matter, for which I crave the indulgence of my readers, my excuse for the procedure being that the personal matter is likely to be of use in *appraising the value of the work*.

Having been more or less earnestly interested in questions of metaphysic from the year 1881, when I was in my thirteenth year, I had formed for myself, in 1887, while studying for university degrees, a set of philosophical aphorisms in Samskṛt, with an English translation. These embodied answers, to my own satisfaction, to all or most of the final questions of metaphysic, in the shape of definitions of the Ultimates of the World-process. I had them printed for private circulation among friends some time between 1887 and 1890; I am not sure of the exact year now. I reproduce these aphorisms below; and for detailed exposition of the ideas contained in them, and of some slight changes and improvements and corrections introduced into the scheme, I may be permitted to refer to a book, called *The Science of Peace*, written by me, and published by the Theosophical Publishing Society in 1904.

अथ

वेदान्तहृदयसूत्रम् ।

१. "अहमेतन्नास्मि" इति निष्क्रियमकालमदेशं पूर्णं शाश्वतं परं "ब्रह्म," "परमात्मा" वा ।

२. "एतत्" समष्ट्युपाध्युपहितः "एतन्नास्मि" इति-"ज्ञान" वान् "अहम्" एव पुरुषः, सूत्रात्मा, "ईश्वरः" ।

३. "अहमै" क्यविरोधा "देत" "ज्ञाना" "अणु" रूपमिति ।
"एतदे" व "अहमेतदि" ति निर्वचनात् सद्भाववती "एतन्नास्मी" ति निषेधादसद्भावावलम्बिनी सदसती प्रधानाव्यक्तेत्याद्यपरनाम्नी अनन्ताणुरूपा "मूलप्रकृतिः" ।

४. अणुरूपै "तद्" व्यष्ट्युपाध्युपहितः "अहमेतद्" इति ज्ञानवान् अहम् "जीवः," "जीवात्मा" वा ।

५. अहमा एतदः प्रत्यक्षीकरणमेव "ज्ञानम्" ।
६ & ७. तत एव "ज्ञाता" "ज्ञेयं" च ।

८. "अह-मेतन्-नास्मी" ति पूर्णज्ञानम् महत्, बुद्धिः, ब्रह्मा, "विद्या" वा ।

९. "अहमेतद्" इत्यंशज्ञान "मविद्या" ।

१०. "एतन्नास्मी" ति नितान्तविरोधेऽपि "अहमेतदि" त्यत्यन्तसंरोधात् अहमेतदोः "अन्योऽन्याध्यासः" ।

११. "एतदः" अहमपरिमितत्वविरोधेन परिमितत्वम् ।
परिमिते च "एतदि" "अहमेतदि" ति संयोगस्य "नास्मी" ति च वियोगस्य यौगपद्यासंभवात् "प्रवृत्ति-निवृत्ति," सृष्टिसंहारा, ध्यारोपापवाद, रूप "क्रम" जन्म ।

१२. क्रम एव "कालः"।

१३. एकस्मिन् काले नानानाम् संभव एव "देशः," खम्, आकाशः।

१४. "अहमेतन्नास्मी" तिवाक्यान्तर्गतं क्रम "स्यावश्यकत्व" मेव "माया" शक्तिर्दैवीप्रकृतिरित्यादि बहुनामिका भगवती स्तुतिशतसहस्राधिष्ठातृदेवता॥

The Heart of the Veḍānṭa

1. (Aham-eṭaṭ-na) "I-this-not-am" is the Motionless, Timeless, Spaceless, Perfect, Eternal, Supreme Brahman, known otherwise as Paramāṭmā.

2. The "I" sheathed in the totality of the "This" and possessing the knowledge "I am not this" is Puruṣha, Sūṭrāṭmā, Īshvara.[1]

3. By opposition to the unity of the "I," the "This" is "*many*," hence atomic. This same "This," endowed with being by the affirmation "I (am) This," and deprived of existence by the denial "(I am) This not," hence existent as well as non-existent, is the (ever becoming, ever changing) endlessly atomic Mūlaprakṛṭi—also named Praḍhāna, Avyakṭa, etc.

