
SOME OBSERVATIONS

ON

HINDUISM

BY

Sir S. SUBRAHMANYA IYER

PRINTED BY ANNIE BESANT, AT THE VASANTĀ PRESS, ADYAR.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON HINDUISM

BY

Sir S. Subrahmanya Iyer

BROTHERS :

IN presenting to you, at this quarterly conference of the Tanjore District Branches of the Theosophical Society, these my views and remarks upon the value of the Hindū faith and Dharma, I should like to express my very great regret at my unavoidable absence from your gathering to-day.

It seems to me to be quite proper, if not absolutely necessary, that I should refer at the outset of my remarks to the attempted and partially successful conversion of Hindū youths to Christianity in this place, as this is a matter which has provoked considerable local feeling, and not the first of its kind, for similar missionary enterprises have before this caused riots, resulting in criminal prosecutions involving the innocent as well as guilty residents of the place.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that I cordially sympathise with those who object to the

practice of enticing from their ancestral religion youths who are quite incapable of forming a deliberate and dispassionate judgment upon so important a matter as a change of religion. I sympathise, not because I hold that any of the religions is the only true one; I am emphatically one of those who believe that every one of the world's great faiths is founded upon the basic truths of the universal Wisdom, or the "Sanātana Dharma" as we should say. The Guardians of Humanity who are the custodians of the Sanātana Dharma do not confine Their truth or Their protection to any limited area or class of people, but at all times have given what was best for each nation or people, in the shape of the religion that was most suited to them. Christianity and Hindūism are, therefore, in my humble opinion, equally entitled to reverence from every man, irrespective of the particular creed to which he adheres. Nevertheless, the prevalent and reprehensible practice of attempting to convert inexperienced Hindū youths to Christianity cannot but be very offensive to all unprejudiced and thoughtful minds; and it is, indeed, a matter for great surprise that the very persons who themselves engage in such proselytising occupation should do so, when they are quite ready to affirm that this world and its humanity are not a hopeless chaos, but are part of an ordered system or cosmos out-breathed and sustained by

Supreme Wisdom—a Supreme Wisdom which we dare scarcely regard as at fault in its due provision for satisfying fully the deepest and most sacred instincts and needs of man. Even if we had not the assurance, which modern occult science affords, that all religions are founded upon and proceed from the impulse of the Divine Teachers, the fact that one form of faith prevails among the people of one country, while a different form holds sway over the people of another, should surely be taken as a social phenomenon ascribable to adequate and intelligible causes, and not as a mere accident with no definite relation to the needs of the different peoples. Careful observers cannot but recognise that a specific faith which prevails in a civilised community is not likely to have been adopted and followed but for its suitability to the members thereof. Consequently, to undermine their belief in their established religion would *prima facie* be to retard progress, not to promote it, and unprejudiced men would, of course, shrink from engaging in a work which would produce such a result. This, however, is not the view held by those bent upon making converts to Christianity, whose minds are hopelessly dominated by the singular notion that the belief in the dogmas which they profess constitutes the only way to salvation. They are obviously blind to the fact that their understanding of their Divine

Teacher is based upon a dead letter interpretation of the not always reliable records of His teachings, to which alone they have access. The absurdity of some of the doctrines held by the adherents to Christianity is not even equalled by the unreasoning character of the beliefs superstitiously held and acted upon by the more ignorant followers of the other religions. And the best testimony to this is that the Christianity preached here in India by the missionaries is far more dogmatic and superstitious than that which is usually preached now-a-days to the believers in the West, for during the last three or four decades the most cultured and intelligent classes there have revolted, either surrendering the beliefs altogether as hopelessly crude, or insisting upon a wider, more humane, and more rational interpretation of them.

As I have remarked, this more generous view of the dispensation of religion by God exerts no influence upon those whose mistaken belief as to the superiority of their own creeds impels them to do the work of evangelising "heathens," as they contemptuously call those people. I remember reading that when, more than a century ago, Schwartz, taking advantage of his friendship with Prince Sharaffojee of the Mahratta Dynasty, vigorously thrust Christianity upon the Brāhmanas of the time, they quite characteristically pleaded for tolerance and urged upon the missionary that,

while it was right that he, as a Christian by religion, should worship God after his own fashion, the same was true for them as Hindūs,—in vain however, for he was not unlike his successors of the present day. Perhaps nothing else can be expected so long as the majority of western people continue to be under the sway of the belief that the crude doctrines that they follow are the only means of salvation.

