Eliot being a perfect literary person never confined his knowledge to the western philosophies; he rather gave a good thought over the philosophies of east as well. His literary creations have fine amount of references from the Indian philosophy as well. To understand the references from the Indian philosophy in the works of Eliot, here is a brief introduction of the Indian philosophy that influenced Eliot during his Harvard years. It becomes essential to have an account of the Christian aspect and the Hindu philosophy that worked within Eliot throughout his literary life. We would like to acquaint our readers with philosophy, the Bhagavad-Gita and the yoga especially and his own catholic liturgy and the word of the lord that is the Bible so that their allusions in his works could be understood in a better way. Indian influences, both Hindu and Buddhist, are scattered everywhere in the Literature created by this British American-born poet, critic and dramatist T. S. Eliot.

2.1 The Indian Philosophy

The philosophy is concerned with the understanding of the life and the universe. It is aimed at comprehending the nature of existence. Philosophy is a human endeavor that leads to the Ultimate Truth. The English word ‘philosophy’ has its root in the Greek term – ‘philo–sophia’. The term ‘philo’ refers to ‘love’ and ‘sophia’ refers to human reason. The Greek terms can be literally translated in English as “love of reason” or “love of human judgment and discrimination.” From the Indian viewpoint, the word ‘philosophy’ suggests “observing and surveying” the existence. In Sanskrit,
the philosophy is referred to as ‘darshana’. The Sanskrit word ‘darshana’ has its root in the word ‘dṛṣṭ’ that means ‘to see’, ‘to look’ or ‘to view’. “Seeing” or “viewing” the reality and the facts of experience forms the basis of philosophy. Senses, mind and even consciousness are involved in this ‘seeing’. “Seeing” also encompasses “contemplation”. Seeing is not simply a sensory activity. ‘Seeing’ may primarily be a perceptual observation. But it may also concern the conceptual knowledge or an intuitional flash. Thus ‘darshana’ suggests vision. In other words, ‘darshana’ is a whole view revealed to the inner self, what we term as the soul or the spirit or the inner being. Philosophy or ‘darshana’ is concerned with the vision of ‘truth and reality’. In Sanskrit, the ‘philosophy’ is also referred to as ‘tatva’. The Sanskrit word ‘tatva’ is concerned with ‘the nature of reality.’

In India, the philosophy is not restricted to the intellectual pursuit. According to Indian view, the word 'philosophy' is concerned with ‘the revelation of the nature of reality’ or ‘the vision of Ultimate Truth and Reality’. Indian philosophy has been the source of sublime knowledge and wisdom for mankind for ages. The systems of Indian philosophy have enriched the life of man not only in India, but across the world. Here you will get a glimpse of Samkhya, Yoga, Vedanta and other systems of Indian philosophy. Our motive is to simplify the fundamentals of Indian Philosophy as reflected in Upanishads and some other prominent Indian scriptures. The historians go on debating about the origin of the Aryans and the time-period when the Vedic civilization developed in India. The Western scholars that the Aryans descended from the regions of the North-Central Asia sometime around 1500 B.C.,
though some other learned scholars have challenged this. Some of the eminent Indian scholars also differ from their Western counterparts, saying that the Aryans were natives of India for long and that the Vedic civilization developed about 4000 to 8000 years ago. The renowned Indian scholar Lokamanya Tilak contends that the first Vedic hymns could have been composed nearly 6000 years ago and the later works like the Upanishads themselves could be nearly 3000 years old. The philosophies developed over long spells of time. It is difficult for the historians to ascertain the period for the development of a particular philosophy.

However, we can safely outline the history of Indian philosophies, according to Dr. Radhakrishnan as follows:

- The Vedic period (1500 B.C. to 600 B.C.)
- The Epic period (600 B.C. to 200 A.D.)
- The Sutra period (200 A.D. to 1700 A.D.)
- The Scholastic period (From Sutra Period to 17th century)

Let us get an idea of these periods:

1. The Vedic Period: This period can be regarded as the dawn of civilization in the world. It witnessed the real transformation of man from a prakrit man to a Sanskrit man. The Vedic period covers the rise and the development of the Aryan culture and civilization. The literature of the Vedic period is considered the most ancient in the world. It consists of the four Vedas, namely, Rig Veda, Yajur Veda, Sama Veda and Atharva Veda. Each of the Vedas is divided into four parts: The Samhitas (the Mantras), the Brahmanas, the Aranyakas and the Upanishads.
(2) The Epic Period: It is the period of the development of the early Upanishads and the darshanas and is concerned with the enriching of intellect of man. The darshanas paved the way for the growth of the systems of philosophies in India. The invaluable dharma-shastras, the great treatises on ethical and social philosophy, are the gifts of this period. Apart from the extra-ordinary philosophical doctrines, the “non-systemic and the non-technical” literature appeared in this age. The great epics Ramayana and Mahabharata are the gifts of this period. The period is very significant because it witnessed the rise and early development of Shaivism and Vaishnavism as well as that of Jainism and Buddhism. The Jainism and the Buddhism are considered as heterodox religious philosophies as they do not endorse the authority of the Vedas.

(3) The Sutra Period: Over a period of time, the Vedic literature and the subsequent works grew to a massive scale. The great scholars made efforts to safeguard the rich heritage. That is how the illustrious Sutras were written. The Sutras are, mostly, epigrammatic sentences in the verse-form. They helped to preserve and transmit the treasure of philosophies expressed in the voluminous ancient works. Badarayana (Veda Vyasa), one of the greatest scholars, wrote Brahma-Sutra, also known as Vedanta-Sutra. The Sutras laid the foundation of the different systems of philosophies in India. The six orthodox systems based on the Sutras are Vaisheshika, Nyaya, Samkhya, Yoga, Purva-Mimamsa and Uttar-Mimamsa.

(4) The Scholastic Period: This period coinciding with the Sutra period, witnessed the distinguished scholars like Shamkaracharya, Kumarila, Madhavacharya, Ramanujacharya, Sridhara and others. With the passage of time, the ancient literature
became nearly incomprehensible. The Vedas, expressed in the *Chhandas*, the old form of Sanskrit, became difficult to follow. Even the interpretation of the *Sutras* posed challenges to the learned scholars. Hence the scholars wrote commentaries on the ancient literature in general and on the *Sutras* in particular. Then a number of commentaries were written. Very often a commentary was written on the original commentary or on an earlier one. Various scholars wrote commentaries on Brahma-Sutra according to their own interpretation. Chief among them were Shamkaracharya, Ramanujacharya and Madhavacharya. Incidentally, three schools of Vedanta were developed: Shamkaracharya’s *Advaita Vedanta*, Ramanujacharya’s *Vishishtadvaita Vedanta* and Madhavacharya’s *Dvaita Vedanta*.

**The Indian philosophy has its roots in the Vedic period**

The great Rishis, settled in the peaceful, invigorating environment of the forests, meditated over the fundamental questions of existence: What is the world? If it’s a creation, what are its constituents? Who is the creator? What is life? What is ‘truth’? What is ‘the nature of reality’? What was revealed to them was expressed in hymns. With the passage of time, the systematized collection of these hymns constituted the Vedas and the Upanishads. Indian philosophy distinctly exhibits a spiritual bent. The essence of religion is not dogmatic in India. Here, religion develops as philosophy progressively scales higher planes. Some of the fundamentals expressed in the Indian philosophy and the Western philosophy may be similar. However, Indian philosophy differs from the Western philosophy on several counts. While the Western philosophy deals with metaphysics, epistemology, psychology, ethics etc. separately, Indian
philosophy takes a comprehensive view of all these topics. The Indian philosophy uniquely describes four purusharthas of life. These purusharthas can well be seen in the works of Eliot when he preaches his readers about the code of living that uplifts man’s spirituality.

**Purusharthas:**

The four basic ends (*purusharthas*) of human life, as recognized by the Indian tradition, are as follows: *artha*, *kama*, *dharma* and *moksha*.

Eliot’s poetry, drama and essays revolve around the concepts of *artha*, *kama*, *dharma*, *karma* and *moksha*. His literary characters are just the figures of modern society lacking in religion and spirituality. Let us now see how these purusharthas are described in Indian Philosophy:

- **Artha**: The Sanskrit word *artha* means ‘that which one seeks.’ Whatever activity and physical material a man needs to support life can be considered as *artha*. *Artha*, in a broad sense, covers man’s professional activities, job, business, wealth, property and all such earthly material helpful in maintaining his life.

- **Kama**: Man seeks pleasure in various activities and material objects. Pursuit of happiness and pleasure is a basic, natural instinct in man. Man derives pleasures from relationships and material objects like food, drink etc. This is *kama*. Man largely accumulates *artha* for *kama*. But *artha* and *kama* should be closely linked with the *dharma*. They should be directed towards *dharma*.

- **Dharma**: ‘That which sustains’ is *dharma*. The word *dharma* stems from the Sanskrit root ‘*dhr*’ meaning ‘to sustain’ or ‘to support’. *Dharma* sustains or
maintains life. *Dharma* supports the society. Man lives in the society with fellow-men and various life forms. *Dharma* lays down duties and obligations expected of man. An individual and the society, for their conduct and actions, get guidance from *dharma*. Man has obligation to his own self, to the fellow-men and to the society, in fact, to the whole environment of the world. All the mutual obligations of these inter-relationships are spelt out by *dharma*.

- **Moksha:** *Moksha* means liberation or total freedom. The Sanskrit word *moksha* is derived from the root ‘*muk*’. This root means ‘to emancipate’ or ‘to release’ or ‘to free’. Indian tradition considers *moksha* as the ultimate goal of life. The sufferings of man are due to *avidya*, his original ignorance about self. He has been oblivious of his true identity. He attaches himself to worldly objects. Tempted and pressed by everlasting lust and insurmountable desires, he remains bonded to the mundane objects. When knowledge (*vidya*) dawns on him, he overcomes the dualities of the world and identifies himself as the infinite, eternal Being. Having been completely free from all attachments, expectations and desires, the liberated soul attains *moksha*.

**Systems of Indian Philosophy**

**Purva Mimamsa**

The first major orthodox philosophical system to develop was Purva Mimamsa. The other one to follow was the Uttar Mimamsa. The orthodox systems accept the authority of the Vedas. The Sanskrit word *'mimamsa* means a ‘revered thought’. The word is originated from the root ‘man’, which refers to ‘thinking’ or ‘investigating’.
The word 'mimamsa' suggests, "probing and acquiring knowledge" or “critical review and investigation of the Vedas”. Each of the Vedas is considered composed of four parts: The Samhitas, the Brahmanas, the Aranyakas and the Upanishads. The first two parts are generally focused on the rituals and they form the Karma-kanda portion of the Vedas. The later two parts form the Jnana-kanda (concerned with knowledge) portion of the Vedas. Purva-Mimamsa is based on the earlier (Purva = earlier) parts of the Vedas. Uttar-Mimamsa is based on the later (Uttar = later) parts of the Vedas. Purva-Mimamsa is also known as Karma Mimamsa since it deals with the Karmic actions of rituals and sacrifices. Uttar-Mimamsa is also known as Brahman Mimamsa since it is concerned with the knowledge of Reality. In popular terms, Purva-Mimamsa is known simply as Mimamsa and Uttar-Mimamsa as Vedas. The Vedas are eternal. They are timeless since they might have taken ages to acquire the written form. The four Vedas are: Rig Veda, Yajur Veda, Sama Veda and Atharva Veda. Each of the Vedas is divided into four parts: The Samhitas, the Brahmanas, the Aranyakas and the Upanishads. The Upanishads are the concluding parts of the Vedas. They expound the supreme philosophical knowledge.

