and to this only, that the Indian metaphysician takes up the great problems of life—the origin of man and the universe, and the relation between mind and matter.

It is not likely that these speculations were viewed with much favour by the great body of Brãhmans engaged in ritualistic practices. Not that the metaphysicians actually discountenanced the ceremonial worship of the old mythological gods as vain and nugatory. On the contrary, they expressly admitted the propriety of sacrifices, and commended them as the most meritorious of human acts, by which man could raise himself to the highest degrees of mundane existence, to the worlds of the Fathers and Devas. But, on the other hand, metaphysical speculation itself had gradually succeeded in profoundly modifying the original character of the sacrificial ritual : an allegorical meaning had come to be attached to every item of the ceremonial, in accordance with the strange monotheistic-pantheistic theory of the Brähmanas which makes the performance of the sacrifice represent the building up of Prajã- pati, the Purusha or “world man," and thus the creation of repro­duction of the universe. In the *Satap. Br.* (vii. 3, 4, 41) he is said to be the whole Brahman (n.), and (vii. 1, 2, 7; xi. I, 6, 17) he is represented as the breath or vital air (prãrta), and the air being his self (ãtman). It needed but the identification of the Ãtman, or individual self, with the Brahman or Paramätman (supreme self), to show that the final goal lay far beyond the worlds hitherto striven after through sacrifice, a goal unattainable through aught but a perfect knowledge of the soul’s nature and its identity with the Divine Spirit. “ Know ye that one Self,” exhorts one of those old idealists,@@1 “ and have done with other words; for that (knowledge) is the bridge to immortality!” Intense self-contemplation being, moreover, the only way of attaining the all-important knowledge, this doctrine left little or no room for those mediatorial offices of the priest, so indispensable in ceremonial worship; and indeed we actually read of Brãhman sages resorting to Kshatriya princes@@2 to hear them expound the true doctrine of salvation. But, in spite of their anti-hierarchical tendency, these speculations continued to gain ground; and in the end the body of treatises propounding the pantheistic doctrine, the Upanishads, were admitted into the sacred canon, as appendages to the ceremonial writings, the Brähmanas. The Upanishads@@3 thus form literally “the end of the Veda,” the *Vedanta* ; but their adherents claim this title for their doctrines in a metaphorical rather than in a material sense, as “ the ultimate aim and consummation of the Veda.” In later times the radical dis­tinction between these speculative appendages and the bulk of the Vedic writings was strongly accentuated in a new classification of the sacred scriptures. According to this scheme they were supposed to consist of two great divisions—the *Karma-kända, i.e.* “ the work- section,” or practical ceremonial (exoteric) part, consisting of the Sarphitãs and Brahmanas (including the ritual portions of the Aranyakas), and the *Jnänakanda,* “ the knowledge-section,” or speculative (esoteric) part. These two divisions are also called respectively the *Pürva-* (“ former ”) and *Uttara-* (“ latter,” or higher@@4) *kända*; and when the speculative tenets of the Upanishads came to be formulated into a regular system it was deemed desirable that there should also be a special system corresponding to the older and larger portion of the Vedic writings. Thus arose the two systems— the *Pürva- (or Karma-) mlmämsä,* or “prior (practical) speculation,” and the *Uttara-* (or *Brahma-) mlmämsä,* or higher inquiry (into the nature of the godhead), usually called the Vedanta philosophy.

It is not yet possible to determine, even approximately, the time when the so-called *Daréanas* (literally “ demonstrations ”), or systems of philosophy which subsequently arose, were first formulated. And, though they have certainly developed from the tenets enunciated in the Upanishads, there is some doubt as to the exact order in which these systems succeeded each other. Of all the systems the Vedanta has indeed remained most closely in touch with the speculations of the Upanishads, which it has further developed and systematized. The authoritative *exposes* of the systems have, however, apparently passed through several redactions; and, in their present form, these sutra-works@@5 evidently belong to a com­

paratively recent period, none of them being probably older than the early centuries of our era. By far the ablest general review of the philosophical systems (except the Vedãnta) produced by a native scholar is the *Sarva-darsaηa-sangraha@@*6 (“ summary of all the Darêanas”), composed in the 14th century, from a Vedãntist point of view, by the great exegete Mãdhava Ächärya.

Among the different systems, six are generally recognized as orthodox, as being (either wholly or for the most part) consistent with the Vedic religion—two and two of which are again more closely related to each other than to the rest, viz. :

