study the ancient Ideals, and seek to apply them to present circumstances, and then, building in accordance with the Indian past, you may hope to raise a fabric that will endure. A nation that has a past cannot afford to ignore that past in working for the future; and the wise architect considers the nature of his materials when he is designing the plan of his edifice.

A Ruler, surrounded by the best of his subjects in Council, such is the ancient Ideal. Government by the Best, selected by the Ruler, not by the choice of masses of the ignorant, such is the ancient method. The West is striving to reach Government by the Best, and is trying many experiments in order to find those Best, trusting that in some way it may prove true at last that "the voice of the people is the voice of God." The East should leap over this intermediate stage of democratic experiments, foredoomed to failure, and, selecting what has been proved good in the past, should apply it to present needs. The village, as the unit of administration may again be taken, and the village Panchayat, the council of elders, may again be charged with the duty of carrying out the village business, and deciding the village disputes, up to a fixed limit. The head officers of each village, the chiefs of the village Panchayats would form the council for the district of ten villages, the heads of these councils the council for the department of a hundred villages, and so on. Taxes should be made proportionate, and, where agricultural produce is concerned, should be levied in kind, and the results stored in granaries, established in each district or in each department, as may be found convenient. The Indian Chiefs would naturally fall into the position

of the feudatory Kings of old, as the Heads of States, or units of government, each ruling with the help of a Council over his State, graded for administrative purposes into villages, districts, departments, etc, and owning allegiance to the Paramount Power, the supreme Emperor of the elder world. All that was wisest, best, most experienced, the pick of all the Royal Councils in India, would form the Imperial Council, that would guide the destinies of the whole.

Some such plan, based on the Ancient Ideals and conformed to modern necessities, might well be worked for by thoughtful and patriotic Indians, acting in harmony with the thoughtful statesmen of the mighty Empire into which, by the will of Îshvara, the Indian Motherland is indissolubly welded. On some such plan may be given to India that which India needs—an ordered liberty and a universal prosperity.

———:o:———

SIXTH LECTURE,

THE HINDU RELIGION.

Our subject for the closing lecture this morning is the Hindu Ideal of Religion, and it is difficult within the scope of a single lecture to say anything worthy of the subject. The Hindu religion is at once so far-reaching and so complex that it would require a long series of lectures, rather than one brief discourse, to give an exposition that would befit the greatness of the theme. I can therefore only give you a few fundamental ideas, which you must work out in detail by thought and study, and to which you must make gradually many additions, if you would have any competent idea of the richness of the jewels of your birthright.

In dealing with a very large subject, it is useful to mark out certain great divisions and to arrange within these all the facts that are to be studied. Various classifications might thus be made; for our purposes this morning we will take the well-known and fundamental divisions of Consciousness—its three aspects—Jnânam, Ichchhâ and

Kriyâ, Wisdom, Will and Activity, because these give us a very convenient form in which to arrange our presentment of Hinduism. We can take its Jnânam aspect, its Ichchhâ aspect, its Kriyâ aspect, and thus cover the whole Dharma. And this is the easier to do because of the singular perfection with which Hinduism is adapted to human life; its departments fall naturally into those of human consciousness. This is true to some extent of all religions in their early days, but in the efflux of time the symmetry is lost. Hinduism and Buddhism have preserved this orderliness; they have lost many details of knowledge, but have preserved the broad outlines of right arrangement. Thus, no distinctive social polity is found in Zoroastrianism, Christianity or Islâm; Zoroastrianism certainly had it, but it is lost; Christianity and Islâm can scarcely be said to have ever possessed it. In Hinduism the social polity was an integral part of the Dharma, and it has not been lost; partly, because India has been an exceptionally self-contained country; partly because the social polity has been the fixed conservative point in Hinduism, while there has been absolute liberty of intellectual research, and consequently endless varieties of religious belief. Within the pale of Hinduism there are the widest diversities of faith and teaching; we find very different forms

of worship, and no worship at all: the Vaiṣhṇava Bhakta at one end of the scale and the Châr-vâka at the other, the Sâñkhyavâdin ignoring Deity and the Yogî seeking to merge himself in God. Freest scope is given to speculation; the intellect may soar with unclipped wings in highest heaven. True, all the Six Darshaṇas found themselves on the Veda, but each uses the fullest liberty in the interpretation of texts.