The word ‘Vedanta’ usually refers to the Upanishads. The word is a compound of ‘Veda’ and ‘ANTA’. It means the ending portion of the Vedas. However, the word ‘Vedanta’, in a broad sense, covers not only the Upanishads but all the commentaries and interpretations associated with the Upanishads. All these works constitute the Vedanta philosophy. The great scholar Badarayana 500-200 B.C initiated the efforts to simplify the Upanishadic philosophy. Badarayana is also known as Ved Vyasa. He
was the first scholar to take up the challenging task of systemizing the immensely vast philosophical doctrines of the Upanishads. The result of his efforts was one of the most illustrious works on Vedanta. Badarayana’s work is known as Brahma-Sutra or Vedanta-Sutra. It is also referred to as Uttar-Mimamsa-Sutra. The Brahma-Sutra has 555 sutras. Most of them are aphoristic and almost unintelligible at first sight. Hence, a number of commentaries were written to interpret them. Among these, the commentaries of Shamkaracharya, Ramnujacharya and Madhavacharya are regarded authentic and are held in very high view. They are regarded as the greatest scholars of Indian philosophy. They are not only the principal commentators of Brahma-Sutra (Vedanta-Sutra) but are also its leading interpreters. Thus, we have three major schools of Vedanta based on the philosophy of the distinguished trio: Advaita (non-dualism) of Shamkaracharya, Vishishtadvaita (qualified non-dualism) of Ramnujacharya and Dvaita (dualism) of Madhvacharya. All three schools are founded on the Vedanta philosophy. However, there have been differences among them. Even the followers of a particular system, within their own fold, differ to some degree on certain issues.

The Vedanta philosophy is focused on the Jagat (the universe), the Jiva (individual soul) and the Brahman (the Supreme Being). Brahman is the repository of all knowledge and power. Jivas are trapped in the Jagat. Attached to the physical world and driven by passions and desires, they remain chained to ceaseless actions (karma). As a result, they subject themselves to countless births in various forms. Their transmigration from this birth (life) to the next depends on the karma
(the quality of action). *Moksha* or *mukti* (liberation) is the goal of life. This philosophy, in general, is accepted by all the three schools. Now let us understand the basic difference among the three schools. *Dvaita* refers to ‘two’. *Dvaita* school is based on the concept of dualism. Madhavacharya emphasizes the distinction between God and individual soul (*Jiva*). In addition, the school differentiates God from matter as well as the soul from matter. The school maintains that the God, *Jiva* and the *Jagat* are three separate and everlasting entities. God governs the world and has control over the souls. The souls in its ignorance remains shackled in the world. By devotion and God’s mercy, the soul can migrate to the Heaven above. It can obtain *Mukti* from the cycle of life and death and live with God forever in the Heaven. **All these concepts of Hindu philosophy are found in the poetry, drama and the essays of Eliot, which are analyzed in detail in the following chapters.**

*Vishishtadvaita* literally means “qualified non-dualism”. Ramanujacharya stresses that God alone exists. He says that Brahman is God. He is not formless. The Cosmos and the *Jivas* form his body. When the *Jiva* (soul) realizes that he is a part of *Paramatman* (God), the soul is liberated. On liberation, his soul enjoys infinite consciousness and infinite bliss of God. The soul is in communion with God, but it does not share the power of the creation or destruction. **Eliot always sermons to his readers that they must reconcile with God and go through purgation. He preaches taking references from this philosophy as well as the Bible.**

The Vedas are the oldest scriptures in the world. The Indian philosophical systems are classified according as they accept the authority of the Vedas or not. The
systems of Indian philosophy are classified into two groups: The Orthodox Systems and The Unorthodox Systems. The orthodox systems are: Vaisheshika, Nyaya, Samkhya, Yoga, Purva-Mimamsa, and Uttar-Mimamsa. The unorthodox systems are: Charvakism, Jainism and Buddhism. Very often, Purva-Mimamsa is referred to as “Mimamsa” only and Uttar-Mimamsa as “Vedanta”. The orthodox systems uphold the supremacy of the Vedas. The unorthodox systems reject the authority of the Vedas. Truly speaking Vaisheshika, Nyaya, Samkhya and Yoga are neither orthodox nor unorthodox. These four systems, while originating, neither accepted nor rejected the Vedas. The orthodox systems form pairs as follows: Nyaya-Vaisheshika, Yoga-Samkhya, Mimamsa-Vedanta. In each of the pairs, the first system is concerned with the practice and the second system focuses on the theoretical aspects. It becomes difficult, sometimes, to name a single founder or a promoter of a system. However, the following are widely acknowledged as proponents of the above systems: Gautama for Nyaya, Kanada for Vaisheshika, Patanjali for Yoga, Kapila for Samkhya, Jaimini for Purva-Mimamsa and Shamkara for Uttar-Mimamsa. Charvakism is believed to have been promoted by Charvaka. Vardhamana Mahavira is acknowledged as the founder of Jainism and Gautama Buddha as the founder of Buddhism. Nyaya is an orthodox school of philosophy. A great sage called Gautama, not to be confused with the Lord Buddha, founded it. Nyaya accepts the basic philosophy of Vaisheshika system. It can be said that the Vaisheshika system is theory, Nyaya is the practice. Nyaya recognizes god but Gautama does not deal with the problem of existence of god in any detail. Like the Vaisheshika, Nyaya holds that the self is an
individual substance, eternal and all pervading. Consciousness is not an essential attribute of the self, but it is only an accidental one. According to Nyaya, salvation is the state of absolute freedom. It is freedom from all pains and pleasures. Then there is freedom from the cycle of the birth and death also. This is what Eliot tries to tell through Harry and Celia. He wants to make his readers realize the concept of liberation of soul from the desirous body and the need of salvation, the moksha or the nirvana.

The common characteristics in Indian Philosophies: The systems of Indian philosophies, with a singular exception of Charvakism, have certain common characteristics. Charvakism remarkably differs from other systems as it promotes materialism. The following characteristics are common to all other systems:

- All the schools emphasize that the philosophy must have a positive impact on life of man. The schools have a general agreement on the importance of the Purushartha. All the schools agree that the philosophy should help man in realizing the main ends of human life: the purusharthas, i.e. artha, kama, dharma and moksha.
- All the systems reflect that the philosophy should lead a man from darkness and ignorance to light and knowledge.
- There is a general agreement among the systems that the truth and reality should be verifiable. They should be substantiated with reasoning and experience. An experience may be sensory, conceptual or intuitional.
• It is accepted by all the schools that man’s suffering results from his ignorance. Man can conquer ignorance and attain total freedom (moksha) in this bodily existence.

• There is a general agreement on man’s essential spirituality.

Samkhyya is one of the most prominent and one of the oldest of Indian philosophies. An eminent, great sage Kapila was the founder of the Samkhyya School. Based on the Upanishads, two schools of philosophy developed in India: (1) The realistic e.g. Samkhyya (2) The idealistic e.g. Vedanta. The Samkhyya philosophy combines the basic doctrines of Samkhyya and Yoga. However, it should be remembered that the Samkhyya represents the theory and Yoga represents the application or the practical aspects. The word Samkhyya is based upon the Sanskrit word samkhya which means ‘number’. The school specifies the number and nature of the ultimate constituents of the universe and thereby imparts knowledge of reality. In fact, the term Samkhyya also means perfect knowledge. Hence, it is a system of perfect knowledge. Samkhyya is dualistic realism. It is dualistic because it advocates two ultimate realities: Prakriti, matter and Purusha, self (spirit). Samkhyya is realism as it considers that both matter and spirit are equally real. Samkhyya is pluralistic also because of its teaching that Purusha is not one but many.

Samkhyya cites out two types of perceptions: Indeterminate or nirvikalpa perceptions and determinate or savikalpa perceptions. Indeterminate perceptions are sort of pure sensations or crude impressions. They reveal no knowledge of the form or the name of the object. There is vague awareness about an object. There is
cognition, but no recognition. An infant’s initial experiences are full of confusion. There is a lot of sense-data, but there are improper or inadequate means to process them. Most of them are indeterminate perceptions. Determinate perceptions are the mature state of perceptions, which have been processed and differentiated suitably. Once the sensations have been processed, categorized and interpreted properly, they become determinate perceptions. They can lead to identification and generate knowledge. Kapila, the proponent of the Samkhya School, rules out the existence of God. He asserts that the existence of God cannot be proved and that God does not exist.

Samkhya argues that if God exists and if God is eternal and unchanging as is widely claimed, then he cannot be the cause of the world. A cause has to be active and changing. However, some of the later commentators of Samkhya seem to bend towards theistic interpretation.

**Bondage and Salvation**

Like other major systems of Indian philosophy, Samkhya regards ignorance as the root cause of bondage and suffering. According to Samkhya, the self is eternal, pure consciousness. Due to ignorance, the self identifies itself with the physical body and its constituents - *Manas, ahamkara* and *Mahat*, which are products of *Prakriti*. Once the self becomes free of this false identification and the material bonds, the salvation is possible.

**Eliot’s plays reflect nothing other than bondage of soul and martyrdom and sin-expiation for salvation.**
Vaisheshika

Kanada, a learned sage, founded this system. This system is believed to be as old as Jainism and Buddhism. Kanada presented his detailed atomic theory in *Vaisheshika-Sutra*. Vaisheshika is a pluralistic realism. It explains the nature of the world with seven categories: *Dravya-* substance, *guna-* quality, *karma-* action, *samanya-* universal, *vishesha-* particular, *amavaya-* inherence and *abhava-* non-existence. This system accepts that God is the efficient cause of the world. The eternal atoms are the material cause of the world. Vaisheshika recognizes nine ultimate substances: Five material and four non-material substances. The five material substances are Earth, water, fire, air and *akasha*. The four non-material substances are space, time, soul and mind. Earth, water, fire and air are atomic but *akasha* is non-atomic and infinite. Space and time are infinite and eternal.

The concept of soul is comparable to that of the self or *atman*. This system considers consciousness as an accidental property. In other words, when the soul associates itself to the body, only then it ‘acquires’ consciousness. Thus, consciousness is not considered an essential quality of the soul. The mind or the *manas* is accepted as atomic but indivisible and eternal substance. The mind helps to establish the contact of the self to the external world objects. The soul develops attachment to the body owing to ignorance. The soul identifies itself with the body and mind. The soul is trapped in the bondage of karma, as a consequence of actions resulted from countless desires and passions. It can be free from the bondage only if it
becomes free from actions. Liberation follows the cessation of the actions. **Eliot too** gave references about the cycle of time in his *Four Quartets*.

**Yoga**

Patanjali was the proponent of the Yoga system. Yoga is closely associated with Samkhya. Yoga is largely based on the Samkhya philosophy. They are two sides of the same coin. Samkhya is the theory, Yoga is the practice. It should be noted, however, that Samkhya is basically an atheistic system, but Yoga is theistic. Patanjali propagated his philosophy of Yoga in his great work – Yoga-Sutra. Yoga-Sutra consists of four parts. While Samkhya uses three terms - *Mahat, ahamkara* and *manas* - to refer to *antahkarana*, Yoga has only one word – *Chitta*. Yoga adopts a single term, *chitta*, to refer to a complex of *Mahat, ahamkara* and *manas*. Patanjali shows the way to emancipation by *ashtanga-yoga*. Yoga is a self-disciplining process of concentration and meditation. Such a Yogic practice leads one to higher states of consciousness. This helps one in acquiring direct knowledge and the result is Self–Realization. Patanjali lays emphasis on the complete control and mastery of *chitta*. He proposes the practice of certain physical and mental exercises. They form the basis of *ashtanga–yoga*.