(1) *Pürva-mimämsä (Mlmämsä),* and (2) *Uttara-mlmämsä (Ve­danta) ;*

*(3) Sänkhya,* and (4) *Yoga'*

(5) *Nyäya,* and (6) *Vaiscshika.*

**1.** The *(Pürva-) Mlmämsä* is not a system of philosophy in the proper sense of the word, but rather a system of dogmatic criticism and scriptural interpretation. It main tains the eternal existence of the Veda, the different parts of which are minutely classified. Its principal object, however, is to ascertain the religious (chiefly ceremonial) duties enjoined in the Veda, and to show how these duties must be performed, and what are the special merits and rewards attaching to them. Hence arises the necessity of determining the principles for rightly inter- preting the Vedic texts as also of what forms its only claim to being classed among speculative systems, viz. a philosophical examination of the means of, and the proper method for, arriving at accurate knowledge. The foundation of this school, as well as the composition of the Sutras or aphorisms, the *Mimämsã-daréana,@@*7 which constitute its chief doctrinal authority, is ascribed to Jaimini. The Sutras were commented on by Sahara Svãmin; and further annotations *(värttika)* thereon were supplied by the great theologian Kuniärila Bhatta, who is supposed to have lived about a.d. 700 and to have worked hard for the re-establishment of Brahmanism. The most approved general introduction to the study of the Mïmãrpsä is the metrical *Jaiminiya-Nyäya-mälä-vistara,@@*8 with a prose commentary, both by Mãdhava Ãchãrya. This distinguished writer, who has already been mentioned several times, was formerly supposed, from frequent statements in MSS., to have been the brother of Säyana, the well-known interpreter of the Vedas. The late Dr Burnell@@9 has, however, made it very probable that these two are one and the same person, Säyana being his Telugu and Mãdhavä- chärya his Brãhmanical name. In 1331 he became the *jagadguru,* or spiritual head, of the Smãrtas (a Vedãntist sect founded by Sankarãcharya) at the Math of Sringeri, where, under the patronage of Bukka, king of Vidyänagara, he composed his numerous works. He sometimes passes under a third name, Vidyäranya,-svãmin, adopted by him on becoming a *sannyäsin,* or religious mendicant.

2. The *Vedãnta* philosophy, in the comparatively primitive form in which it presents itself in most of the older Upanishads, constitutes the earliest phase of sustained metaphysical speculation. In its essential features it remains to this day the prevalent belief of Indian thinkers, and enters largely into the religious life and convictions of the people. It is an idealistic monism, which derives the universe from an ultimate conscious spiritual principle, the one and only existent from eternity—the *Atman,* the Self, or the *Purusha,* the Person, the *Brahman.* It is this primordial essence or Self that pervades all things, and gives life and light to them, “ without being sullied by the visible outward im- purities or the miseries of the world, being itself apart”—and into which all things will, through knowledge, ultimately resolve them selves. “ The wise who perceive him as being within their oνn Self, to them belongs eternal peace, not to others.”@@10 But, while the commentators never hesitate to interpret the Upanishads as being in perfect agreement with the Vedãntic system, as elaborated in later times, there is often considerable difficulty in accepting their ex- planations. In these treatises only the leading features of the pantheistic theory find utterance, generally in vague and mystic, though often in singularly powerful and poetical language, from which it is not always possible to extract the author’s real idea on fundamental points, such as the relation between the Supreme Spirit and the phenomenal world—whether the latter was actually evolved from the former by a power inherent in him, or whether the process is altogether a fiction, an illusion of the individual self. Thus the Katha-upanishad@@11 offers the following summary: “ Beyond the senses [there are the objects; beyond the objects] there is the mind (manas) ; beyond the mind there is the intellect (buddhi); beyond the intellect there is the Great Self. Beyond the Great One there is the Highest Undeveloped (avyaktam) ; beyond

@@@1 Mundaka-upanishad,∙ii. 2, 5.

@@@2 From such allusions, or statements, in the Upanishads, some scholars have actually gone the length of claiming the origin of this cardinal doctrine of Vedãnta philosophy for the Kshatriyas. It seems to us, however, very much more likely that these anecdotes were introduced by the Brahmanical sages of set purpose to win over their worldly patrons from their materialistic tendencies to their own idealistic views. Kapila, the author of the materialistic Sänkhya, is supposed to have been a Kshatriya, and so, we know, was the Sãkya Muni.

@@@3 Cf. P. Deussen, *The Philosophy of the Upanishads* (Edinburgh, 1906).

@@@4 Cf. Mundaka-upanishad, i. 4, 5, where these two divisions are called “ the lower *(apara)* and the higher *(para)* knowledge.”

@@@5 These works have all been printed with commentaries in India; and they have been partly translated by J. Ballantyne and by K. M. Banerjea. The best general view of the systems is to be obtained from H. C. Colebrooke’s account, *Misc. Essays,* i. (2nd ed.), with Professor Cowell’s notes. Compare also the brief abstract

given in Goldstücker’s *Literary Remains,* vol. i. A very useful classified index of philosophical works was published by F. Hall (1859).

@@@6 Edited in the *Βibl. Ind.;* translated by E. B. Cowell and A. E. Gough (1882).

@@@7 Text and Commentary, *Bibl. Ind.*

@@@8 Edited by Th. Goldstücker, completed by E. B. Cowell; also ed. *Anand-Ser.* (Bombay, 1892).

*@@@9 Vamsa-brähmana,* Introd.

@@@10 Katha-upanishad, ii. 5, 12.

@@@11 Katha-up., i. 3, 10; ii. 6, 7.