In conduct and social life, however, great strictness has been enforced, and this has given stability to the nation. In Hindusim we see combined the qualities taken as motto by Positivist thought: "Order and Progress;" Order, steady and stable in social matters; Progress in intellectual conceptions. This has enabled Hinduism to preserve through the vast ages of its existence a comparative simplicity of outline as originally laid down by its Ṛiṣhis.

Those to whom Hinduism was given were the first sub-race of the great Âryan stock, and hence the completeness of the Dharma imparted. Moreover, this was necessary in view of the part which India was to play in the life of the world, a part which demanded her survival through the long unfolding of Âryan peoples, a part which is not yet exhausted. It was necessary that an immense development of the concrete intellect

should take place, that the Lower Manas should grow, expand and conquer the material world; in order to balance this, a high development of spirituality was needed in another branch of the race, so that material civilisation should not sweep over the world, and that the whole race might profit by the countervailing development in its earliest and (at present) latest branches.

Jnânam. In this great field of wisdom, Hinduism presents its extraordinarily rich crop of philosophic thought. By common consent, human intelligence has not overtopped the six Darshaṇas in which Hindu thought is embodied. There is, indeed, a distinction between Philosophy and Science, but both belong to Jnânam. The Six Darshaṇas are the main contribution of Hinduism to the thought of the world, the thought which studies the nature of God, of consciousness, of man, of the universe, not in details—that belongs to Science—but as seen by the trained and purified intelligence. Philosophy deals with principles; it works by the Pure Reason; it educes certain great underlying principles, and leaves to Science the working out of details by observation, and the practical applications of the principles under ever-varying conditions. The Six Darshaṇas deal with principles, and, rightly viewed, they are, as their name implies, six ways of looking at the same

truth; they are reflections of six aspects of truth, rather than separate systems, and should be seen as complementary, not as antagonistic.

The six are arranged in three sets of two, because in each pair one member is closely related to the other. Thus we have the Nyâya and the Vaisheshika; the Sâñkhya and the Yoga; the Purva and the Uttara Mimânsa.

The Nyâya concerns itself with the training of the mind, by a system of logic, for the discovery of truth, the truth which gives liberation; this training of the intellect is a necessary preliminary to its effective use, for the intellect untrained to observe and infer correctly is useless even for this world, how much more for the discovery of the higher truths. The Vaisheshika deals with the constitution of the universe, of atoms, of their conjunctions and disjunctions—a theory of the universe, of the principles on which it is built.

In the Sâñkhya, the broad lines of evolution are given, as seen from within rather than from without, working downwards from the first great pair of opposites through their successive modifications and differentiations. This is all accepted in the Yoga, but man is further taught how he may evolve the powers enfolded in him, and regain unity.

The Purva Mimânsa deals with the relations

between the visible and invisible worlds, and the methods by means of which they may interwork harmoniously. The Uttara Mimânsa, or Vedânta, exhibits three views of the relation between God and man, fitted for different temperaments, and marks the highest point reached by the human intellect in philosophical speculation.