*Ashtanga–yoga* comprises of eight *anga* (steps): *yama, niyama, asana, pranayama, pratyahara, dharana, dhyana* and *Samadhi*. These eight steps are divided into two parts: External part of five *anga*: *yama, niyama, asana, pranayama* and *pratyahara*. Internal part of three *anga*: *dharana, dhyana* and *samadhi*. *Yama* means restraint. One must turn to ethics by refraining himself from immoral activities. This
is the first step towards self-discipline. Niyama means observance. It refers to the cultivation of values and virtues in life. These two anga – Yama and Niyama – protects the aspirant from irresistible temptations and desires and offer a protection from the distractions. The next two steps, asana and pranayama, prepares the physical body for the Yogic practice. Asana means posture of the body. A steady but comfortable posture is essential for Yoga. Pranayama is concerned with the control of breath. The cycles of inspiration, kumbhaka and expiration have to be carefully monitored. Both these anga enhances the steadiness of the body and mind. Pratyahara is concerned with the withdrawal of the senses. The senses, by their inherent nature, remain focused on the external world. Pratyahara helps to detach the sense organs from the objects of the world. The isolation from the world objects facilitates the concentration of the mind on any particular object.

The ultimate three steps are dharana - concentration, dhyana - meditation and Samadhi - spiritual absorption. Dharana is concerned with the concentration. It is concerned with concentrating the chitta on a single object. The subject is focusing on an object. If the mind diverts to some other object, it has to be fixed again on the chosen object of concentration. Dhyana is concerned with contemplation. In this stage, the aspirant can keep the mind steady on the object chosen for contemplation. The mind is focused without interruptions and there is unidirectional flow of chitta. Though the mind is steadfast, yet there is awareness of the mind of the self. There is an observer; there is also the one that is being observed. Samadhi is the ultimate stage of Yogic practice. Now all self-awareness of the mind disappears. The aspirant
(seeker) becomes aware that his attachment to the *Prakriti* was owing to the ignorance (*avidya*). The illusion is gone. This is the ultimate, *nirbeej Samadhi*. There is the unification of the subject and the object. Now there is no object at all. The duo, the subject and the object, mingles into unity. They are no separate entities. There is only one, but it is not an object. There is oneness devoid of material existence; it is pure Consciousness. Samkhya system is based on atheism but Yoga believes in God. Both Yoga and Samkhya holds that there are many *purushas*. Unlike Samkhya, Yoga holds that there is one Supreme *Purusha* (God) who is above all *purushas* and that no other *Purusha* can be like that Supreme *Purusha*. This Supreme *Purusha* does not create the *Prakriti* or other *purushas*.

**All these concepts and beliefs of Indian philosophy existing in Hinduism and Buddhism as well as Jainism is well located in the poetry and drama of T.S. Eliot. However, it can be easily analyzed and compared with the holy Bible too as one can find these beliefs in Catholicism too as far as the concept of dharma karma, purushartha, tyaga and moksha are concerned. Eliot’s work shows that he is mythical about the mortality of the physical and immortality of the spiritual.**

This research work on Thomas Stearns Eliot’s literary work is an effort to explore his great literature in the light of the Liturgical usage and the Holy Bible and the Indian philosophy as well. As the Indian philosophy is limitless with its multiple branches including religion, Vedas, Upanishads, yoga etc so is the vastness of the holy Bible including the old testament and the new testament of the lord’s word. It
would not be an exaggeration to say that the English Bible is, next to Shakespeare, the greatest work in English literature, and that it has greater influence than even Shakespeare does upon the written and spoken language of the English race. One’s literary study is very incomplete if it is studied without some general knowledge of the relation of the Bible to that literature.

It is one thing to consider every word of a book as the word of God or gods, and another thing is to consider it simply as the work of men like ourselves. The wonder of the English Bible can really be best appreciated. From the moral point of view it contains very much that we cannot until day approve of; and what is good in it can be found in the sacred books of other nations. Everywhere to-day in Europe and America the study of Buddhist and Sanskrit literature is being pursued not only with eagerness but with enthusiasm—an enthusiasm which sometimes reaches to curious extremes. There are stories that people from west happened to read an English translation of the “Bhagavad-Gita.” Almost immediately, they resolved to devote the rest of his life to religious study in India, in a monastery among the mountains; giving up wealth, friends, society, everything that Western civilization could offer him, in order to seek truth in a strange country. This effectiveness is admit able and is visible on Eliot but the difference is that in spite of this influence he remained strong Anglican giving allusions from Christianity. Every great scripture, whether Hebrew, Indian, Persian, or Chinese, apart from its religious value will be found to have some rare and special beauty of its own; and in this respect the original Bible stands very high as a monument of sublime poetry and of artistic prose. If it is not the greatest of religious
books as a literary creation, it is at all events one of the greatest; and the proof is to be found in the inspiration which millions and hundreds of millions, dead and living, have obtained from its utterances. The Semitic races have always possessed in a very high degree the genius of poetry, especially poetry in which imagination plays a great part; and the Bible is the monument of Semitic genius in this regard. Something in the serious, stern, and reverential spirit of the genius referred to make a particular appeal to Western races having certain characteristics of the same kind.

“There are two methods for the literary study of any book—the first being the study of its thought and emotion; the second only that of its workmanship. A student of literature should study some of the Bible from both points of view.

2.2

The Bible

Atonement in Christianity Similar to the Moksha in Hinduism

The Bible refers to collections of sacred scripture of Judaism and Christianity. There is no single version: both the individual books -Biblical canon and their order vary. The Hebrew Bible contains 24 books that were rearranged into 39 by Christian denominations, while complete Christian Bibles range from the 66 books of the Protestant canon to 81 books in the Ethiopian Orthodox Bible. The oldest surviving Christian Bibles are Greek manuscripts from fourth century AD; the oldest complete Hebrew manuscripts date from the Middle Ages. The Hebrew Bible, or Tanakh, is divided into three parts: (1) the five books of the Torah "teaching" or "law" comprise
the origins of the Israelite nation and its covenant with God; (2) the Nevi'im "prophets" containing the historic account of ancient Israel and Judah plus works of prophecy; and (3) the Ketuvim "writings", poetic and philosophical works such as Psalms and Job.\(^3\) Christian Bible includes the books of the Hebrew Bible, but arranged in a different fashion: Hebrew Scripture ends with the people of Israel restored to Jerusalem and the temple and the Christian arrangement ends with the book of the prophet Malachi.

The Christian Bible is divided into two parts. The first is called the Old Testament, containing the 39 books of Hebrew Scripture, and the second portion is called the New Testament, containing 27 books. Soon after the establishment of Christianity in the first century, Church Fathers compiled Gospel accounts and letters of apostles into a Christian Bible which became known as the New Testament. The Old and New Testaments together are commonly referred to as "The Holy Bible". The canonical composition of the Jewish Bible is in dispute between Christian groups: Protestants hold only the books of the Hebrew Bible to be canonical; Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox additionally consider the deuterocanonical books, a group of Jewish books, to be canonical. The New Testament is composed of the Gospels "good news", the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles -letters, and the Book of Revelation.

1. **The Old Testament** consists of a collection of writings believed to have been composed at various times from the twelfth to the second century B.C. The books
were written in classical Hebrew, except for brief portions (Ezra 4:8–6:18 and 7:12–26, Jeremiah 10:11, Daniel 2:4–7:28) which are in the Aramaic language, a sister language which became the *lingua franca* of the Semitic world. Much of the material, including many genealogies, poems and narratives, is thought to have been handed down by word of mouth for many generations. Very few manuscripts are said to have survived the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.4

2. The Old Testament is accepted by Christians as scripture. Broadly speaking, it contains the same material as the Hebrew Bible. However, the order of the books is not entirely the same as that found in Hebrew manuscripts and in the ancient versions and varies from Judaism in interpretation and emphasis (see for example Isaiah 7:14).

Christian denominations disagree about the incorporation of a small number of books into their canons of the Old Testament. A few groups consider particular translations to be divinely inspired, notably the Greek Septuagint, the Aramaic Peshitta, and the English King James Version.

**New Testament** is a collection of 27 books, of 4 different genres of Christian literature (Gospels, one account of the Acts of the Apostles, Epistles and an Apocalypse). Jesus is its central figure. The New Testament presupposes the inspiration of the Old Testament. There are wide differences of opinion among Christians as to how particular incidents as described in the Bible are to be interpreted and as to what meaning should be attached to various prophecies. However,
Christians in general are in agreement as to the Bible's basic message. A general outline, as described by C. S. Lewis. It is as follows: At some point in the past, humanity chose to depart from God's will and began to sin.

1. Because no one is free from sin, people cannot deal with God directly, so God revealed Himself in ways his people could understand Him.

2. God called Abraham and his progeny to be the means for saving all of humanity.

3. To this end, He gave the Law to Moses.

4. The resulting nation of Israel went through cycles of sin and repentance, yet the prophets show an increasing understanding of the Law as a moral, not just a ceremonial, force.

5. Jesus brought a perfect understanding of the Mosaic Law, that of love and salvation.

6. By His death and resurrection, all who believe are saved and reconciled to God.

7. Many Christians, Muslims, and Jews regard the Bible as inspired by God yet written fallibly by imperfect men. Many others, who identify themselves as biblical literalists, regard both the New and Old Testament as the undiluted Word of God, spoken by God and written down in its perfect form by humans. Still others hold the Biblical infallibility perspective, that the Bible is free from error in spiritual but not scientific matters. "Bible scholars claim that discussions about the Bible must be put into its context within church history and then into the context of contemporary culture." Belief in sacred texts is attested to in Jewish antiquity.
8. Various texts of the Bible mention Divine agency in relation to prophetic writings, In their book *A General Introduction to the Bible*, Norman Geisler and William Nix wrote: "The process of inspiration is a mystery of the providence of God, but the result of this process is a verbal, plenary, inerrant, and authoritative record.9

**Atonement in Christianity:** Atonement is a doctrine that describes how human beings can be reconciled to God. In Christian theology, the atonement refers to the forgiving or pardoning of sin through the death of Jesus Christ by crucifixion, which made possible the reconciliation between God and creation. Within Christianity, there are three main theories for how such atonement might work the ransom theory, the satisfaction theory and the moral influence theory. All of these theories can be well located in the themes of Eliot’s plays. Readers can understand them well in the themes of poetry and drama of T.S. Eliot in the following chapters of this thesis.

**Etymology**

1. The word *atonement* was invented in the sixteenth century by William Tyndale who recognized that there was not a direct English translation of the biblical Hebraic concept. The word is composed of two parts "at" and "onement" in order to reflect the dual aspect of Christ's sacrifice: the remission of sin and reconciliation of man to God. Tyndale's concept overcomes the limitations of the
word reconciliation whilst incorporating aspects of propitiation and forgiveness.\textsuperscript{10, 11, 12}

\textbf{2.} Christians have used three different metaphors to understand how the atonement might work.\textsuperscript{13} Churches and denominations may vary in which metaphor they consider most accurately fits into their theological perspective, however all Christians emphasize that Jesus is the Saviour of the world and through his death the sins of humankind have been forgiven.\textsuperscript{14}

The first metaphor, epitomized by the "ransom to Satan" theory, was used by the fourth-century theologian Gregory of Nyssa based on verses such as Mark 10:45 – "the Son of Man came to give his life as a ransom for the many". In this metaphor Jesus liberates mankind from slavery to Satan and thus death by giving his own life as a ransom. Victory over Satan consists of swapping the life of the perfect (Jesus), for the lives of the imperfect humanity. A variation of this view is known as the "Christ’s Victor" theory, and sees Jesus not used as a ransom but rather defeating Satan in a spiritual battle and thus freeing enslaved mankind by defeating the captor.