4. The "I" clothed in the sheath of an

1 This idea has been somewhat modified and developed in *The Science of Peace* where the word used is Praṭyag-āṭmā, a distinction being made between it and Sūṭrāṭmā, for technical purposes. So, more or less slight modifications would have to be made in the wording of the other aphorisms also if they were being written out anew, in the light of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*.

"atom" (*i.e.*, a part of the "This," as distinguished from the totality thereof) and possessing the consciousness, "I (am) this" is the jīva, called otherwise the jīvāṭmā.

5. The placing before itself of the "This" by the "I" is *Knowledge*.

6 & 7. Whence the *Knower* and the *Known*.

8. The full-knowledge "I-this-not-am" is Mahaṭ, Buḍḍhi, Brahmā, Viḍyā.

9. The part-knowledge "I (am) this" is A-viḍyā.

10. The complete identification implied in the "I (am) This," despite the utter opposition conveyed in "(I am) This not," results in (the) *Mutual Assimilation* (of the qualities, so to say, of the "I" and the "This").

11. The "This" by opposition to the unlimitedness of the "I" is "limited". Owing to the impossibility, in the limited This, of a contemporeity of the union (of the I and the This) contained in the "I (am) This" and of the separation involved in the "(I am) This not," results the (succession of the) movement (motion, or cyclic moving) of *Assumption* and *Renunciation*, Creation and Destruction, Hypothesis and Refutation (Manifestation and Absorption, Evolution and Involution, Life and Death, etc., etc.).

12. This succession (of the movement) itself is *Time*.

13. The possibility of the Existence of the "Many" in (and at) one Time is *Space*.

14. The *Necessity* of the movement involved in the sentence "I-this-not-am" is Māyā, Shakṭi, Ḍaivī-Prakṛṭi, the Goddess of a hundred names and a thousand hymns.

When I met Paṇdiṭ Ḍhanarāja, at Bārābaṅkī, in 1897, as said before, and, day after day, heard his astonishing accounts of extant ancient works, I one day asked him whether in any of these he had met with any definition of Brahman, the Absolute, or Paramāṭmā, the Supreme Self, in the words of the first aphorism printed above. He was silent for sometime and then said "Yes". At my further request, he repeated a paragraph in the middle of which occurred, like an islet in a stream, the four words recognisable to me, while on both sides thereof were masses of what was to me then entirely unintelligible language. I asked him whence he had made the quotation. He mentioned the name of *Praṇava-Bhāṣhya* in reply, to the best of my recollection. (When, long after, I referred the point to him, he said my memory was at fault, and that he had mentioned the right name, *Praṇava-Vāḍa*, from the very beginning.)

My opportunities, at the time, of seeing and conversing with him, were not many or long, because of the exigencies of the service I was in.

I was, moreover, shortly transferred by the Government to another district, and so lost sight of him for the time being. I resigned the service in March, 1899, partly to find more time for such studies as I was interested in, and partly to look after the secretarial work of the Central Hinḍū College, Benares, founded a few months previously by Mrs. Annie Besant, in the best and highest interests of Hinḍū youth and Hinḍū religion. In the winter of 1899-1900 I wrote out *The Science of the Emotions*, the main ideas of which I had put forward many years previously in a very roughly sketched article, entiled "Findings," in *The Theosophist*, in 1894; and the work was published in London, by the Theosophical Publishing Society, in the summer of 1900.

About the end of July in this latter year I went to Bārābaṅkī for a couple of days to pay a visit to my old friend Paṇdiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās. At the latter's house I saw Paṇdiṭ Ḍhanarāja again. The broken conversations of 1897 were resumed. I made further enquiries about the commentary on the *Praṇava* the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* as he called it now. He repeated passages from it; also from what he declared was an ancient commentary by Bārhāyaṇa on the original *Brahma-Sūṭras*. My interest was aroused strongly. Between this interest on the one hand, and the doubts and suspicions hanging around the

the six weeks he stayed with us, he took down to the dictation of the blind man nearly 8,000 shloka-measures. Then he had to go back and rejoin his post.

