

the remote past, and certainly not the abode of Sadhus.

Amongst other objects of interest we noticed, was a woollen *āsana* (sitting cloth) and an iron-tipped arrow: we should have liked to carry some of these things away with us, but Bhutia superstition prevented it, as the spirits of the dead might be disturbed, they said. As we left the cave, our companions, the Alakias performed some ceremony, which they assured us, would save the souls of the dead.

High, high above this cave, was a place called *Vyasavana*, where there were many beautiful springs and trees, and where it was believed, *Vyasa* could even now be seen, if any one had the hardihood to climb such a distance. But no one was ever known to have done so.

We were glad to find, an easier path on our return journey, pointed out by two Bhutias, who had then come up to us, probably from curiosity, as to our motives for visiting the cave, and undertook to take us back to *Bhabanagar*. We gladly accepted their offer, but our old friends, the thorny creepers were again needed to help us in our descent, before we were on the right path, and we finally arrived at the *Dharmasala*, breathless and exhausted, our bodies and clothes much the worse for the rough treatment they had suffered through the hard scramble we had undertaken. We were soon surrounded by a crowd of wondering Bhutias who listened eagerly to our experiences, and displayed much interest in the account we gave them of the cave of bones.

## REVIEWS

**PURUSHA SUKTA.** Translated and explained by *B. V. Kamesvara Aiyar*, M. A. Professor of English, H. H. the Raja's College, Pudukkottai, and Editor, *Sanskrit Journal*, Madras. Roy. 16 mo., 1898.\*

**SANDHYAVANDANAM** of Rig, Yajus and Sama Vedins with a literal translation, and explanatory paraphrase and commentary in English. By the same author, Madras. Roy. 16 mo., 1898.†

**BHAGAVAD GITA** with Ramanujacharya's Visishtadvaita commentary. Translated into English by *A. Govindacharya*, Madras. Demy 8 vo., 1898.‡

When last year we read Mr. A. Mahadeva Sastri's translation of *Gita* and *Sāukara Bhāshya*, we felt that a new era in Indian scholarship had commenced, and the places so grotesquely filled by Western Pandits—those of translators, commentators, and critics of the

ancient Indian Scriptures, were going to taken by their natural possessors—the Indian. The works before us today, not only demonstrate that that feeling was not mere fancy but that the time is quite ripe, when fitful, irregular, and uncertain individual labour in this direction—as individual labour, however able and worthy, generally is—should be supplanted by regular, organised work, guided by certain fixed principles, and having for its aim, the accomplishment of certain well-defined objects. We give expression to this idea here, that all who feel the necessity of such organised work and particularly the authors named above, who have by their unaided individual efforts so eminently distinguished themselves for undertaking it, may take it up for consideration.

Mr. Kamesvara Aiyar's *Purusha-Sukta* and *Sandhyavandanam* cannot be spoken of too highly. The erudition, judgment and lofty patriotism betrayed in these two small books, entitle him to the deep respect of every Indian heart. A fair, discriminative, scientific spirit reassures the reader all through the pages, of

\*Price 6 annas.

†Price 6 annas.

‡Three sorts have been got up. Rs. 12, 10, and 8.

the writer's mature understanding and high sincerity of purpose. Indeed, we feel we shall be wanting in our duty to our readers, if we do not state it as our opinion that we should like each one of them to peruse these two books with the best attention.

Mr. Govinda Charlu's translation of Gita with the Vishishtâdvaita commentary of Râmânûja calls for attention for various reasons. The translation is lucid and excellent throughout, and the notes and references exhaustive. Every page bears witness to the pains taken by the translator to perform his task to the best of his power; and his task was surely not a light one. He has also done a great service to the English-knowing world by giving it for the first time the Vishishtadvaita interpretation of Gita—a philosophy which naturally finds favour with the masses of mankind because of great simplicity, and upholding the path of devotion through love and emotion as the highest.

The printing and get up of the book are very good; but we should like to point out to Mr. Srinivasa Charlu that there are a great many misprints—errors in proof correction, and that the italics in many places are of 'wrong founts,' which should be set right in the next edition.

When we have said all this,—and we have tried not to say a word which we thought was not deserved—we may say without the fear, we hope, of quarrelling with Mr. Govinda Charlu, that we did not like among other things, the idea of his holding out high hopes to mankind, of the delight and other good things, which his book, according to him, was destined to bring them. This sort of self-advertisement—we are ready to believe Mr. Charlu is guilty of it unwittingly,—does not in our humble opinion quite become him or his subject either. We beg also to differ from him *in toto* when he draws 'odorous' comparison between Ramanuja and Sankara. This is not the place to enter into details; but all men may not think very much of the God, "Whose will and pleasure, it is, to *dramatically*\* display the universe," and who, therefore, prefer,—as Mr. Charlu is pleased to put it—"the cold

abstraction of a Sankara's God." The universe may be a *drama* to the Vishishtadvaita God, but a very real *tragedy* indeed to the hapless actors in the play.

We shall say another word and be done. Ramanuja of course has interpreted the Gita as if there were no advaita teachings in it. We should like to know how Mr. Charlu looks at this question. Does he think there are no Srutis teaching rigorous advaita? How for instance does he explain the Srutis quoted by Sankara as "advaita" in his commentary on Brahma Sutra I. i. 11? We should like to have a clear definition of the Vishishtadvaita position in respect to his question from the broad, enlightened, modern followers of Ramanuja, and we trust Mr. Charlu will fulfil our expectations in the second volume which he has promised us.

---

WHY I AM A VEGETERIAN, an address delivered before the Chicago Vegetarian Society by *J. Howard Moore*. Fcap. 8vo., 1895.\*

So long as life means what it does now, the constant adjustment of inner functions to outer conditions—a constant whirl of want and supply to keep the equilibrium between waste and repair, the maintenance of life without destruction of life will be an impossibility, since the waste of 'life' cannot be repaired by 'dead' things, even if it were possible for 'dead' things to exist. The strong point on the vegetarian side, therefore, is not that a vegetable diet entails no loss of life, but that it destroys life of a much lower order, where feeling and susceptibility are comparatively very little developed; hence it contributes less pain and unhappiness to the sum total of feelings in the world than the meat diet. Even if other things be regarded as equal, vegetarianism has this distinct ethical gain; and the immense importance of this gain will be realized when it is remembered, that the history of civilization is the

---

\*Frances L. Dusenberry. McVicker's Theatre Building Chicago, U. S. A. Price 25 cents.

\*The italics are ours.