\textbf{3.} The second metaphor, used by the eleventh century theologian Anselm, is called the "satisfaction" theory. In this picture, humanity owes a debt not to Satan, but to sovereign God himself. A sovereign may well be able to forgive an insult or an injury in his private capacity, but because he is a sovereign, he cannot if the state has been dishonored. Anselm argued that the insult given to God is so great that only a perfect sacrifice could satisfy and Jesus, being both God and man, was this
perfect sacrifice. A variation on this theory is the commonly held Protestant "penal substitution theory," which instead of considering sin as an affront to God’s honour, sees sin as the breaking of God’s moral law. Placing a particular emphasis on Romans 6:23 (the wages of sin is death), penal substitution sees sinful man as being subject to God’s wrath with the essence of Jesus' saving work being his substitution in the sinner's place, bearing the curse in the place of man (Galatians 3:13). Another variation that also falls within this metaphor is Hugo Grotius’ "governmental theory", which sees Jesus receiving a punishment as a public example of the lengths to which God will go to uphold the moral order. The third metaphor is that of healing, associated with Pierre Abelard in the eleventh century, and Paul Tillich in the twentieth. In this picture, Jesus’ death on the cross demonstrates the extent of God’s love for us, and moved by this great act of love humankind responds and is transformed by the power of the Holy Spirit. This view is favoured by most liberal theologians as the moral influence view, and also forms the basis for Rene Girard’s "mimetic desire" theory (not to be confused with meme theory).

**Eastern Christianity**

4. Eastern Orthodoxy and Eastern Catholicism have a substantively different soteriology; this is sometimes cited as the core difference between Eastern and Western Christianity. Salvation is not seen as legal release, but transformation of the human nature itself in the Son taking on human nature. In contrast to other forms of Christianity, the Orthodox tend to use the word "expiation" with regard
to what is accomplished in the sacrificial act. In Orthodox theology, expiation is an act of offering that seeks to change the one making the offering. The Greek word that is translated both into propitiation and expiation is "hilasmos" which means "to make acceptable and enable one to draw close to God". Thus the Orthodox emphasis would be that Christ died, not to appease an angry and vindictive Father, or to avert the wrath of God, but to change people so that they may become more like God. 16

**Roman Catholic views on atonement and reparation**

As expressed by Pope Pius XI in his encyclical *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, in the Roman Catholic tradition the concepts of atonement and redemption are often seen as being inherently related. And atonement is often balanced with specific Acts of Reparation which relate the sufferings and death of Christ to the forgiveness of sins. 17 Eliot’s work is full of this belief. The work is discussed in detail in coming chapters. Moreover, in *Miserentissimus Redemptor* the Pontif called acts of reparation a duty for Roman Catholics: We are holden to the duty of reparation and expiation by a certain more valid title of justice and of love.”... "Moreover this duty of expiation is laid upon the whole race of men. 18 Pope John Paul II referred to the concept as: the unceasing effort to stand beside the endless crosses on which the Son of God continues to be crucified. 19 The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has other opinion. It expands the doctrine of the atonement complementary to the substitution atonement concept, including the following:
1. **Suffering in Gethsemane.** The Atonement began in Gethsemane and ends with Christ's resurrection. (Luke 22:44; Doctrine and Covenants 19:16-19; Mosiah 3:7; Alma 7:11-13). Christ described this agony in the Doctrine and Covenants as follows: "For behold, I, God, have suffered these things for all, which they might not suffer if they would repent. Which suffering caused myself, even God, the greatest of all, to tremble because of pain, and to bleed at every pore, and to suffer both body and spirit..." (Doctrine and Covenants 19:15,18).

We find in Eliot’s plays that the leading characters reflect this suffering and look for peace and penance through their spiritual guide, an important character present in each of his plays whether in the form of Amy, Harcourt, Edgerson or so.

2. **The relationship of justice, mercy, agency, and God's unconditional love.** Christ's infinite atonement was required to satisfy the demands of justice based on eternal law, rendering Him Mediator, Redeemer, and Advocate with the Father. Thus, he proffers divine mercy to the truly penitent who voluntarily come unto him, offering them the gift of his grace to "lift them up" and "be perfected in Him" through his merits (2 Nephi 2 and 9; Alma 12, 34, and 42; Moroni 9:25; 10:33; compare Isaiah 55:1-9).

3. **No need for infant baptism.** Christ's atonement completely resolved the consequence from the fall of Adam of spiritual death for infants, young children and those of innocent mental capacity who die before an age of self-
accountability; hence, all these are resurrected to eternal life in the resurrection. However, baptism is required of those who are deemed by God to be accountable for their actions. (Moroni 8:10-22)

4. **Empathetic purpose.** Christ suffered pain and agony not only for the sins of all men, but also to experience their physical pains, illnesses, anguish from addictions, emotional turmoil and depression, "that His bowels may be filled with mercy, according to the flesh, that he may know according to the flesh how to succor his people according to their infirmities" (Alma 7:12; compare Isaiah 53:4). "The word (atonement) describes the setting 'at one' of those who have been estranged, and denotes the reconciliation of man to God. Sin is the cause of the estrangement, and therefore the purpose of the atonement is to correct or overcome the consequences of sin."20 Eliot’s characters are always in search of atonement.

**The New Church -Emanuel Swedenborg**

According to the doctrine of The New Church, as explained by Emanuel Swedenborg, there is no such thing as Substitution to atonement. According to New Church doctrine, God Himself descended in the form of Divine Truth to incarnate into a human body, which is Jesus Christ or the Son of God. In this human form he conquered Hell by resisting all temptation against evil, until he made his very human body Divine. Thus in Jesus Christ God became man, and man became God, in one person.21 Redemption was a subjugation of the hells and a reordering of heaven, which was accomplished by Jesus resisting temptation. The passion of the cross was
not in itself redemption; instead, it was the last temptation, which Jesus Christ
dured before his human was made Divine (JA) From the union of God and man in
Jesus Christ proceeded the Holy Spirit, which regenerates all people who make an
effort to resist temptation and reform their lives (JA). It is only through actual
repentance whereby sins can be remitted (JA). This doctrine is similar to the Eastern
Orthodox view of the atonement and is found in all of Eliot’s plays. Simply by
following a state of temptation and repentance, man will reach a state where the Lord
will protect him from further temptation and evil. It becomes essential here to
acquaint all with the catholic liturgy and the liturgical cycle of a Christian
calendar, so that its existence in Eliot’s works can be located and witnessed
easily. Eliot adapted prayers and readings from the liturgy and we can see its
usage in his drama and poetry that he wrote after his conversion to Catholicism.

Below is a description of the mass.

2.3

The liturgy

**INTRODUCTORY RITES** [stand] Entrance Procession:[After the people have
assembled, an opening song or entrance antiphon is sung or recited as the priest and
the ministers enter the church and process to the altar; after reverencing the altar
(sometimes also using incense), they go to their chairs.] Greeting: **Priest:** In the name
of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. **[All together make the sign of
the cross.] All:** Amen. Option A: **Priest:** The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the
love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all. *All:* And with you.

Option B: *Priest:* The grace and peace of God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ be with you. *All:* Blessed be God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. *Or All:* And also with you. Option C: *Priest:* The Lord be with you.[or *Bishop:* Peace be with you.] *All:* And also with you. [The priest or another minister may then briefly introduce the Mass of the day, saying something about the readings, the feast, and/or the special occasion being celebrated.]

**Rite of Blessing and Sprinkling Holy Water:** *Priest:* Dear friends, this water will be used to remind us of our baptism. Let us ask God to bless it, and to keep us faithful to the Spirit he has given us. [or similar words of introduction]

Option A: *Priest:* God our Father, your gift of water brings life and freshness to the earth; it washes away our sins and brings us eternal life. We ask you now to bless this water, and to give us your protection on this day, which you have made your own. Renew the living spring of your life within us and protect us in spirit and body, that we may be free from sin and come into your presence to receive your gift of salvation. We ask this through Christ our Lord. *All:* Amen.

Option B: *Priest:* Lord God almighty, creator of all life, of body and soul, we ask you to bless this water: as we use it in faith forgive our sins and save us from all illness and the power of evil. Lord, in your mercy give us living water, always springing up as a fountain of salvation: free us, body and soul, from every danger, and admit us to
your presence in purity of heart. Grant this through Christ our Lord. All: Amen.

Option C (during the Easter Season): Priest: Lord God almighty, hear the prayers of your people: we celebrate our creation and redemption. Hear our prayers and bless this water which give fruitfulness to the fields, and refreshment and cleansing to man. You chose water to show your goodness when you led your people to freedom through the Red Sea and satisfied their thirst in the desert with water from the rock. Water was the symbol used by the prophets to foretell your new covenant with us. You made the water of baptism holy by Christ's baptism in the Jordan: by it you give us a new birth and renew us in holiness. May this water remind us of our baptism, and let us share the joy of all who have been baptized at Easter. We ask this through Christ our Lord. All: Amen.

[After blessing the water, the priest moves through the church sprinkling all of the people while an antiphon or other song is sung. When the sprinkling and the song is finished, the priest concludes this rite as follows:]

Priest: May almighty God cleanse us of our sins, and through the Eucharist we celebrate make us worthy to sit at his table in his heavenly kingdom. All: Amen. [This rite is commonly celebrated during the Easter Season, but may also be used at other times. When it is used, the Penitential Rite is omitted, and the Mass continues with the Gloria (on most Sundays and solemnities) or with the Opening Prayer (during Advent and Lent, and on weekdays).] Alternatively, Penitential Rite: Priest: As we prepare to celebrate the mystery of Christ's love, let us acknowledge our failures and
ask the Lord for pardon and strength. or Coming together as God's family, with confidence let us ask the Father's forgiveness, for he is full of gentleness and compassion or My brothers and sisters, to prepare ourselves to celebrate the sacred mysteries, let us call to mind our sins.[or similar words of introduction, followed by a period of silent reflection.]

Option A: All: I confess to almighty God, and to you, my brothers and sisters, that I have sinned through my own fault, in my thoughts and in my words, in what I have done, and in what I have failed to do; and I ask blessed Mary, ever virgin, all the angels and saints, and you, my brothers and sisters, to pray for me to the Lord, our God. Priest: May almighty God have mercy on us, forgive us our sins, and bring us to everlasting life. All: Amen.

Option B: Priest: Lord, we have sinned against you: Lord, have mercy. All: Lord, have mercy. Priest: Lord, show us your mercy and love. All: And grant us your salvation. Priest: May almighty God have mercy on us, forgive us our sins, and bring us to everlasting life. All: Amen.

Option C: [The priest or another minister may speak The following or other invocations, but the priest always gives the final blessing.] Minister: You raise the dead to life in the Spirit: Lord, have mercy. All: Lord, have mercy. Minister: You bring pardon and peace to the sinner: Christ, have mercy. All: Christ, have mercy. Minister: You bring light to those in darkness: Lord, have mercy.
All: Lord, have mercy. Priest: May almighty God have mercy on us, forgive us our sins, and bring us to everlasting life. All: Amen.

Kyrie: [The following acclamations are sung or recited, either in English or Greek, unless they have already been used, as in option C above.] Priest: Lord, have mercy. All: Lord, have mercy. Priest: Christ, have mercy. All: Christ, have mercy. Priest: Lord, have mercy. All: Lord, have mercy. Or Priest: Kyrie, eleison. All: Kyrie, eleison. Priest: Christe, eleison. All: Christe, eleison. Priest: Kyrie, eleison. All: Kyrie, eleison. Gloria: [This ancient hymn of praise is used on all Sundays outside of Advent and Lent, on solemnities and major feasts, and in solemn local celebrations. It is preferably sung by the whole congregation, but may also be sung by the choir or recited by all. The priest may begin with a brief sung or spoken invitation for the people to praise God.]