I began again about the middle of November, 1900, and, by the end of the month, reduced to writing another 2,000 shlokas. In the beginning of December, 1900, I had to go out with Mrs. Besant on a tour in the North of India, in connexion with the College and the Theosophical Society. I, therefore, engaged Paṇḍiṭ Ambā Ḍās Shāstṛī, a Paṇḍiṭ of Benares, educated in Samskṛṭ in the indigenous way, with a special training in the *Nyāya* Philosophy, to complete the work for me. I may note here that Paṇḍiṭ Ambā Ḍās does not know English. He completed the last 2,000 shlokas of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* on the 9th January, 1901.

Throughout the months of October, November and December, 1900, and up to the 13th of January, 1901, I used to avail myself of the spare hours that I could secure during the days I was in Benares, generally between the hours of 9 and 11 in the night, to read out to the blind Paṇḍiṭ what had been written by Gangānāṭh Jhā or Ambā Ḍās Shāstṛī, and correct any mistakes that had crept in, as pointed out by him. This work of revision was also completed on the 13th January, 1901.

Between the 13th and the 19th January, 1901,

I took down to the Paṇḍiṭ's dictation the original "Preface" to the book, which for some reason of his own, never explained to me, he had reserved to the last. On the 19th January, 1901, Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja left for his home in Belhar Kalān.

Although, on repeated reading, the language of the work becomes, generally speaking, intelligible, yet the precise sense remains often obscure and indefinable. It will remain obscure throughout to minds not specially trained and prepared by previous metaphysical study to grasp and utilise slight clues to subtle ideas. There are other drawbacks to a study of the work: too much repetition of the same ideas in only slightly different forms or aspects and only slightly different language; too much condensation in one place, and over-prolixity in another; and so on. Yet, despite these drawbacks, as they are from a modern point of view, the work is unique. It is different entirely from anything on the subject of Philosophy now current in Samskṛṭ, or any other language, so far as I am aware. It has had a special charm and attraction for me, and has aroused an almost superstitious enthusiasm in me, because of the entire agreement of its line of thought with that which I evoked for myself independently many years before I knew anything about Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, or about this

work, and an aphoristic outline of which I had circulated privately in print amongst a few friends, and then sketched out roughly in a few articles under the titles of "To Him That Seeks," "Findings," and "Further Findings," in *The Theosophist* for March, May and October, 1894, and later on published in fuller detail in *The Science of the Emotions* and *The Science of Peace*, in 1900 and 1904 respectively.

I have already stated how *The Science of the Emotions* was written out in the winter of 1899-1900, when I possessed only an acquaintance with Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, and had not yet heard anything from him about the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* beyond the mere name. I found, later on, the main ideas of that book expounded in the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* in a few pages of the third and largest section, on *Kriyā*, entitled the *Kriyā-Prakaraṇa*.

I may be permitted to add here, with respect to *The Science of Peace*, that it is practically a detailed commentary on the set of aphorisms reproduced above, made by me for my own use in 1887, as said before; and deals with most of the many questions incidentally raised in *The Science of the Emotions*, and left there to be answered elsewhere, as belonging to metaphysic. The drafting of this work, *The Science of Peace*, was begun in June 1900, when I was away, for a change of air, at the

hill town of Waltair, also called Vizagapatam, on the sea-shore, midway between Calcutta and Madras on the eastern coast of India. The whole of it, and the bulk of a continuation of it, dealing especially with metaphysical psychology of cognition, desire and action (not yet published) was drafted out in June, and on my return to Benares, in July 1900, just before the beginning of the reduction into writing of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*. More of the continuation was drafted, in a sporadic manner, during the time the other was being taken down. (This is yet in hand and may be revised and published later.)