Looked at thus, the value of the six systems is apparent, and we regard each as given by a great Ṛiṣhi for the training and purification of the human intellect. Each contains a fundamental view of truth, and as the Ṛiṣhis were beings who had transcended humanity in evolution, by long service, by sacrifice, by tapas, we naturally recognise as worthy of deepest study each view presented by them, and we cannot believe that one spoke in contradiction of another. Wisdom, it has been said, is like the milk of the cow, the Ṛiṣhis like the milkers, and the milk remains ever the same. If truth is to rule the minds of men, differing in temperament, differing in type, differing in the stage of evolution reached, it must be presented in different ways. Hinduism has recognised this in its Six Systems of Philosophy, all considered as orthodox, and as on a level in dignity. Surely then a Hindu falls below the high standard of Hinduism, if he becomes bitter in sectarianism and violent in controversy. The breadth of Hinduism must not be narrowed, nor its wide extent be

lessened. All aspects of truth are necessary, and all the coloured rays combine to make the one white beam of truth; therefore each should try to learn from others those aspects of truth that his own vision does not easily distinguish, and thus enrich and widen his knowledge.

But the Jnânam aspect of Hinduism is not exhausted when we have scanned its Philosophies, for Science has here also its place. Hinduism presents us with science applying to all worlds, and not only with the science of the physical plane, though here also its contributions are most noteworthy. Hindu astronomy—as the West is slowly discovering—was no scientific weakling, but was the root of the astronomy that reached Europe from Arabia, and embraced a profound knowledge of the movements of the earth, planets and starry systems; it included also a true astrology, of which the poor remnants left to-day only suggest its past greatness. Hindu medicine was, and still is, a science, and contains subtler and more potent remedies than any known in the West. And so I might run over the sciences of old, had we time, and shew how large and varied was the lore of ancient days. The science of the worlds invisible was directly connected with the Kriyâ aspect of Hinduism, the rites and ceremonies of the exoteric Religion. For these were all based on a full knowledge of the invisible worlds, and may

be justified by a scientific knowledge of those worlds, which, it should be remembered, are phenomenal worlds quite as much as the world visible to bodily eyes. The reason that the ceremonial side of Hinduism has fallen into disrepute among western-educated men is their complete ignorance of any science beyond the physical. And, unhappily, the accredited teachers of Hinduism, lacking equally all knowledge of super-physical science, are forced to appeal to authority where they should appeal to reason. The modern mind, impatient of authority, demands reason for the compliances demanded of it, and ever asks: "Why? Why?" when confronted with the order to do this, to perform that. "Why should I perform Shrâddha?" asks the modern youth. "What is the use of the daily Sandhyâ?" If no answer be given, he may yield because compelled to obey, but there will be rebellion in his heart, although his lips be silent. Is the lad wrong in his questionings? If so, then the course of evolution, guided by the will of Îshvara, is wrong. It is the Divine Will which has brought evolution to the point at which this questioning mind inevitably and naturally arises, and this stage of evolution is as Divine as any other. The time has come for it to develope one class of its powers by challenging all, by questioning all; and if this do not take place,

the next step in evolution becomes impossible, and the all-round growth of the mind will be marred. It is idle to complain against the inevitable, and to resent as an impertinence the challenge of the evolving mind. True, the questions are often foolish, often crude, often shallow, but the impulse that underlies them is in the path of evolution. The Will to know is part of the Will to live. The kind of irritation, of annoyance, that is apt to be felt by the questioned, is not due to any very sound reason, but is apt to be the expression of the feeling that he is unable to answer, and he resents questions that prove to him his own ignorance. One who is able to explain is never impatient with questions, but ready to place his own knowledge at the disposal of the eager mind. The science that Hinduism originally gave enables all such questions to be answered. The science of Yoga is effective along two lines. First, it quickens the development of the super-physical senses, latent in all; and, working on the Sûkşhma Sharîra, organises and evolves it as a means of communication with the subtler worlds. By means of this, a man can investigate the subtle worlds, observe their phenomena, discover their laws, familiarise himself with their inhabitants, and trace out the results there produced by happenings on the physical plane. Thus he is able