All: Glory to God in the highest, and peace to his people on earth. Lord God, heavenly King, almighty God and Father, we worship you, we give you thanks, we praise you for your glory. Lord Jesus Christ, only Son of the Father, Lord God, Lamb of God, you take away the sin of the world: have mercy on us; you are seated at the right hand of the Father: receive our prayer. For you alone are the Holy One, you alone are the Lord, You alone are the Most High, Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, in the glory of God the Father. Amen. Opening Prayer: Priest: Let us pray. [After a time of silent prayer, the priest sings or says the Opening Prayer, which is different for each Mass. At the end, the people proclaim their consent.] All: Amen. [sit]
LITURGY OF THE WORD: First Reading: Lector: A reading from the Book (or Letter, or Acts) of ... [Different readings are prescribed for each day. At the end of the reading, the lector proclaims, and the people respond:] Lector: The Word of the Lord. All: Thanks be to God!

Responsorial Psalm: [The choir and/or cantor sing or recite the psalm; the people join in the repeated response.]

Second Reading: [A second reading is prescribed for all Sundays and major feasts, but not for most weekdays or minor feasts. The lector's introduction, conclusion, and the people's response are the same as in the First Reading, above.] [stand] Alleluia or Gospel Acclamation: Choir or Cantor: Alleluia! All repeat: Alleluia! Choir or Cantor: [verse] All repeat: Alleluia! [The "Alleluia" may be repeated two or more times, especially during the Easter Season. If it is not sung, it should be omitted.] [During the Season of Lent, a different "Gospel Acclamation" is used, such as "Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ, King of endless glory!" or "Praise and honor to you, Lord Jesus Christ!" or "Glory and praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ!" or something similar.]

Gospel: Before the Gospel Proclamation: Deacon (or Priest): The Lord be with you. All: And also with you. Deacon (or Priest): A reading from the Holy Gospel according to... [Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John] All: Glory to you, Lord! After the Gospel Proclamation: Deacon (or Priest): The Gospel of the Lord. All: Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ! [sit]
**Homily**: [The bishop, priest, or deacon then speaks to the people, usually focusing on that day's scriptures and/or on the feast or special occasion being celebrated at that Mass; but the homily may also be based on any liturgical text from the Mass.] [stand]

**Profession of Faith**: [On Sundays and solemnities, the Nicene Creed is normally recited by everyone after the homily. The Apostles’ Creed may be used instead, esp. in celebrations of Masses with children.]

**NICENE CREED**:

We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all that is seen and unseen. We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, one in Being with the Father. Through him, all things were made. For us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven: [bow during the next two lines:] by the power of the Holy Spirit he was born of the Virgin Mary, and became man. For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate; he suffered, died, and was buried. On the third day he rose again in fulfillment of the Scriptures; he ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead, and his kingdom will have no end. We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son. With the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified. He has spoken through the Prophets. We believe in one holy catholic and
apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

_APOSTLES' CREED:_

I believe in God, the Father almighty, creator of heaven and earth. I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord. He was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary. He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried. He descended to the dead. On the third day, he rose again. He ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come to judge the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.

**General Intercessions / Prayer of the Faithful:** _Lector_...let us prays to the Lord. 

_All:_ Lord, hear our prayer. [or a similar response, repeated after each petition]

**LITURGY OF THE EUCHARIST:** Presentation of the Gifts /

Preparation of the Altar: _Priest:_ Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation. Through your goodness we have this bread to offer, which earth has given and human hands have made. It will become for us the bread of life. _All:_ Blessed be God forever. _Priest:_ Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation. Through your goodness, we have this wine to offer, fruit of the vine and work of human hands. It will become our spiritual drink. _All:_ Blessed be God forever. [If there is no singing during the presentation of the gifts, the priest may
say the preceding prayers aloud, and the people may respond. However, if a presentation song is being sung, the priest recites these prayers inaudibly, and the people's response is omitted. Then, after the priest has washed his hands and the music is finished, he invites the people to join in prayer:]

**Priest:** Pray, my brothers and sisters, that our sacrifice may be acceptable to God, the almighty Father. **All:** May the Lord accept the sacrifice at your hands, for the praise and glory of his name, for our good, and the good of all his Church.

**Prayer over the Gifts:** [The priest sings or says this prayer, which is different for each Mass. At the end, the people respond:] **All:** Amen.

**Eucharistic Prayer:** [The priest may choose from among four regular Eucharistic Prayers, or two other Eucharistic Prayers for Masses of Reconciliation. On appropriate occasions, the priest may also choose from among three Eucharistic Prayers for Masses with Children, or four recently approved Eucharistic Prayers for Various Needs and Occasions. Each prayer has a similar structure, including some responses and acclamations by all the people. There are also many choices for the "Preface," depending on the liturgical season, the feast of the day, and the ritual or occasion being celebrated at that Mass. Click here for the full texts of the various Eucharistic Prayers.] [The posture of the people during the Eucharistic Prayer is different in various countries and regions; in the United States, the people normally stand until the "Holy, Holy", and then kneel until after the "Great Amen."]

**Preface Dialogue:** **Priest:** The Lord be with you. **All:** And also with you. **Priest:** Lift up your
hearts. 

All: We lift them up to the Lord. Priest: Let us give thanks to the Lord, our God. 

All: It is right to give him thanks and praise. Holy, Holy (Sanctus): 

All: Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, Heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest. [kneel]

Memorial Acclamation: Priest: Let us proclaim the mystery of faith. All: A - Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again. or B - Dying you destroyed our death, rising you restored our life. Lord Jesus, come in glory. or C - When we eat this bread and drink this cup, we proclaim your death, Lord Jesus, until you come in glory or D - Lord, by your cross and resurrection, you have set us free. You are the Savior of the World.

Doxology and Great Amen: Priest: Through him, with him, and in him, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all glory and honor is yours, almighty Father, for ever and ever.

All: Amen! [may be sung more than once]

COMMUNION RITE- Lord's Prayer: Priest: Let us pray with confidence to the Father in the words our Savior gave us or Jesus taught us to call God our Father, and so we have the courage to say or Let us ask our Father to forgive our sins and to bring us to forgive those who sin against us or Let us pray for the coming of the kingdom as Jesus taught us. All: Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass
against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. *Priest:* Deliver us, Lord, from every evil, and grant us peace in our day. In your mercy keep, us free from sin and protect us from all anxiety as we wait in joyful hope for the coming of our Savior, Jesus Christ. *All:* For the kingdom, the power, and the glory are yours, now and forever.

**Sign of Peace:** *Priest:* Lord Jesus Christ, you said to your apostles: I leave you peace, my peace I give you. Look not on our sins, but on the faith of your Church, and grant us the peace and unity of your kingdom where you live forever and ever. *All:* Amen. *Priest:* The Peace of the Lord be with you always. *All:* And also with you.

*Deacon or Priest:* Let us offer each other a sign of peace. [*The ministers and all the people exchange an embrace, handshake, or other appropriate gesture of peace with those near them, according to local custom.*]

**Breaking of the Bread:** *All:* Lamb of God, you take away the sins of the world: have mercy on us. Lamb of God, you take away the sins of the world: have mercy on us. Lamb of God, you take away the sins of the world: grant us peace. *This is found in Eliot’s Ash Wednesday.* [*This text may be sung or recited, and may be repeated several more times until the breaking of bread and the preparation of the communion vessels is finished; but the last phrase is always "Grant us peace."*]

**Communion:** *Priest:* This is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. Happy are those who are called to his supper. *All:* Lord, I am not worthy to receive you, but only say the word and I shall be healed. *This is also found in Eliot’s Ash*
Wednesday. [The manner of receiving communion differs significantly between various countries, dioceses, and even individual parishes. In the United States, the people normally process to the front in lines, receive communion standing, and then return to their places in the congregation. In some cases, the ministers may go to other locations within the church to distribute communion, or may even approach individuals at their places (esp. the elderly or infirm). Communion is now usually offered "under both species", i.e., both the consecrated bread and the consecrated wine. It may be distributed by priests, deacons, or designated laypersons, called "Extraordinary Ministers of the Eucharist." Communicants are encouraged to receive the consecrated bread in their hands, but may also receive communion on the tongue. After returning to their places, the people are encouraged to remain standing until everyone has received communion, but in many parishes the people immediately sit down or kneel for silent prayer.] Communion Minister: The body of Christ. Communicant: Amen. Communion Minister: The blood of Christ. Communicant: Amen.

Communion Song: [During the reception of Communion, an appropriate song is sung, or at least a short "Communion Antiphon" is recited.] Period of Silence or Song of Praise: [When the distribution of Communion is completed, there may be a period of silence for individual prayer, or a psalm or song of praise may be sung. The people stand, sit, or kneel during this time, although the posture of the congregation should be unified.]
Prayer after Communion: Priest: Let us pray. [All pray in silence for a while, unless a period of silence has already been observed. Then the priest sings or says the Prayer after Communion, which is different for each Mass. At the end, the people proclaim their consent.] All: Amen.

[Announcements, etc.]: If there are any announcements, acknowledgements, reflections, eulogies, or similar actions, these are best included here, after the Prayer after Communion and before the Concluding Rite. The people may remain standing, or may be invited to sit, depending on the length of the announcements or activity.

CONCLUDING RITE: Greeting: Priest: The Lord be with you. All: And also with you.

Blessing: Option A: Simple Form Priest: May almighty God bless you, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. All: Amen. Option B: Solemn Blessing: Deacon or Priest: Bow your heads and pray for God's blessing. [One or more invocations may be spoken, and the people usually respond "Amen" to each one. The following conclusion is always used.] Priest: May almighty God bless you, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. All: Amen. Option C: Prayer over the People Deacon or Priest: Bow your heads and pray for God's blessing. [The priest may choose from several options, depending on the occasion or special need. The following conclusion is always used.] Priest: May almighty God bless you, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. All: Amen. Dismissal: Deacon or
Priest: Go in the peace of Christ. or The Mass is ended, go in peace or Go in peace to love and serve the Lord. All: Thanks be to God! Recessional and Closing Song

[Although it is traditional in many countries and many parishes to sing a final song or to have some instrumental music played as the priest and ministers process out of the church, this is not prescribed in the Order of Mass.]

2.4 The Bhagavad-Gita

The Bhagavad-Gita begins before the start of the climactic battle at Kurukshetra, with the Pandava prince Arjuna becoming filled with doubt on the battlefield. Realizing that his enemies are his own relatives, beloved friends, and revered teachers, he turns to his charioteer and guide, Krishna, for advice. In summary the main philosophical subject matter of the Bhagavad Gita is the explanation of five basic concepts or "truths"22 Bhaktivedanta Veda Base Network (ISKCON). http://bhagavadgitaasitis.com/introduction/en1. Retrieved 2008-01-14. "The subject of the Bhagavad-gita entails the comprehension of five basic truths" Ishvara (The Supreme Controller) Jiva (Living beings/the individualized soul) Prakrti (Nature/Matter) Dharma (Duty in accordance with Divine law) Kaala (Time)

Overview of chapters: Krishna displays his Vishvarupa, the Universal Form to Arjuna on the battlefield of Kurukshetra. The Gita consists of eighteen chapters in total. Message of each chapter is as follows: Arjuna requests Krishna to move his chariot between the two armies. When Arjuna sees his relatives on the opposing army
side of the Kurus, he loses morale and decides not to fight. After asking Krishna for help, Arjuna is instructed that only the body may be killed as he was worried if it would become a sin to kill people including his gurus and relatives, while the eternal self is immortal. Krishna appeals to Arjuna that, as a warrior, he has a duty to uphold the path of dharma through warfare. Arjuna asks why he should engage in fighting if knowledge is more important than action. Krishna stresses to Arjuna that performing his duties for the greater good, but without attachment to results, is the appropriate course of action. Krishna reveals that he has lived through many births, always teaching Yoga for the protection of the pious and the destruction of the impious and stresses the importance of accepting a guru. Arjuna asks Krishna if it is better to forgo action or to act. Krishna answers that both ways may be beneficent, but that acting in Karma Yoga is superior. Krishna describes the correct posture for meditation and the process of how to achieve Samādhi. Krishna teaches the path of knowledge - Jnana Yoga.

