On the whole, the book is thoroughly praiseworthy in matter and manner. Its defects are incidental and trivial in comparison with its solid excellencies.

GEORGE M. FORBES.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

YOGA PHILOSOPHY: Lectures delivered in New York, winter of 1895-6, by the SWAMI VIVEKANANDA on *Rāja-Yoga*, or, Conquering the Internal Nature. London, N. Y., and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co., 1897. Pp. xii + 234, 8vo. 3s. 6d.

OF the Swami's Yoga philosophy it may be said, as of someone's Christianity, that "it is really a new firm trading under an old name and trying to purchase the good-will of the former establishment." The Swami's Yoga is neither Hinduism nor Christianity, but a mixture of both. And as the Swami's Yoga, so is the Swami himself. Neither of them is the genuine article. In the circumstances it could scarcely be otherwise. The Swami is not a Brahman, but a half-Christianized Sudra, and has consequently no right to the self-assumed title. He was born in a half-Christianized family and graduated from a Scotch missionary college—facts which have greatly influenced his life and his lectures. The effect of the Christian teaching is seen in the very first motto under which the lectures are published: "Each soul is potentially Divine." The true Yogi would have said: "Each soul is divine—eternally and necessarily so, and cannot be anything else." And as it is with the motto, so is it with the Babu's assumed name or *alias*. His true name, with its genuine academic degree, is Narendra Nath Datta, B.A., and his national title is "Babu," not Swami. His assumption of the Swami is from the Hindu point of view as improper as it would be to add the M.A. to the B.A. degree without the university's authority. So, also, in the matter of his dress. It is not the genuine Yogi dress; and the life he is living is not Yogi life. It is important to realize all this, as the real Yoga philosophy consists so largely in dress or no dress, in food or next to no food, and in the peculiarities of the life lived, much more than in the doctrines believed in. Doctrine is at a discount in Yoga philosophy.

Further, it must never be forgotten that, like mathematics, Indian philosophy is reasoned from definitions clearly laid down in each system. These definitions differ *toto cælo* from those given in European philosophies and theologies. A Hindu's idea, for example, of God,

soul, mind, body, has little in common with a European's. The Swami takes no trouble to define his terms. This is the more remarkable as a Bengali Babu knows perfectly well the value of definitions. But Mr. Datta uses his terms sometimes like a Hindu, at other times, without notice, like a European, to the utter confusion of his readers. And as to his "commentaries," as on his title page, or "commentary" in his text, it can only be said that he illustrates the truth of his own remark (p. 13) that "the more modern the commentator, the greater the mistakes he makes." Take, for example, aphorism 2 : 10, which the most distinguished Brahman Sanskritist of modern Bengal, whose marble bust is being put up in the Calcutta University, Dr. R. L. Mitra, C.I.E., translates : "These, the subtle ones, should be avoided by an adverse course," *i. e.*, the subtle or fine afflictions, distinguished from the gross, should be suppressed, not through the stimuli of *external* objects, their natural course, but by *internal* reflection or concentration. They will thus become like roasted seeds, and will not sprout. But Mr. Datta imposes the Christian idea so beautifully illustrated by Dr. Chalmers in his sermon on the "Expulsive Power of a New Affection"—an idea which our Babu no doubt received from his Scotch missionary teacher, but which is utterly foreign to Hindu philosophy. He translates thus Patanjali's Sanskrit : "They, to-be-rejected-by-opposite-modifications, are fine." "For instance," he explains in his commentary, "when a big wave of anger has come into the mind, how are we to control that? Just by raising a big opposing wave. Think of love. Sometimes a mother is very angry with her husband, and while in that state the baby comes in, and she kisses the baby; the old wave dies out and a new wave arises." This is very good Christian teaching and not a bad illustration; but there could scarcely be any teaching or illustration more alien to the true Yoga. That it is so is seen from the very next aphorism (the eleventh), even as translated by our Swami. But we pass on to the fourteenth and fifteenth, which will also illustrate our point. Mr. Datta translates them : "14—They bear fruit as pleasure or pain, caused by virtue or vice. 15—To the discriminating all is, as it were, painful, on account of everything bringing pain, either in the consequence, or in apprehension, or in attitude caused by impressions; also on account of the counteraction of qualities." The taming down of the original "verily" into "as it were" is the Christian's as distinguished from the Yogi's idea. So, also, are the Swami's labored explanations and illustrations. Dr. Mitra's remark is clear and to the point, and his translation is faithful

to the original, what cannot be said of the Babu's. "15—To the discriminating all are verily painful because of the adversity of the actions of (the three qualities) and of the pains of sequence, anxiety, and residua," *i. e.*, "to all ordinary beings the fruition is thus of two kinds; but to the Yogi all are painful." "Nor does the rule apply only to sins; it applies equally to virtuous deeds. . . . In fact, every work, whether right or wrong, has its apportioned desert, and it must be born in a corporeal existence, and the succession of birth, decay, and death must in the ordinary course of things recur over and over again without a limit. The fruits may be joy or suffering, according as the cause is virtue or vice, but to the discriminating [*i. e.*, the Yogi] they are invariably painful." Hence, he should do no virtuous or vicious act, so there will be no residua. So much for the morality of the Yogi.