What then is the effectual remedy for diminishing, if not altogether stopping, these undesirable efforts to turn away children belonging to the higher classes of Hindū society from the religion into which they are born, which is as natural to their minds (if they were left to unfold without being poisoned with suggestions which are plausible to them because they are unused to weighing considerations) as their bodies and customs are natural to the climate in which their karma brings them to live—and not only their natural karma, I should say, but also what is necessary for their continued growth or evolution? The answer to this question is not far to seek, should Hindūs realise their duty in the matter of imparting religious education to the rising generation, and should they earnestly adopt measures for imparting such education on lines required by modern conditions and environments. Everybody seems now to agree that without

adequate provision for religious training in schools no system of education can be sound. The part which misguided schoolboys have been made to play during the last two or three years in the perpetration of political offences in India has awakened the Government to the absolute necessity for elementary religious or moral education in the schools. Whether, in accordance with the advice given by the Bishop of Madras in a speech recently delivered, the department of public instruction will be abolished in order to make way for the introduction of less rigorous and more elastic methods of general instruction, is a thing about which it is hazardous to predict at the present time.

Assuming that such abolition is not quite a practicable affair, it seems to me that the Government, having admitted the necessity for religious training in schools, might welcome proposals from the different communities who are prepared to provide for the religious part of the school curriculum, each community making provisions on lines most agreeable to itself, subject to the general control of the educational authorities so as to avoid any possible clash and conflict of interests as between the different communities themselves. Now, can we really be sure that the Hindūs would avail themselves of this favourable opportunity, and concert measures for discharging the obliga-

tions which this would involve. I extremely regret to say that, so far as I can see, there seems at present no hope that they would rise to the occasion. It is quite true that the majority of our Hindū brethren who have not had any English education would be only too glad to see their children being properly taught to carry out the religious practices of their caste; but I must say that this is not exactly what is required,—it is rather necessary to imprint upon the minds of the growing generation the broad principles which govern our religious teachings and practices, for the moulding of character which this alone can do is the essential purpose of all religions. Yet I fear that the fathers and mothers of this class do not appreciate this purpose, nor possess the spirit of combined action. On the other hand the comparatively few who have received the benefits of English education are so wholly steeped in politics, and in social reforms of the material order, that they are disposed to pay little or no attention to the religious education of boys, and much less of girls. They do not, I fancy realise that it forms the very basis of national growth and are consequently not impressed with its vital importance. I must confess therefore, not without some sadness, that it is not probable that the non-theosophist Hindūs will stand together in this matter of systematic religious education, notwithstanding its

great need and paramount importance. This, however, does not alter the attitude nor the responsibility of those of us who *are* Hindū Theosophists. We must do our utmost to prevent the conversion of our inexperienced youths to a foreign religion. It is a work of every Theosophist to infuse into any religion, and especially his own, fresh vigour and vitality, for he knows that all religions are but a part of the eternal truth, of the Ancient Wisdom, which ever has been given to the different peoples of the world according to their several needs, and that the only requirement is to make this eternal truth shine forth more purely in every faith, loaded as they have been with the misconceptions and superstitions of men. Upon us, therefore, devolves the special responsibility of restoring Hindūism, so far as may lie in our power, to its ancient glory and grandeur. It is not a sign of irreverence towards our noble ancestors to endeavour to emulate their greatness, as so many of our people unconsciously suppose, and if it were, we should not need to fear outshining them. We are not absolved from our duty by their greatness. It is as necessary that future generations shall be able to look back with honourable pride to their ancestry, as we to ours. We have received our heritage, glory be to our forefathers, but shame to us if we do not try to hand it on unsullied and unimpaired.