Krishna defines the terms *brahman, adhyatma, karma, atman, adhibhuta* and *adhidaiva* and explains how one can remember him at the time of death and attain his supreme abode. Krishna explains panentheism, "all beings are in me" as a way of remembering him in all circumstances. Krishna describes how he is the ultimate source of all material and spiritual worlds. Arjuna accepts Krishna as the Supreme Being, quoting great sages who have also done so. On Arjuna's request, Krishna displays his "universal form" *Viśvarūpa*, a theophany of a being facing every way and emitting the radiance of a thousand suns, containing all other beings and material in
existence. Krishna describes the process of devotional service - Bhakti Yoga. Krishna describes nature, the prakrti, the enjoyer, the purusha and consciousness. Krishna explains the three modes, the gunas of material nature. Krishna describes a symbolic tree representing material existence, its roots in the heavens and its foliage on earth. Krishna explains that this tree should be filled with the "axe of detachment", after which one can go beyond to his supreme abode. Krishna tells of the human traits of the divine and the demonic natures. He counsels that to attain the supreme destination one must give up lust, anger and greed, discern between right and wrong action by evidence from scripture and thus act rightly. Krishna tells of three divisions of faith and the thoughts, deeds and even eating habits corresponding to the three gunas.

In conclusion, Krishna asks Arjuna to abandon all forms of dharma and simply surrender unto him. He describes this as the ultimate perfection of life. The Gita addresses the discord between the senses and the intuition of cosmic order. It speaks of the Yoga of equanimity, a detached outlook. The term Yoga covers a wide range of meanings, but in the context of the Bhagavad Gita, describes a unified outlook, serenity of mind, skill in action and the ability to stay attuned to the glory of the Self - Atman and the Supreme Being - Bhagavan - the lord almighty. Krishna summarizes the Yoga through eighteen chapters. Three yogas in particular have been emphasized by commentators:

1. Bhakti Yoga or Devotion,
2. Karma Yoga or Selfless Action
3. Jnana Yoga or *Self Transcending Knowledge*. We find that there is one spiritual advisor in all of Eliot’s plays such as Harcourt Reilly and Eggerson.

**Message of the Gita**

There are 6 arishadvargas, or evils that the Gita says one should avoid: kama (lust), krodha (anger), lobh (greed), moha (delusion), mada or ahankar (pride) and matsarya (jealousy). These are the negative characteristics, which prevent man from attaining moksha (liberation from the birth and death cycle). Several scholars and philosophers have tried to summarise the central teaching of the Bhagavad Gita. The Gita centers on the revelation of Vaishnava monotheism, offering the alternative of just war, even against relatives, provided the aggression is in the "active and selfless defence of dharma", to the pacifist Hindu concept of non-violence. Scholar Radhakrishnan writes that the verse 11.55 is "the essence of bhakti" and the "substance of the whole teaching of the Gita". Ramakrishna said that the essential message of the Gita could be obtained by repeating the word several times.

"'Gita, Gita, Gita', you begin, but then find yourself saying 'ta-Gi, ta-Gi, ta-Gi'. *Tyagi* means one who has renounced everything for God."same as Eliot’s message to renounce the world…."According to Swami Vivekananda, "If one reads this one Shloka one gets all the merits of reading the entire Gita; for in this one Shloka lies imbedded the whole Message of the Gita."

Mahatma Gandhi writes, "The object of the Gita appears to me to be that of showing the most excellent way to attain self-realization" and Gandhi writes that this
can be achieved by selfless action, "By desireless action; by renouncing fruits of action; by dedicating all activities to God, i.e., by surrendering oneself to Him body and soul." Gandhi called Gita, *The Gospel of Selfless Action*. 26 **Eliot preaches this self-realization everywhere whether that was to realize one’s religion or the fate.**

**Comparison of Christianity and Hindu Philosophy**

**The Bhagavad-Gita and the New Testament**

Frank F. Ellinwood has compared the two religious scriptures in a very beautiful manner. He says- No other portion of Hindu literature has made so great an impression on Western minds as the Bhagavad-Gita “The Lord’s Lay,” or the “Song of the Adorable.” It has derived its special importance from its supposed resemblance to the New Testament. In addition, as it claims to be much older than the oldest of the Gospels or the Epistles, it carries the inference that the latter may have borrowed something from it.

1. Mr. Mohini M. Chatterji has published a plausible translation in Boston. he devoutly believes this to be the revealed word of the Supreme Creator and Upholder of the universe. 27

2. He admits that at a later day “the same God, worshipped alike by Hindus and Christians, appeared again in the person of Jesus Christ,” and that “in the Bible He revealed Himself to Western nations, as the Bhagavad-Gita had proclaimed Him to the people of the East.” And he draws the inference that “If the Scriptures of the Brahmans and the Scriptures of the Jews and Christians, widely separated
as they are by age and nationality, are but different names for one and the same truth. A careful and reverent observation of the two sets of Scriptures will show forth the conscious and intelligent design of revelation.” The fact that the Bhagavad-Gita is thoroughly pantheistic, while the Bible emphasizes the personality of God in fellowship with the distinct personality of human souls, seems to interpose no serious difficulty in Mr. Chatterji’s view, since he says “’The Lord’s Lay’ is for philosophic minds, and therefore deals more at length with the mysteries of the being of God.” “In the Bhagavad-Gita,” he says, “consisting of seven hundred and seventy verses, the principal topic is the being of God, while scarcely the same amount of exposition is given to it in the whole Bible;” and he adds, “The explanation of this remarkable fact is found in the difference between the genius of the Hebrew and the Brahman race, and also in the fact that the teachings of Jesus Christ were addressed to ‘the common people.’”

The air of intellectual superiority, which is implied in these words, is obvious. Mr. Chatterji also finds an inner satisfaction in what he considers the broad charity of the Brahmanical Scriptures. He quotes a passage from the Narada Pancharata which speaks of the Buddha as “the preserver of revelation for those outside of the Vedic authority.” And he concludes that when one such revealer is admitted there can be no reason for excluding others; therefore Christianity also should be allowed a place. He declares on Vedic authority that whosoever receives the true knowledge of God, however revealed, attains eternal life. And for a parallel to this he quotes the saying
of Christ, that “this is eternal life that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.” “The Brahmanical Scriptures,” he says, “are of one accord in teaching that when the heart is purified God is seen; so also Jesus Christ declares that the pure in heart are blessed, for they shall see God.”

God, who “at sundry times and in divers manners” has spoken to men in different ages, made known his truth, and essentially the same truth, both on the plains of India and in Judea. In addition, he reminds Hindus and Christians alike, that this knowledge of truth carries with itself an increased responsibility. He says: “The man who sees the wonderful workings of the Spirit among the nations of the earth, bringing each people to God by ways unknown to others, is thereby charged with a duty. To him with terrible precision applies the warning given by Gamaliel to the Pharisees, ‘Take heed to yourselves what ye intend to do ... lest ye be found to fight even against God.’ If one be a Brahman, let him reflect when opposing the religion of Jesus what it is that he fights. The truths of Christianity are the same as those on which his own salvation depends. How can he be a lover of truth, which is God, if he knows not his beloved under such a disguise? Moreover, if he penetrates behind the veil, which should tend only to increase the ardor of his love, he cannot hate those who in obedience to the same truth are preaching the Gospel of Christ to all nations. Indeed, he ought to rejoice at his brothers’ devotion to the self-same God, and to see that he is rendering service to Him by helping others to carry out the behests given to them by the Divine Master. If, on the other hand, he be a Christian, let him remember that while he is commanded to preach repentance and remission of sins in the Saviour
Jesus, he is also warned against ‘teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.’”

All this seems like charity, but really it is laxity. And here is the very essence of Hinduism. Its chief characteristic that which renders it so hard to combat is its easy indifference to all distinctions. To reason with it is like grasping a jellyfish. Its pantheism, which embraces all things, covers all sides of all questions. It sees no difficulties even between things, which are morally opposites. Contradictions are not obstacles, and both sides of a dilemma may be harmonized. In addition, largely this same imprecision of confidence characterizes all the heathen systems of the East. The Buddhists and the Shintoists in Japan justify their easy-going partnership by the favorite maxim that, while “there are many paths by which men climb the sides of Fusyama, yet upon reaching the summit they all behold the same glorious moon.”

The question whether all do in fact reach the summit is one, which does not occur to an Oriental to ask.

This same pantheistic charity is seen in the well-known appeal of the late Chunder Sen, which as an illustration is worth repeating here: “Chunder Sen, servant of God, called to be an apostle of the Church of the New Dispensation, which is in the holy city of Calcutta; to all the great nations of the world and to the chief religious sects in the East and West, to the followers of Moses and of Jesus, of Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, Mohammed, Nanak, and of the various Hindu sects; grace be to you and peace everlasting. Whereas sects, discords, and strange schisms prevail in our father’s family; and whereas this setting of brother against brother has proved the prolific source of evil, it has pleased God to send into the world a message of peace and
reconciliation. This New Dispensation has commanded to bear witness to the nations of the earth. Thus said the Lord: ‘I abominate sects and desire love and concord ... I have at sundry times spoken through my prophets and my many dispensations. There is unity. There is one music but many instruments, one body but many members, one spirit but many gifts, one blood but many nations, one Church but many churches. Let Asia and Europe and America and all nations prove this New Dispensation and the true fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men.’ This is what T.S. Eliot ha tried to lock up as a whole in his literature, explaining with the help of stories of sin and suffering.

However, this remarkable production seems to possess everything except definite and robust conviction. In addition, its flaccid philosophy was not sufficient to hold back even Chunder Sen himself from the desertion of his principles not long afterward. This sugary smell of counterfeit charity, with which he thus gently sprayed the sects and nations of humanity, soon lost its flavor.

3. “Charity” is the watchword of indifferentism in the West as well as in the East; and the East and the West are joining hands in their attempt to pacify the world into slumber with all its sins and woes unhealed. An Unitarian from Boston delivered a farewell address to the Buddhists of Japan, in which he presented three great Unitarians of New England—Channing, Emerson, and Parker—in a sort of transfiguration of gentleness and charity. He maintained that the lives of these men had been an unconscious prophecy of that mild and gentle Buddhism which he had
found in Japan, but of which they had died without the sight. Thus the transcendentalism of New England joins hands with the Buddhism and the Shintoism of Japan, and the Brahmanism of Calcutta, and all are in accord with Mr. Chatterji and the Bhagavad-Gita. Even the Theosophists profess their sympathy with the Sermon on the Mount, and claim Christ as an earlier prophet. The one refrain of all is “Charity.” All great teachers are avatars of Vishnu. Religions are all ethnic and local, while the *ignis fatuus* of a mystic pantheism pervades the world. Mr. Chatterji’s preface closes with a prayer to the “merciful Father of humanity to remove from all races of men every unbrotherly feeling in the sacred name of religion, which is but one.” The prayers were touching and beautiful on the assumption that there were no differences between truth and error. In addition, there are thousands, even among us, who are asking, “Why may not Christians respond to this broad charity, and admit this Hindu eclectic poem to an equal place with the New Testament?” More or less indifferent to all religions, and failing to understand the real principles on which they severally rest. Moreover, one cannot deny that Eliot could understand it and unify the religions of the east and the west in his work whether it was *The Waste Land*, *The Family Reunion*, *The Cocktail Party*, *Four Quartets*, *Ash Wednesday* or his essays.