to see the why and the wherefore of the various rites and ceremonies enjoined by Hinduism. Just as the western scientist tells his pupil: You must do so and-so, in order to produce such-and-such results, so does the trained Yogî, the scientist of the subtle worlds, say: If you wish to bring about such and such conditions in Pretaloka or Pitṛiloka, you must do such and such things here. First-hand knowledge is only gained by practice and experiment, whether in this or in other worlds. The second part of the the science of Yoga deals with the unfolding of the consciousness itself, not with the evolution of its subtle instruments. By the training therein given, new powers of consciousness unfold, and new states are entered and understood. The great truths of the higher worlds, the intellectual and spiritual, are directly cognised, instead of being only inferred, as by the use of the lower mind. They are known as directly, as immediately, as physical objects are known through the physical senses of sight, touch, taste, etc. By Yoga the truths of the intellectual and spiritual world become objects of knowledge, objects directly perceived, though not by any organs of sense, however subtle. How can this be? The nature of Chit, consciousness, is knowledge. Objects of knowledge are as much objects of direct cognition to the faculty of knowledge, as objects of sense are

objects of direct sensation by the faculty of sensing. The idea of vibration will help us. That white pillar, reflecting the rays of light, causes vibration in the nerve-cells of my retina similar to those of the light-rays. By that assonance of vibrations in the rays and in my nerve-cells, my consciousness infers the presence before me of the white pillar. By a similar principle, an idea is known as true or false by the consciousness, because it is assonant with the faculty of knowledge if true, discordant if false; it produces harmony or discord. This is what is called knowing by intuition, the immediate answer of knowledge to the object of knowledge, by direct cognition and not by inference. This unfoldment of the consciousness is gained by Yoga, as well as the organisation and development of the Sûkṣhma Sharîra.

In all faiths we find much unbalanced and unsystematic growth of the subtle faculties, giving rise to sudden visions, and various sporadic phenomena. But in Hinduism and Buddhism, and also in the Sufism of Islâm, we find a definite and scientific system, which, diligently practised, at last evolves the latent powers in man, and thus enables him to master the secrets of nature beyond the physical plane. By these he can study the *post-mortem* states, and see the koshas taught about in Hinduism. These things become matters of

knowledge, instead of matters of faith, and belief in them rests on study instead of on authority. This was, of old, the strength of Hinduism, and the loss of the knowledge of practical Yoga is its present weakness. In former days, every would-be student of the Vedânta was prepared by Yoga-training, and the absence of this training now accounts for the endless disputes over the meaning of passages in the books ; for none now speaks with the authority of first-hand knowledge, but we have wearisome quotation of authority after authority, grammatical deductions, verbal controversies.

If some of the Hindus again practised Yoga as of old, and unfolded the inner faculties which scan the subtle world, they would go far beyond modern science and might guide it. If Hinduism can be made again what once it was, it will take the lead once more in the intellectual world and will open up new paths for western science. If Hindus do not take up these studies, fitted as their bodies are by long heredity for them, then will the West—as soon as it realises the possibility of such achievement—set itself to work therefor with its fiery energy and dauntless perseverance, and will pass onwards, outstripping the Hindus in evolution.

Let us leave the aspect of Hinduism belonging

to Jñânam, and study that which belongs to Ichchhâ.

Ichchhâ. Ichchhâ is Will, and secondarily Desire, and covers the whole of the emotional nature, the motive power in man. On the strength of a man's emotions depends his effective power, for all activity is motived by emotion, which is to activity as the steam to the piston. The culture of the emotional nature, which has as its outgrowth virtues and vices, is taken up in the vast devotional literature of Hinduism, while all its histories and its dramas are based on the idea of showing the play of emotions, their relation to virtues and vices, their outcome in happiness and misery. And primarily arises before our eyes, in relation to emotion, the theory and the histories of Avatâras—looked at so much askance to-day—as at once arousing the deepest devotion of which man's emotional nature is capable, and training and developing that nature along effective and inspiring lives.