As the earliest and oldest sub-race of the great Āryan stock we received, from our Manu, the great Vaivasvata, and the Mahārṣhis, greatest of all Veda Vyāsa, the Teacher of our race, what we now call our Sanātana Dharma. Its foundations are laid deep and strong, but the superstructure depends for its beauty and inspiration upon the lives of its followers in every age. Stately and noble beyond all conceiving could this be, if men lived according to its inspiration which of old was thus given especially to Indians, the first sub-race of the Āryans, as best suited to their character and development. In thus speaking of Hindūism, I am far from drawing any invidious comparison between the various religions founded by the same high Authority, but I do wish to assert that it fulfils the highest need of all Hindūs, and in support of this claim of the high merit of our own faith it is sufficient to draw attention to its fundamental doctrines of the immanence of God in all nature, and the perfect universality of the law of Absolute justice, and the doctrine of reincarnation—doctrines now being acknowledged by all rational minds, both in the East and the West, as irrefutable and as affording the only hope for man. How then can we best try to discharge our special responsibility to our mother faith? Surely by studying and understanding it in the light of Theosophy, which

alone furnishes the key to a right comprehension of it. The correctness of these my views as to the help to be derived from Theosophy in the right understanding of our Scriptures and a full comprehension of important truths, (especially when they appear therein as though under a veil), will be evident to all who, even to a slight degree, have used the light shed upon the Scriptures by the writings of a Theosophical teacher like our President, Mrs. Annie Besant.

Let me illustrate the view which I have just expressed by an example or two. Take the Sārīrika Mīmāṃsa Sūtra dealing with the question of Samsāra in relation to the Mighty Ones spoken of as Ādhikāra Puruṣhas. The Sūtra runs thus :

यावदधिकारमवस्थितिराधिकारिकाणाम् ।

“Those who are office-bearers remain (in *samsāra*) as long as their office continues”. One of the instances mentioned in the commentary ascribed to Śaṅkara illustrative of the class within the import of the Sūtra is the great Sage familiar to us—He who is usually spoken of as Vyāsa. That name is, in truth, as everyone knows, part of the phrase describing the office held by Him, that is Veda Vyāsa, Veda-chārya being another expression found in the books with reference to it. The office is the same as that which the Buddhists call Bodhisattwa, now filled by the Lord Maitreya, who succeeded in

it the Sage Veda Vyāsa. Let this observation startle whom it may, yet I shall say that recent occult investigation has brought to light the fact that it was the same Sage whom the Hindūs know as Kṛṣṇa Dwaipāyana Vyāsa who took birth as Gauṭama in the incarnation in which He attained the glorious height of Buddhahood—His last appearance on earth in a physical body. How so mighty a one as the Buddha, who by the tremendous force of his magnetism was able to sweep up thousands to the level of Arhaṭs, could be involved in samsāra might, at first sight, seem puzzling. If, however, the student brings to bear upon the interpretation of the Sūtra the information about the place of Masters in religions, to be found in the lecture of that name, he will soon discover that the difficulty at first felt in grasping the true import of the aphorism arose from applying samsāra to the Mighty Ones in question in the same sense in which it is understood when used with reference to ordinary humanity. In the case of the latter the turning of the wheel of births and deaths is of course inevitable. But the student should easily see that, since They are not subject to the compulsory pilgrimage, the reason why They may be spoken of as in samsāra is to be found in the fact that They voluntarily renounced for the time being, (the period of the offices They took up), the far greater bliss

of working on the nirvāṇic plane. The taking up of a duty on the part of such Great Ones constitutes a bond and a limitation which They cannot break through, though that bond is self-imposed. Such renunciation cannot of course be attended by kārmic consequences of the character which acts upon those who have not been liberated, for these great Beings have nothing to be acted upon by such kārmic influences. It is hardly necessary to say that a mukṭa, by assuming an office and taking up bodies including the densest, the physical, does not expose himself to any real suffering, nor does he in the least incur loss of the nirvāṇic consciousness which is of the very nature of One who has reached that exalted level. Remembering that things spiritual should not be looked at merely with the eyes of flesh, the Theosophist regards the renunciation of nirvāṇa on the part of an aḍhikārī as analogous to the sacrifice ascribed to the Logos Himself in the creation of His universe, and thus fully grasps the meaning of the sūtra. I may close the above comments by adding that the essence of this important matter is nowhere better illustrated than in the two short passages which I now quote from the lecture alluded to above, the first containing a concise statement as to the responsibility incurred by a Master of the Wisdom Who comes forward to start in the world a fresh spiritual impulse by

founding a religion, and the second graphically describing the inevitable reaction of such an effort to serve humanity.