Emerson and others caught it from afar and discoursed to a generation now mostly gone of the gentle maxims of Confucius, Krishna, and Gautama. But now Krishna is among us in the person of his most devout apostle, and a strange hand of fellowship is stretched out toward us from the land of the Vedas. It behooves us to
question, first, into the pantheistic philosophy which underlies these sayings, and to ask for their meaning as applied in real life; and second, we shall need to know something of Krishna whether he speaks as one having authority. It should be borne in mind that pantheism sacrifices nothing whatever by embracing all religions, since even false religions are a worship of Vishnu in their way, while Christianity by its very nature would sacrifice everything. According to pantheism all things that exist, and all events that transpire, are expressions of the Divine will. The one only existent Being embraces all causes and all effects, all truth and all falsehood. He is no more the source of good than of evil. “I am immortality,” says Krishna. “I am also death.”

Man with all his thoughts and acts is but the shadow of God, and moves as he is moved upon. So is believed in Christianity that it is the will of God that takes place on the earth. In the daily liturgy, there is a prayer, which has the following verse:

“…..thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven”.

We can say that here the teachings of the Hindu and the Christianity are similar. Arjuna’s divine counselor says to him: “The soul, existing from eternity, devoid of qualities, imperishable, abiding in the body, yet supreme, acts not nor is by any act polluted. He, who perceives that actions are performed by Prakriti alone, and that the soul is not an actor, sees the truth aright”. Conditionally if this reasoning is correct, it is not we who sin; not we who worship; and in the last analysis all religions are alike; they are only the varied expressions of the thought of God. As He manifests his power in nature in a thousands of forms, producing some objects which are beautiful
to the eye and others which are repulsive, so in his spiritual manifestations. He displays variety. The ignorance and degradation of fetichism are His, as well as the highest revelations of spiritual truth. A certain class of evolutionists tells us that God contrived the serpent’s poison-fang and the mother’s tender instinct with “the same creative indifference.” And the broad pantheism which overrides the distinctions of eternal right and wrong, and divests God of all moral discriminations, puts Vedantism and Fetichism, Christianity and Witchcraft, upon the same basis. The Bhagavad-

Gita and the Gospel both command the brotherhood of men, the aim is to insist on the inflexible and intractable barriers of caste; the other commends a charge of love, which shall regard neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free. This was the view of Eliot too as we explore his works.

Judging from Mr. Chatterji’s own stand-point, his work has been well done. He has shown a careful study not only of his own literatures and philosophies, but also of the scriptures of the Old and New Testament—in this respect setting us an example worthy to be followed by Christian scholars. Such a man has in the outset an immense advantage over those who know nothing of the enemies’ positions, but regard them only with scorn. Before the high court of public opinion, as represented by our current literature, sheer assumption will go to the wall, even though it has the improved cause, while skillful error, intelligently put and courteously commended, will win the day. We now inquire about Krishna was he Arjuna’s friend? what was the origin of the “Lord’s Lay,” and what are its real merits as compared with the New Testament? Krishna and Arjuna—like Rama Chandra—were real human heroes who
distinguished themselves in the wars of the Indo-Aryans with rival tribes who contested the dominion of Northern India. They did not live three thousand years before Christ, for they belonged to the soldier caste, and according to the consensus of Oriental scholarship the system of caste did not exist till about the beginning of the Brahmanic period—say eight hundred years before Christ. Krishna was born in the Punjab, near Meerut, and it was near there that his chief exploits were performed. The legends represent him as a genial but a reckless forester, brave on the battlefield, but leading a life of low indulgence. The secret of his power lay in his sympathy. His worship, even as a heroic god, brought a new element into Hinduism as contrasted with the remorselessness of Siva or the cold indifference of Brahma. It was the dawn of a doctrine of faith, and in this character it was probably of later date than the rise of Buddhism. Indeed, the Brahmans learned this lesson of the value of Divine sympathy from the Buddha. The supernatural element ascribed to Krishna, as well as to Rama, was a growth, and had its origin in the jealousy of the Brahmans toward the warrior caste. His adoration as the Supreme was a reflection of the inventive Brahmans. These heroes had acquired great repute; and their exploits were the glory and delight of the dazzled common people. In raising them to the rank of deities, and as such appropriating them as kindred to the divine Brahmans, the shrewd priesthood saved the prestige of their caste and aggrandized their system by a fully developed doctrine of incarnations. Thus, by a growth of centuries, the Krishna cult finally crowned the Hindu system.
The Mahabharata, in which some author whose name is unknown incorporated the Bhagavad-Gita, is an immense literary mosaic of two hundred and twenty thousand lines. The Bhagavad-Gita was incorporated as a part of this great epic probably as late as the second or third century of our era, and by that time Krishna had come to be regarded as divine, though his full and extravagant deification as the “Adorable One” probably did not appear till the author of “Narada Pancharata” of the eighth century had added whatever he thought the original author should have said five centuries before. As it now stands the poem very cleverly, weaves into one fabric many lofty aphorisms borrowed from the Upanishads and the later philosophic schools, upon the groundwork of a popular story of which Arjuna is the hero. Arjuna and his four brothers are about to engage in a great battle with their cousins for the possession of a hereditary throne. The divine Krishna, once himself a hero, becomes Arjuna’s charioteer, that in that capacity he may act as his counselor. As the battle array is formed, Arjuna is detained with misgivings at the thought of slaughtering his kindred for the glory of a scepter. “I cannot, will not fight,” he says; “I seek no victory, I seek no kingdom; what shall we do with regal pomp and power? What with enjoyments or with life itself, when we have slaughtered all our kindred here?”

1. Krishna then enters upon a long discourse upon the duties of caste and the indwelling of the Infinite, showing that the soul, which is a part of deity, cannot be slain, though the body may become pieces. “The wise,” he says, “grieve not for the departed nor for those who yet survive. Never was the time when I was not, or thou, or yonder chiefs, and never shall be the time when none of us shall
be. As the embodied soul in this corporeal frame moves swiftly on through boyhood, youth, and age, so will it pass through other forms hereafter; be not grieved thereat.... As men abandon old and threadbare clothes to put on others new, so casts the embodied soul its worn-out frame to enter other forms. No dart can pierce it; flame cannot consume it, water wet it not, nor do scorching breezes dry it—indestructible, eternal, all-pervading, and deathless. It may seem strange to Western minds that a long discourse, which constitutes a volume of intricate pantheistic philosophy, should be given to a great commander just at the moment when he is planning his attack and is absorbed with the most momentous responsibilities; it seems to us strangely inconsistent also to expatiate elaborately upon the merits of the Yoga philosophy, with its asceticism and its holy inertia, when the real aim is to arouse the soul to ardor for the hour of battle. But these infelicities are no impediment to the Hindu mind, and the steadiness of the plot is entirely secondary to the doctrine of caste and of philosophy, which the author makes Krishna proclaim. Gentle as many of its precepts are, the Bhagavad-Gita, or the “Lord’s Lay,” is a battle-song uttered by the Supreme Being while the competing hosts anticipated the signal for fratricidal carnage.

The grotesqueness, which characterizes all Hindu literature, is not wanting in this story of Krishna and Arjuna, as given in the great poem of which the Bhagavad-Gita forms a part. The five sons of Pandu are representatives of the principle of righteousness, while the hundred brothers of the rival branch are embodiments of evil. Yet, when the victory had been gained and the scepter was given to the sons of
Pandu, they despised it and courted death, though the “Adorable One” had urged them on to strife. Bishma, the leader of the hostile force, in a personal encounter with Arjuna, had been filled so full of darts that he could neither stand nor lie down. Every part of his body was bristling with arrows, and for fifty-eight days, he lingered, leaning on their sharp points. Meanwhile the eldest of the victors, finding his throne only a “delusion and a snare,” and being filled with remorse, was urged by Krishna to visit his unfortunate adversary and receive instruction and comfort. Bishma, lying upon his bed of spikes, edified him with a series of long and tedious discourses on pantheistic philosophy, after which he asked the tender-hearted Krishna for permission to depart. He is no longer the embodiment of evil: the cruel arrows with which the ideal of goodness had pierced him fall away, the top of his head opens, and his spirit soars to heaven shining like a meteor. How strange a reversal is here! How strange that he who had been the representative of all evil should have been transformed by his suffering, and should have been made to instruct and comfort the man of success. The similar is the story of sin of men and suffering of Jesus. He was pierced too on the cross for being righteous.

Krishna was not known as a god even in the period of the Buddha. And the Epics, which are so largely drawn upon, are later still. And it is upon the basis of the Epics, and the still later Puranas, that the common people of India still worship him as the god of good-fellowship. The masses longed for a god of human sympathies. In the Bhagavad-Gita as we now have, with its many changes, Krishna has become the supreme God. However, according to Lassen, his actual worship as such was not
rendered earlier than the sixth century; and Professor Banergea claims that it “was not at its zenith till the eighth century, and that it then borrowed much from Christian, or at least Hebrew, sources.” Webber and Lorinser have maintained a similar view. Krishna as the Supreme and Adorable One has never found favor except with the pantheists, to this day the worship of the real Krishna is the most popular of all Hindu festivals.

We are now prepared to assume that the pantheistic groundwork of the poem on the one hand, and its borrowed Christian conceptions and Christian nomenclature on the other, will explain its principal alleged parallels with the New Testament. With his great familiarity with our Bible, and his rare ability in adjusting shades of thought and expression, Mr. Chatterji has presented no less than two hundred and fourteen passages which he matches with texts from the Bible. Many of these are so skillfully worded that one not familiar with the peculiarities of Hindu philosophy might be stumbled by the comparisons. Mr. R.C. Bose tells us that this poem has shaped much evil among the foreign population of India; and in this country, there are thousands of even civilized people with whom this comparison will have great sway. Men with unsettled minds who have turned away with contempt from the crudities of spiritualism, who are disgusted with the rough assailments of Ingersoll, and who find only homesickness and desolation on the bleak and wintry Moor of agnostic science, may yet be counseled through such works to realize their religion and which, like Christianity, has bridged the terrible gulf between unapproachable deity and our human conditions and wants by giving to the world a
God-man-Jesus. If the original author and the various expositors of the Bhagavad-Gita have not borrowed from the Christian revelation, they have rendered a tribute to the great Christian doctrine of a divine and human mediator: they have given striking evidence of a felt want in all humanity of a God with men. If it was a deeply conscious, want of the human heart that led the heathen of distant India to grope their way from the cheerless service of remorseless deities to one who could be touched with a feeling of their infirmities, and could walk these earthly paths as a counselor by their side. This is the theme and the message of Eliot’s every creation. He was erudite enough to mingle the Hinduism and the Christianity to make a global appeal to raise the spiritualism. Let us examine some of the alleged parallels, which are found in the Hinduism, Christianity and Eliot’s literature. They may be divided into three classes:

1. Those, which are merely fanciful. Nine-tenths of the whole number is of this class. They are such as would never occur to a Hindu on hearing the gospel truth. Only one who had examined the two records in the keen search for parallels, and whose wish had been the father of his thought, would have seen any resemblance. I shall not occupy much time with these.