As to the Swami's theology, it is neither Christian nor Yoga. He delights in caricaturing the Christian's God as "the great Being sitting above the clouds and governing the whole universe." "If," says Mr. N. N. Datta, B. A., speaking oracularly as "the Swami Vivekananda," "men believe in God, they may become good, and moral, and so make good citizens. We cannot blame them for holding such ideas, seeing that all the teaching these men get is simply to believe in an eternal rigmarole of words, without any substance behind them" (p. 4), not a very bad description of much of the Swami's own fluent words about God. He translates Patanjali's definition of God: "Isvara (the Supreme Ruler) is a special Purusa untouched by misery, the results of actions or desires." To this definition he adds the comments: "The Yogis avoid many ideas about God, such as creating," and "they arrive at God in a peculiar fashion of their own," as, for example, that He is only one soul out of the innumerable uncreated millions of souls that have existed from all eternity, and that, like these other souls, he does nothing and desires nothing, and is consequently untouched by misery. That is the Yogi's god. But it is difficult to say whether it be our Swami's. Compare the above translation and comments of the Swami's with the Brahman Sanskritist, Dr. Mitra's, straightforward, literal translation: "God is a particular soul which is untouched by affliction, works, deserts, and desires." The Yoga philosophy is the atheistic Sankhya philosophy of Kapila *plus* God. But, save as a sop to Hindu religiousness, even to the Yogi it is a useless addition, as it plays but a very subordinate, unnecessary part in Yoga, as is seen by the *or* of aphorism 1:28: "Or by devotion to God;" *i. e.*, devotion to God may be used as one of the various

means (foolish, absurd, and even disgusting) towards the end aimed at alike by the atheist and by the Yogi. The Yogi says devotion to God *may* be found helpful, the Sankhya philosopher says no. Even the Swami says: "In the study of Râja-Yoga no faith and belief is necessary." But what is the end contemplated by the Yogi? Negatively, it is not what the Swami suggests, absorption into the God-head, or union with God. This idea forms no part of the Yoga theory. Patanjali, like Kapila, rested satisfied in the complete isolation of the soul—*free*, emancipated, as God is described above, from the results of actions and desires. The existence or non-existence of God has no bearing whatever in either philosophy on the final aim contemplated. Neither has it on the secondary and intermediate ends sought after, and which figure so largely in both philosophies. These are generally spoken of as *Siddhis* or "perfections," and include power over disease and death, absolute control over all our corporeal and mental processes, the occupying and animating of dead corpses, levitation, the control of sun, moon, and stars, the passing into and acting through any other living bodies, and such like mythical powers. The readers of Southey's *Curse of Kehama* know what a Hindu's curse may mean, and Yogis deal largely in curses, if there be any truth in the Hindu scriptures. As our author has given, neither in his book, nor, as far as we are aware, in his life, any evidence that he has yet attained such "perfections," or, indeed, that he has seen any other who possessed them, we simply conclude that he possesses an unlimited assurance, or, in slang phrase, "colossal cheek." With Dr. Jogendra Nath Bhattachayya, the Brahman president of the largest college of Pundits in the world, and the able and learned author of *Hindu Castes and Sects*, we would remark that "some of the most important features of the Hindu's so-called religions are so palpably absurd that the only difficulty in a subsequent age will be to imagine that such things could ever have appeared credible." We may be allowed to doubt whether our "Swami" believes in these *Siddhis* of which he writes so confidently. As regards the Swami's justification in publishing a new translation of the aphorisms of Patanjali, it is enough to say that Dr. Rajendra Lala Mitra's and M. N. Dvivedi's translations, not to speak of Dr. Ballantyne's and Govindadeva Sastri's, all renowned Sanskrit scholars, are infinitely more satisfactory, on the score of both faithfulness to the original and intelligibility, than Mr. Datta's.

K. S. MACDONALD.

CALCUTTA, INDIA.