(1) "And that is the next point in the idea of the Master. Those who founded a religion were bound to remain wearing the body of man, fixed to the earth, bound to the outward semblance of humanity, so long as the religion lived upon earth which they had given to it. That was the rule: no liberation for the Man who founded a religion until all who belonged to that religion had themselves passed out of it, into liberation, or into another faith, and the religion was dead. The death of a religion is the liberation from all bondage of the Master who gave it to the world. He in a very real sense is incarnate in the religion that He bestows. While that religion lives and teaches, while men still find in it the expression of their thought, so long that divine Man must remain, and guide and protect and help the religion which He gave to earth. Such is the law."¹

(2) "Heavy the responsibility of a divine Man who takes upon Himself the tremendous burden of speaking out to the world a new Word in the divine revelation. All that grows out of it makes the heavy burden of His destiny. Everything which happens within that communion of which He is the centre must react upon Him, and He is ultimately responsible, and as that divine Word is always spoken

¹ *London Lectures of 1907*, Annie Besant. p. 34.

in a community of men and women imperfect, sinning, ignorant, that Word is bound to be distorted and twisted, because of the medium in which it works. That is why every such Teacher is called a 'sacrifice'—Himself at once the sacrificer and the sacrifice, the greatest sacrifice that man may make to man, sacrifice so mighty that none in whom Deity is not unfolded to the greatest height compatible with human limitation is strong enough to make it, is strong enough to endure it. That is the true sacrifice of the Christ; not a few hours' agony in dying, but century after century of crucifixion on the cross of matter, until salvation has been won for the people who bear His name, or until they have passed under some other Lord. Hence is that road always called the 'Way of the Cross'."¹

Let us now take verse six of chapter ten of the Gīṭā. Referring to the words therein, pūrvē chaṭvāro manavaṣṭaṭha, Mr. T. Subba Rao spoke thus in the course of his profound discourses delivered at the Theosophical Convention of 1886: "There is a peculiarity in this passage to which I must call your attention. He speaks here of four Manus. Why does He speak of four? We are now in the seventh manvantara—that of Vaivasvaṭa. If he is speaking of the past Manus, he ought to speak of six but he only mentions four. In some commentaries an attempt has been made to

¹ *Ibid*, pages 35 and 36.

interpret this in a peculiar manner. The word chaṭvārah is separated from the word manavah, and is made to refer to Sanaka, Sanandana, Sanat̥kumāra and Sanat̥sujāta, who are also included among the Mind-born Sons of Prajāpati. But this interpretation will lead to a most absurd conclusion, and make the sentence contradict itself. The persons alluded to in the text have a qualifying clause in the sentence. It is well-known that Sanaka and the other three refused to create though the other sons had consented to do so; therefore in speaking of those persons from whom humanity has sprung into existence, it would be absurd to include these four also in the list. The passage must be interpreted without splitting the compound into two nouns. The number of Manus will then be four, and the statement would contradict the Paurāṇic accounts, though it would be in harmony with the occult theory. You will recollect that Mr. Sinnett has stated that we are now in the fifth root-race. Each root-race is considered as the saṅgati of a particular Manu. Now the fourth root-race has passed, or in other words there have been four past Manus. There is another point to be considered in connection with this subject. It is stated in Manusmṛiti that the first Manu (Svāyambhuva) created seven Manus. This seems to be the total number of Manus

according to this Smṛti. It is not alleged that there was, or would be, another batch of Manus created, or to be created at some other time.

“But the Paurāṇic account makes the number of Manus fourteen. This is a subject which requires a considerable amount of attention at your hands; it is no doubt a very interesting one, and I request such of you as have the required time at your disposal to try and find out how this confusion has arisen. The commentators try to get the number fourteen out of Manu. Of course an ingenious paṇḍit can get anything out of anything, but if you will go into the matter deeply it is quite possible we may be able to find out how the whole mistake has arisen, and if there is any mistake or not. Any further discussion of the subject at present is unnecessary.”

These observations show the obscure nature of the whole subject. The lecturer hardly suggests any clue to the solution of the difficulties raised by him. When he wrote signing himself Solar Sphinx, as he sometimes did, it was his wont to say that the business of the sphinx was to propound riddles, not to solve them. The present is obviously an instance in which he has played the rôle of that mythological creature in order, no doubt, to make us think for ourselves. I feel it is altogether beyond my power to give an explanation of the matter which would be deemed quite acceptable.