In the ideal figure of Shrî Râmachandra we have the Perfect Man, the Man who in every relation of life—son, husband, brother, king—set an example of nobility and purity great as human imagination can depict. We have in Him the highest perfection to which human qualities can be carried, and it is this perfected humanity, tried

to the uttermost, yet never found wanting, that acts as so inspiring an ideal through the length and breadth of India, that has roused a deep unswerving devotion, which makes the name of "Râma" spring ever to the lips of the living, and sounds it as most powerful protection around the dead body carried to the funeral fire. "Râm, Râm," croons the mother over the form of her firstborn, sleeping on her breast; "Râm, Râm," sobs the mourner, as his dead passes from his ken.

And what of Shrî Kṛishṇa, most joyous, most exquisite of figures? In Râmachandra there is a perfect humanity, adapting itself to every changing circumstance of life, but in Shrî Kṛishṇa there is something more, some subtle gleam of divinity, of half-heard melody, of elusive fleeting grace, scarce seen yet sensed. Truly we see in Him human greatness as politician, as statesman, as a guide of nations, as the stern rebuker of Duryodhana, the tender friend of Arjuna and Yudhishṭhira, as the speaker of the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ*. But there is another side to this heroic figure, more difficult for the modern mind to grasp; it is the spiritual aspect, the form of the Divine Child, the Lord of Love and Life, the universal Self, revealing Himself to the individual self as the Spouse and Lover of each. Because man's mind materialises these

symbols, cannot catch their spiritual meaning, but carnalises them, dragging them down into the mud of physical lust, therefore is Shrî Kṛishṇa blasphemed. The raptures of spiritual union, of the union of the Spirit of man with God, can scarce be put into any language that does not degrade and coarsen them; the delicate fragrance of the jessamine flower must be sensed, it cannot be described.

Out of love for Shrî Râma and Shrî Kṛishṇa has sprung a vast devotional literature, which lifts desire upwards, and fixes it on the Supreme. Aided by this, the emotional nature expands and blooms into fairest flowers, without which the world grows vulgar, sordid, grey.

The noble ethical teaching, again, which Hinduism contains, offers full training for the will, and the most inspiring stimulus for conduct. We have seen sufficiently, in our study of Ideals, how full and rich is Hinduism, in its aspect of Ichchhâ.

Kriyâ. The aspect of Kriyâ in Hinduism shows itself first in the social polity. This is founded on, sustained by, the fourfold system of caste. The four stages in the long pilgrimage of the soul are mapped out in the four castes, the youth, prime, maturity and old age of the Jîvâtmâ. For the evolution of the Jîvâtmâ, without waste of time, without loss of effort, this is the perfect system. Everywhere

of course, the stages are found, since they exist everywhere, but nowhere else are they so codified, so defined, made the basis of a nation. "Nowhere else," I say, speaking of our modern days, for of old they existed, in the primary branches of the Âryan Race. But in India they have persisted, and have maintained the life of the nation, despite all wars, invasions and conquests. India has preserved her racial characteristics, instead of being swamped by the waves of conquerors, because of this strong barrier of caste, against which they have broken in vain. It is remarkable that no religious movement in India, whatever it might do in the beginning, has succeeded in abolishing caste. Chaitanya ignored caste, but his followers are caste-people. Guru Nânak overrode castes, but it has re-appeared among the Sikhs. The Lord Buddha was careless of it, but His religion did not succeed in living permanently in India. Modern movements have repudiated it, but, cast out at the front door, it creeps in again at the back. It is as though the lesson were ever being repeated, that the divisions are natural ones, and therefore cannot be destroyed.

It is true that many abuses have grown up with, and are intertwined with, the caste-system as it exists to-day, and that these should be destroyed. But indiscriminate attacks are doomed to failure. The innumerable sub-castes are a weakness, split-

ting up society into irrationally small fragments, and unjustifiable by any solid reasons. Many rules enforced by caste governments are irrational, and while over-strict in ceremonial compulsions they are unduly lax in moral standards. The absence of provisions for the restoration of lapsed Hindus, and for the occasional transfer from one caste to another —exceptional indeed but not wisely made impossible—are blots on the modern system. And other points might be mentioned in which reform is needed, did time permit.