The correspondences, nay, frequently, identities of thought between my draft and the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* were very startling to me; and have been the main cause for my, so to say, superstitious faith in the latter work. It came upon me more and more strongly, as I proceeded with the work, that on the one hand I was taking down, in one form and language, to dictation from the rote-memory of another, what I had been reproducing on the other hand, in another form and language, and much more imperfectly, from my own reason-memory of the samskāra, the impress, of past births; and that both forms were derived, not only from the Common Store of All-knowledge, All-consciousness, which is in and which is the World-process at large, and

whence and wherein is all knowledge whatsoever, but also, more particularly, from a special literature which existed and was extant and matter of public knowledge and study in India, some thousands of years ago, and which still exists, but now inextant and hidden, and to be rediscovered by single-minded and laborious search only.

After having taken down to dictation the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*, I felt for some time that it was perhaps not necessary for me to continue work on *The Science of Peace*. But on looking at the two again, I saw that while the root-principles, the main ideas, were the same, there was much difference in the method of treatment and the details. My draft, I saw, taking its stand on the one, single, indispensable, and indefeasible fact of consciousness, endeavoured to lead thought up from current answers to the ultimate problem of metaphysic, regarding them as insufficient, to a higher and (as it appeared to me) more perfect synthesis and complete explanation, and then to deduce all other root-ideas and principles therefrom; and so dealt almost entirely with the *why* of things. The older work, on the other hand, practically started where my draft ended, assumed the root-ideas as proved, as, in fact, matter of common knowledge, and at once entered upon numerous applications of those root-ideas to the facts around us, to the details

of the World-process, of human life and evolution, and to the technicalities of Samskṛṭ literature in particular, which had never entered into my mind. In other words, the difference between the two works was the difference between abstract and concrete, laws and cases, rules and facts. Moreover, the older work was full of obscurities, and full of technical ways of thought and expression, unfamiliar to readers of English and thinkers employing the modern counters of thought; while the newer work was written more, though not by any means entirely, from the standpoint and in the language of modern philosophical thought. It seemed to me, indeed, that the newer work would serve efficiently as an introduction and help to the study of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*, showing, as it did, the steps by which the principles and conclusions taught in an ancient and now hidden literature had been worked up to anew by an individual consciousness, in modern days, and without any help from that previous literature. I therefore decided to put *The Science of Peace*, before the public. I shall endeavour and hope I may be able to place the continuation of the work before them also, later on, for similar reasons.

In concluding this note I would record my deep gratitude to Mrs. Annie Besant, who was the first to appreciate *The Science of the*

Emotions and *The Science of Peace,* and who read them in manuscript, suggested many improvements, encouraged me to publish the works, and finally had them published by the Theosophical Publishing Society, giving a series of lectures on each book, while it was in the Press, and thereby introducing the main ideas to a much larger public than they would have reached otherwise, and in a far more lucid and interesting manner than the written treatises have achieved; and who, again, has encouraged and enabled me to publish the present work, and not only done so but has embellished it with valuable footnotes from her own pen.

I have written down the above personal history in the hope that I may thereby inspire a special interest in the work, by pointing out such an extraordinary coincidence connected therewith, as is, even by itself, and apart from the inherent merits of the work, no mean test of truth. Unless there is an agreement of basic fact, such coincidences do not occur. When they do occur they constitute at least sufficient reason for careful enquiry. I myself earnestly believe that there is a providential purpose in this coincidence, and that the time has come when the general modern public, prepared by the ideas of the great German philosophers, by the world-wide revival of interest in Samskṛṭ learning and philosophy, especially *Veḍānṭa,* and finally by

the Theosophical movement and literature—than which there is no more promising seed, at the present day, of all-embracing tolerance and sympathy and brotherhood—is ready for a larger metaphysic, a deeper psychology, a more reason-supported ethic than it has been content with so long, a metaphysic and a science of Yoga that will form the completing keystone of the great dome of knowledge, wherein the different sciences serve as the building stones, bound together by the mortar of psychology and physiology.

With this foreword, I would leave the reader to judge whether the work satisfies or does not satisfy lastingly any deep-seated need of his. But before proceeding to the actual summary of the work I should say, in two more preliminary notes, something about the genuineness of the work, and about the nature of this summary.