Nevertheless, I venture to make the following suggestions. It is obvious, as Subba Row says, that the words in question in the text must be taken literally, and that consequently the number of Manus alluded to by the writer is neither more nor less than four. Who are they? In dealing with this query it should be remembered that there are more classes of Manus than one—Manus of root-races, Manus of rounds, and so on. As the present is the fifth root-race, and as each of the past four root-races had its Manu, the answer to the above question may very likely be that the text refers to the Manus of those past four races.

The better answer, to my mind, would be that the reference is to round Manus. The phrase “mind-born” in the text seems to militate against the correctness of the first answer, for reasons which I shall proceed to show. No doubt the Manus of the last four races came out of a chain other than ours. But They stood on a level lower than that to which some of the highest of the Lords who came from Venus had attained. And having regard to the fact that the evolution in that planet is one still in progress, those Lords have not to be taken as the product of a past kalpa. When we think of the stupendous nature of the work of a round Manu and of the immensity of time during which His office continues, it is impossible to resist the idea that one called upon to undertake such a task must be the

glorious fruitage of some past kalpa, descending in this to co-operate with the Planetary Spirits in the evolutionary work of the chain. As such beings come forth directly from the *transcendent* aspect of the Logos Himself, as far as this kalpa is concerned, especially to help His creation, they may with the most perfect fitness be described as the mind-born sons of Prajāpati, while all other beings, who are the product of the creative activity of the kalpa, are Manusantāṭi, progeny of the Manus. If I am right in thinking that the phrase "mind-born" is inconsistent with the supposition that root-race Manus were intended by the verse in question, there seems to be no difficulty in taking it as referring to the Manus of the round, the three past and the present fourth, unless it be that the word "preceding" in the text is inapplicable to the Manu of the round which is still going on. May not, however, the expression be understood as used in opposition to the round Manus, who are to be in charge of the remaining three rounds, the Manu of the present round having been at work long, long before Arjuna came to be taught by the Lord? If the reference be not to round Manus, those intended must be taken to be the chain Manus, whose position is infinitely higher. As regards both these classes, the correct number is certainly fourteen, inasmuch as both rounds and chains have each a root as

well as a seed Manu. I shall only add that, if the solution I have offered be unsatisfactory, I hope that it will at least tend to keep the subject clearly before the minds of readers who think it worthy of investigation. They may rest assured that, whatever may be the true explanation of the matter, it cannot be found outside Theosophy.

Lastly, let us take the first four verses of the eighth chapter of the Gīṭā, which, it seems to me, is the most important and valuable chapter in the whole book. The meaning of the term *aḍhiḍaivam* clearly dawned upon me only when I tried to understand it in the light of Theosophical knowledge as to the Logoi of the solar system. The commentator on the Gīṭā refers to *aḍhiḍaivam* as the *maṇḍalāṇṭaravṛṭṭipurūṣha*. That, however, did not throw any light on the point. In spite of the complete description of the transcendental qualities of *maṇḍalāṇṭaravṛṭṭipurūṣhas*, in verse nine of the chapter, I could not quite grasp their place in our cosmos and their relation to man. That the reaching of the region of *maṇḍalāṇṭaravṛṭṭipurūṣha* was not the attainment of the highest goal was rendered clear by verse ten. This made me identify *maṇḍalāṇṭaravṛṭṭipurūṣhas* with Planetary Logoi, a conclusion which, I venture to hope, is not incorrect. Of course, they are the agents of the Solar Logos, and the

expression maṇḍalāntaravṛttipuruṣha taken as referring to those who act under Him who is the Lord of the system, is quite appropriate. This view enabled me to see that the basic ideas of the philosophy of the Gītā were put in a nutshell by the statement that the six objects of the study and meditation which (accompanied with complete devotion to himself, Vāsudeva) would lead to beatitude, are :

(1) Akṣharam, the indestructible Parabrahman or the absolute, the all ;

(2) Adhyātman, the highest subjective manifestation of Parabrahman—Pratyagātman, or the one abstract Logos, the highest Self, whose partner is Mūlaprakṛti or root of matter, the objective manifestation of Parabrahman, the not-self, and by implication the manifestation of Pratyagātman, namely, Īshvaras of particular systems, who themselves again show forth as Tṛimūrṭi or the trinity ;

(3) Karma, the concomitant of the appearance of the pair above mentioned, Pratyagātman and Mūlaprakṛti, and likewise of the appearance of Īshvaras and the root of matter of their systems, consisting of the arousing into activity of the three guṇas latent in a condition of equilibrium in the root of matter ;

(4) Adhibhūtam, caused by and resulting from karma, in the shape of bubbles constituting the kṣharam or the destructible ;

(5) Adhidaivam, the highest order of spiritual entities or creative potencies in the system, under one or other of which came the class making up;

(6) Adhiyajña, Jīvātman the highest spirit, being the sacrifice in human bodies.