But you, the younger generation, before whom this question will come in a few years' time, will do wisely to think and consider carefully, before you make up your minds to entirely repudiate the caste-system, because of abuses which are excrescences, and which may be removed without destroying the whole system. It is not wise to cut down a great tree which shelters a whole village, and has sheltered it for many generations, because a few poisonous creepers have twined themselves round its branches. Better exercise a little patience, and give a little time, and lop off the poisonous creepers, leaving the tree unharmed. It is not well to destroy the stately edifice, built by the Ṛiṣhis, and which has weathered many a storm, and given safe shelter to a myriad generations. Chaldea, Persia, Egypt, Greece and Rome have perished, mighty as once

they were, far-reaching in empire, splendid in achievement; India, which was their contemporary, has outlived them all, and is now lifting her proud head once more to greet the rising sun of a new dawn. And this marvellous endurance, while primarily due to her profound spirituality, is partly due also to the stability given her by her caste-system, a social stability of form answering to the inner stability of spirit.

It is interesting to notice that in the West there is a growing conviction that India is at an advantage, and not at a disadvantage, in her caste-system. Anglo-Indians, returning to the social anarchy of the West, speak favourably of a system which they have seen in its workings, and of which they readily perceive the gain. Comte restored it in his social system, seeing in it the only way in which order could be accompanied with progress. It is seen that birth is a surer and more dignified foundation for a social order than is wealth, and western culture is keenly alive to the perils that menace refinement and noble nurture, when wealth becomes the standard of social consideration, and when an uncultivated and ignorant pork-butcher or salesman may, by virtue of his millions, rule society and shoulder his rough way into the ranks of the gently-bred. It is true that a Shûdra Ego, born by some crooked destiny

into the family of a great noble, may be wholly unworthy of the place to which his birth entitles him. Yet, even then, his training and his nurture, the influence of a great tradition and the constant pressure of social demand, will make him more fit to be a leader of society than the aforesaid multi-millionaire, who has a Shûdra body and Shûdra manners as well as being a Shûdra Ego, and who has had none of the refining and restraining influences of education to mould him into the shape demanded by his social position. Money, as the standard of social rank, vulgarises and degrades society as a whole, while the tradition of noble birth and noble manners refines and constrains.

In the Four Âshramas, the Four Castes of the nation are reproduced for the individual; I have already spoken on these—on two of them fully—so I need not dwell on them now. If you have followed the root-idea which underlies them, you will have seen how one of the perfections of Hinduism is its perfect orderliness, in its arrangements for each stage and department of life. Let me add that old men are gravely needed in modern life for advice and counsel rather than for active work. The active work should lie on the shoulders of men from five-and-twenty to fifty, and then they should cease the making of money,

the competition for existence, and turn to the graver, more responsible labour of counsel and direction. If this were possible, the struggle for existence would lessen, and life would become less wearing, less harassing.

Another part of the Kriyâ aspect of Hinduism is the ceremoinal part of the Religion, and I have already referred to the evolution of the Siddhis, which renders possible an exact and complete defence of them, one and all. A prominent part of these ceremonies is the repetition of mantras, and we may take that as an illustration of the way in which all ceremonies may be dealt with. A mantra, as you know, is a definite succession of sounds, and you can no more alter that succession without destroying the mantra, than you can alter the succession of notes in a melody without changing the melody. Hence you cannot translate a mantra, since the words of the translation will not form the same sequence of sounds as did the original words. You can make a new mantra, if you have the knowledge to construct it, by choosing the necessary sounds, but it will not be a translation of the old one. The sounds of the mantra produce vibrations, which assume a definite form, and according to the sounds will the form be. You learn, in physics, about the formation of sound-figures, geometrical shapes pro-