I refrain from multiplying instances of the value of the comparative study of Hindūism and Theosophy, believing that the examples I have discussed above with some fullness present both in a light which should suffice to bring home their error to the minds of those amongst us who think that Hindūism is not worthy of their attention, also to the minds of those who, on the contrary, repudiate the teachings of Theosophy because of their supposed incompatibility with exoteric Hindū ideas. After studying our scriptures with the aid of Theosophy what do we see are the methods of discharging the duty it involves? The answer is: try to spread among your co-religionists such light as you may have been able to obtain from your study, and that especially among the youths, who are more susceptible to noble ideals than the older people, especially when such ideals are presented by those who themselves are living up to what they preach.

Even if there be no religious classes in the schools there is no adequate reason why our members should not gather together for a talk with the boys during holidays and at other times, basing such

talks upon the excellent expositions of Hindūism contained in the Sanāṭana Dharma Text-books issued by the Central Hindū College Committee, and in the lectures of Mrs. Annie Besant on Karma and Reincarnation and similar subjects, in which I may venture to say are to be found the most instructive expositions, illustrated by the results of scientific discoveries and researches which so strongly appeal to our young men in these days of the rapid development of the concrete mind. Workers along this line will find that a book about to be published consisting of Mrs. Besant's answers to questions on Hindūism will be of immense use for the elucidation of all points of Hindū doctrine and religious practice. The intuition and felicitousness of these answers cannot but dissipate the many mistakes and doubts which now prevail to the detriment of our noble faith, the greatest of our heritages. If such workers come forth from among us, their labours will surely attract to their work the blessings of the Masters, for it is part of Their plan to spiritualise India first, so as to make it an instrument for the furtherance of Their work in other parts of the world. The uplifting of India can only come through the spiritualising of its people, and as I have already said it will be far more effective to work upon the growing generation than upon those who are already middle-aged.

A few words about another aspect of the matter under consideration. Viewing Hindūism as a system of practical religion, we see that one of its merits is in the emphasis it lays upon the necessity of sacraments. The importance of these to the vast majority of men and women in every civilised society will be found demonstrated in the lecture upon the sacramental life delivered by our President in London last year. It is there pointed out that much has been lost in Western countries through the decay of faith in the efficacy of sacraments which followed close upon the heels of the Reformation, and the hope is expressed that the spread of Theosophy will bring back with it the knowledge of the real use and the advantages which would flow from due attention to them. Surely, then, none of us here should be guilty of neglecting the observance of the most important and sacred of Hindū sacraments. Among these, to my mind, are the Sandhyas, or the worship to be gone through at the morning and the evening twilights. It would be a mistake for any Hindū member, unless he has actually entered the Stream or taken the first Initiation—to think that he is above the necessity of going through the routine of such set and formal worship. We should not be blind to the fact that such worship is a most efficient aid to self-purification, and that without it spiritual progress is difficult for most types of

people. Remember that the Manu laid it down that Upanayana must be performed and the Gāyatrī manṭra communicated to a child at the end of its seventh year, when the ego takes full possession of his bodies, so that no time be lost in securing to him the benefits of the uplifting vibrations which the recital of the great manṭra necessarily causes in the subtle bodies. I am sure that none of you will disagree with me in holding that by far the most important part of the work to be done by us in regard to our youths is to prevail upon them to attend to the twilight worship, not to drop it as meaningless jargon and superstition because their elders are at a loss to explain the rationale of it. The best way of doing this is to make them understand the true meaning and import of the Samskr̥t manṭras which they are required to recite, and to explain the effects which the performance of the rites would produce on them in due course of time. Recently, I lighted upon a commentary on the Sandhyās which, while quite brief, struck me as being particularly good, the manṭras being so explained as to constitute the purest possible worship of the one Supreme Spirit. A good translation of it into English is eminently desirable, as it will help greatly in the comprehension of the Vedic passages used in the performance of the Sandhyās, which are quite abstruse.