duced on a disk vibrating under a note, and further experiments have shewn that elaborate forms are produced by musical phrases. These vibrating forms cause vibrations in the medium around them, first here on earth, and then in Bhuvarloka and beyond ; these, in turn, throw into corresponding vibrations bodies against which they strike, when those bodies are capable of responding to them. As these vibrations come up against the Sûkṣhma Sharîra, they throw it into corresponding vibrations, and the result is the purification of the Sûkṣhma Sharîra, for the vibrations shake out the coarser matter which cannot vibrate with them, and it is this coarser matter which corresponds to unclean and coarse and wrong thoughts. Now when an evil thought is in a person's mind, it sets up vibrations, and these vibrations affect any Sûkṣhma Sharîra in which suitable coarse matter is found ; but the Sûkṣhma Sharîra which has been purified by mantras does not contain such coarse matter, and hence there is no response to the vibrations of the evil thought, and it cannot reach the mind within that pure Sûkṣhma Sharîra.

You are taught to perform Sandhyâ daily. Now the mantras in that Sandhyâ act in this way on your Sûkṣhma Sharîras, and thus you go out into the world to your daily work purified and guarded against evil. Day by day the work of purification

goes on, slowly and gradually, but surely. Only remember that if, while it is going on, you think an evil thought and allow it to dwell in the mind, you will undo by your thinking that which the mantra has done, for your thought will draw back into the Sûkṣhma Sharîra the coarse matter that had been expelled.

The mantras of the Sandhyâ—and all mantras—do more than purify the Sûkṣhma Sharîra of the reciter. The beneficial vibrations they set up spread outwards through the surrounding neighbourhood, making the thought and desire atmosphere pure and wholesome, destroying mischievous vibrations and strengthening the helpful. Thus, in your Sandhyâ, you benefit others as well as yourselves; and if all performed daily their Sandhyâ, or some similar religious function, then would the whole life of India be changed and sweetened, and lifted to a higher level. And the boys in the Boarding House, who do this, are contributing to this good work, are creating for the whole College a purer and better atmosphere than would otherwise prevail. Each boy, who with pure heart and earnest mind and strong devotion, performs his daily Sandhyâ, is thus purifying himself and helping to make the College an influence for good on all who come to it, and is thus doing his little share in the great work of the regeneration of India.

So also with the mantras in the Shrâddha ceremony; these set up, in Bhuvarloka, vibrations that aid the Jîvâtmâ in the building up and in the destruction of the sheaths suitable to the stages of his journey, as he dwells in Pretaloka, as he passes on to Pitṛiloka, as thence he enters Svarga. And these facts, as I have already said, can be observed and verified by those who have developed the inner vision. It is in order that there may be some in modern days to bear witness to these facts, that the Ṛishis are aiding some to develop these Siddhis, and thus to revive the old science, and meet modern science on her own ground, thus justifying the teaching of the elder world.

On this knowledge the ceremonial functions of Hinduism are based, and all true ceremonies—though not all that are performed to-day—are based on knowledge thus derived. Boys often ask about the different ceremonies and customs which they observe around them, and they cannot tell which are important and which are unimportant. One general rule is useful to remember: that which is based on the authority of the Shruti or Smṛiti, which is ancient and universal, may fairly be presumed to rest on a sound scientific foundation. That which is not so based, which is modern and local, may, or may not, have a sound scientific foundation.

Thus, many customs differ in the north and in the south of India. An inhabitant of Madras will regard as all-important an observance of which an inhabitant of the Panjab has never heard; the orthodoxy of one district is not the orthodoxy of another. And, oddly enough, men often cling more to the local and the modern than they do to the universal and the ancient, and grow far more bitter over a controversy involving some trivial difference than over a matter in which principles are involved. Bitter sectarian divisions most often turn on subordinate points.

In the College Text Books, the local and the modern have been omitted, and the ancient and the universal have been carefully preserved; hence the ceremonies therein mentioned can be explained and defended, and are worthy the study of thoughtful people. This being so, it is desirable that any of you, who do not understand the reason for any ceremonial precept laid down, should ask for explanation, and meanwhile conform to it, as you would conform to any other precept laid down by authority for your guidance. Religion, in this, does not demand more from you than does science. Both require careful and prolonged study, and will only yield up their secrets to the strenuous and diligent enquirer. In both, much seems at first to be obscure and unintelligible; in both, the obscure

gradually becomes clear, and the unintelligible plain.

I am laying stress on this because in your hands, and in the hands of thousands like you, all over the country, lies the immediate future of India, and the greatest danger of all for India is that she should lose her Religion. You need not be anxious about her share in modern civilisation; of that she will have all she needs, enough and probably to spare. That lies in the inevitable course of evolution, is part of the inevitable destiny of every nation. The tendencies of the modern mind, the trend of modern thought, the alluring attractions of material splendour, the subtle influence of the conquering race—all these assure to India a full share of twentieth century civilisation. But there is a danger—a very real and pressing danger—that India may lose her Religion, that Hinduism may go down in the struggle between the Old and the New. And if Hindus do not maintain Hinduism, who shall save it? If India's own children do not cling to her faith, who shall guard it? India alone can save India, and India and Hinduism are one. No one in a western body can do what you can do. No love of mine for India, no fulness of service, no completeness of devotion, can do in this alien body what you, India's sons, can do. A Hindu is *born*, he is not made.

No amount of service to Hinduism, no practice of Hindu ways of life, no belief in Hindu teachings, no training in Hindu wisdom, can make a non-Hindu into a Hindu. Hence, even those of us who have Hindu hearts, and have past Hindu lives behind us, can only help you; the main work you must do for yourselves.

Make no mistake. Without Hinduism, India has no future. Hinduism is the soil into which India's roots are struck, and torn out of that she will inevitably wither, as a tree torn out from its place. Many are the religions and many the races which are flourishing in India, but none of them stretches back into the far dawn of her past, nor is necessary for her endurance as a nation. Every one might pass away as they came, and India would still remain. But let Hinduism vanish, and what is she? A "geographical expression" of the past, a dim memory of a perished glory. Her history, her literature, her art, her monuments, all have Hinduism written across them. Zoroastrianism came for refuge, and her sons have found asylum and welcome in India; but Zoroastrianism might pass, and India would remain. Buddhism was founded here, but Buddhism has disappeared, and India remains. Islâm came, a wave of conquest, and the Musulmâns form a part of the Indian people, and will share in the making

of the future; yet Islâm might pass, and India would remain. Christianity has come, and the Christians rule the land and influence its steps; yet Christianity might pass, and India would remain. India lived before their coming; India could live after their passing. But let Hinduism go, Hinduism that was India's cradle, and in that passing would be India's grave. Then would India with India's Religion be but a memory, as are Egypt and Egypt's Religion now. India would remain then as a subject for the antiquarian, the archeologist, a corpse for dissection, but no longer an object of patriotism, no longer a Nation.

If you forsake Hinduism, you stab your Mother to the heart, and Hinduism, which is her life-blood, pouring forth, her life will flee. Wounded, mutilated, conquered, degraded, she has been, this widowed Mother of the Âryan race, this discrowned Queen. But still her religion keeps her living, she who, otherwise, would be numbered with the dead. As you value your future, as you love your Motherland, do not lose your grip of your ancient Faith, nor be seduced away from the allegiance on which India's life depends. There is no religion into whose vessels more spiritual life can be poured than into those of Hinduism, no vessels of purer gold, of more priceless worth.

I charge you, be faithful to the Hinduism which

is your very life, and let no profane hand touch this holy thing committed to your charge.

PEACE TO ALL BEINGS.