2. Those resemblances that is only accidental. It may be an accident of similar circumstances or similar causes; it may be a chance resemblance in the words employed, while there is no resemblance in the thoughts expressed.

3. Those coincidences that spring from natural causes. For an example of these, the closing chapter of the Apocalypse speaks of Christ as “the Alpha and the Omega,
the Beginning and the End.” It is a natural expression to indicate his supreme power and glory as Creator and final Judge of all things. In a similar manner, Krishna is made to say, “I am Beginning, Middle, End, Eternal Time, the Birth and the Death of all. I am the symbol A among the characters. I have created all things out of one portion of myself.” There are two meanings in Krishna’s words. He is in all things pantheistically, and he is the first and best of all things. In the tenth chapter he names with great particularity sixty-six classes of things in which he is always the first: the first of elephants, horses, trees, kings, heroes, etc. “Among letters I am the vowel A.” “Among seasons I am spring.” “Of the deceitful I am the dice.”

The late Dr. Mullens calls attention to the fact that the Orphic Hymns declare “Zeus to be the first and Zeus the last. Zeus is the head and Zeus the centre.” In these three similar forms of description one common principle of supremacy rules. The difference is that in the Christian revelation and in the Orphic Hymns there is dignity, while in Krishna’s discourse there is frivolous and vulgar particularity. Let us notice a few examples of the alleged parallels more particularly. In Chapter IX. Krishna says: “Whatever thou doest, whatever thou eatest, whatever thou offerest in sacrifice, etc., commit that to me.” This is compared with 1 Corinthians x. 31: “Whether therefore ye eat or drink or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.” Also to Colossians x. 17: “Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.” Even if there were no pantheistic differential at the foundation of these utterances, it would not be at all strange if exhortations to an all-embracing devotion should thus in each
case be made to cover all the daily acts of life. However, aside from this there is a wide difference in the fundamental ideas, which these passages express. Paul’s thought is that of loving devotion to an infinite Friend and Saviour; it is such an offering of loyalty and love as one conscious being can make to another and a higher. But Krishna identifies the giver with the receiver, and Arjuna is taught to regard the gift itself as an act of God. The phrase “commit that to me” is equivalent to “ascribe that to me.” In the context we read: “Of those men, who thinking of me in identity with themselves, worship me, for them always resting in me, I bear the burden of acquisition and preservation of possessions. Even those devotees of other gods, who worship in faith, they worship me in ignorance.” In other words, the worshipper is to make no difference between himself and the Infinite. He is to refer all his daily acts to the Infinite as the real actor, his own personal ego being ignored. This is not Paul’s idea; it is the very reverse of it. It could give comfort only to the evildoer who desired to shift his personal responsibility.

Let us consider another alleged resemblance. In the fifth chapter, Krishna declares that whoever knows him “attains rest.” This is presented as a parallel to the words in Christ’s prayer: “This is life eternal that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.” In both passages the knowledge of God is made the chief blessing to be sought, but in the one case knowledge means only a recognition of the Infinite Ego as existing in one’s personal ego: it is a mere acceptance of that philosophic theory of life. Thus, one of the Upanishads declares that “whoever sees all things in God, and God in all things, sees the truth aright;” his
philosophy is correct. On the other hand, what Christ meant was not the recognition of a pantheistic theory, but a real heart-knowledge of the Father’s character, a loving experience of his divine mercy, his fatherly love, his ineffable glory. The one was cold philosophy; the other was experience, fellowship, gratitude, filial love. Pantheism thought was that God cannot be known practically—that He is without limitations or conditions that we can distinguish Him from our finiteness only by divesting our conception of Him of all that we are wont to predicate of ourselves. He is subject to no such limitations as good or evil. In Chapter IX., Krishna says: “As air existing in space goes everywhere and is unlimited, so are all things in me.... I am the Vedic rite, I am the sacrifice, I am food, I am sacred formula, I am immortality, and I am also death; also the latent cause and the manifest effect.” To know the God of the Bhagavad-Gita is to know that he cannot be known.

By a similar contradiction the more the devout worshipper knows of God the less he knows, because the process of knowledge is a process of “effacement;” the closer the gradual union becomes the fainter is the self-personality, till at length it fades away entirely, and is merged and lost as a drop in the unlimited sea. This is the so-called “rest” which Krishna promises as the reward of knowing him. It is rest in the sense of extinction; it is death; while that which Christ promises is eternal Life with unending and rapturous activity, with ever-growing powers of fellowship and of love. Take another alleged parallel. Chapter VI. commends the man who has reached such a measure of indifference that “his heart is even in regard to friends and to foes, to the righteous and to evil-doers;” and this is held up as a parallel to the Sermon on the
Mount, which commends love to enemies that we may be children of the heavenly Father who sendeth rain upon the just and upon the unjust. In the one case the apathy of the ascetic, the extinction of susceptibility, the ignoring of moral distinctions, the crippling and deadening of our noblest powers; in the other the use of these powers in all ways of beneficence toward those who injure us, even as God, though his heart is by no means “even” as between the righteous and the wicked, stills shows kindness to both. Now, in view of the great plausibility of the parallels which are thus presented to the public—parallels whose subtle fallacy the mass of readers are almost sure to overlook—one can hardly exaggerate the importance of thoroughly sifting the philosophy that underlies them, and especially on the part of those who are, or are to become, the defenders of the truth. [LEWIS] But turning from particular parallels to a broader comparison, there is a general use of expressions in the New Testament in regard to which every Christian teacher should aim at clear views and careful discriminations; for example, when we are said to be “temples of the Holy Ghost,” or when Christ is said to be “formed in us the hope of glory,” or it is “no longer we that live, but Christ that liveth in us.” It cannot be denied that defenders of the Bhagavad-Gita, and of the whole Indo-pantheistic philosophy, might make out a somewhat plausible case along these lines.

I recall an instance in which an honored pastor had made such extravagant use of these New Testament expressions that some of his co-presbyters raised the question of a trial for pantheism. But it is one thing to employ strong terms of devotional feeling, as is often done, especially in prayer, and quite another to frame theories and
philosophies, and present them as accurate statements of truth. The New Testament nowhere speaks of the indwelling Spirit in such a sense as implies an obliteration or absorption of the conscious individual ego, while “effacement” instead of fellowship is a favorite expression in the Bhagavad-Gita. Paul in his most ecstatic language never gives any hint of extinction, but, on the contrary, he magnifies the conception of a separate, conscious, ever-growing personality, living and rejoicing in Divine fellowship for evermore.

In the New Testament, the expressions of our union with Christ are often reversed: instead of speaking of Christ as abiding in the hearts and lives of his people, they are sometimes said to abide in Him and that not in the sense of absorption. Paul speaks of the “saints in Christ,” of his own “bonds in Christ,” of being “baptized in Christ,” of becoming “a new creature in Christ,” of true Christians as being one body in Christ, of their lives being “hid with Christ in God.” Believers are spoken of as being “buried with Christ,” “dead with Christ.” Every form of expression is used to represent fellowship, intimacy, spiritual union with Him, but always in a rational and practical sense, and with full implication of our distinct and separate personality. The essential hope of the Gospel is that those who believe in Christ shall never die, that even their mortal bodies shall be raised in his image, and that they shall be like Him and shall abide in his presence.

It only remains to be said that, whatever may be the similarities of expression between this Bible of pantheism and that of Christianity, however they may agree in
the utterance of worthy ethical maxims, that which most broadly differentiates the Christian faith from Hindu philosophy is the salient presentation of great fundamental truths which are found in the Word of God alone.

1. The doctrine that God in Christ is “made sin” for the redemption of sinful man—that He is “the end of the law for righteousness” for them that believe; this is indeed Divine help: this is salvation. Divinity does not here become the mere charioteer of human effort, for the purpose of coaching it in the duties of caste and prompting it to fight out its destiny by its own valor. Christ is our expiation, takes our place, for our sakes becomes poor that we through his poverty may become rich. What a boon to all fakirs and merit-makers of the world if they could feel that that law of righteousness which they are striving to work out by mortifications and self-tortures had been achieved for them by the Son of God, and that salvation is a free gift! This is something that can be apprehended alike by the philosopher and by the unlettered masses of men.

2. Another great truth found in our Scriptures is that the pathway by which the human soul returns to God is not the way of knowledge in the sense of philosophy, but the way of intelligent confidence and loving trust. “With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made.” Man by wisdom has never known God.

This has been the vain effort of Hindu speculation for ages. The author of the Nyaya philosophy assumed that all evil springs from misapprehension, and that the
remedy is to be found in correct methods of investigation, guided by skillfully arranged syllogisms. This has been in all ages the chief characteristic of speculative Hinduism. Moreover, the Bhagavad-Gita furnishes one of its very best illustrations. Of its eighteen chapters, fifteen are devoted to “Eight Knowledge.” In addition, by knowledge is meant abstract speculation. It is a reaching after oneness with the deity by introspection and metaphysical analysis. “Even if thou wert the greatest evil-doer among all the unrighteous,” says Krishna, “thou shalt cross over all sins even by the ark of knowledge.” “Oh, Arjuna, as blazing fire reduces fuel to ashes, so the fire of knowledge turns all action into ashes.” In the first place a knowledge of the infinite within us is unattainable, and in the second place it could not avail us even if attainable. It is not practical knowledge; it is not a belief unto righteousness. Faith is not an act of the brain merely, but of the completely moral nature. The wisdom of self must be laid aside, self-righteousness cast into the dust, the pride and rebellion of the will surrendered, and the whole man become as a little child. This is the way of knowledge that can be made experimental; this is the knowledge that is unto eternal life.

3. Another great differential of the New Testament is found in its true doctrine of divine co-operation with the human will. Our personality is not destroyed that the absolute may take its place, but the two act together. “For men of renunciation,” says the Bhagavad-Gita, “whose hearts are at rest from desire and anger, and knowing the only self, there is on both sides of death effacement of the individual in the supreme spirit.” In such a person, therefore, even on this side of death, there is a termination of
the individual in the supreme. Over against this the Gospel presents the doctrine of co-operative grace, which instead of crippling our human energies arouses them to their highest and best exertion. “Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.” The divine acts with and through the human, but does not destroy it. It imparts the greatest encouragement, the truest inspiration. This is what taught by Eliot in Ash Wednesday—-to work out your own salvation.

4. We notice but one more out of many points of between the doctrines of the Hindu and the Christian Bibles, viz., the difference between ascetic inaction and the life of Christian activity as means of religious growth. I am aware that in the earlier chapters of the Bhagavad-Gita, Krishna urges Arjuna to gallant activity on the battleground. It is wholly foreign to Hindu philosophy; it is even contradictory. The author of the poem, who seems to be aware of the inconsistency of arousing Arjuna to the mighty activities of the battle-field, and at the same time indoctrinating him in the spirit of a dead and nerveless harshness, Arjuna struggles hard with the awkward task of bridging the illogical gulf with bewilderment. But we take the different chapters as they stand, and in their obvious meaning. “The man of meditation is superior to the man of action,” says Chapter I., 46, “therefore, Arjuna, become a man of meditation.” How the man of meditation is to proceed is told in Chapter VI., 10-14. “Let him who has attained to meditation always strive to reduce his heart to rest in the Supreme, dwelling in a secret place alone, with body and mind under control, devoid of expectation as well as of acceptance. Having placed in a clean spot one’s seat, firm,
not very high nor very low, formed of the skins of animals, placed upon cloth and grass upon that, sitting on that seat, strive for meditation, for the purification of the heart, making the mind one-pointed, and reducing to rest the action of the thinking principle as well as that of the senses and organs. Holding the body, neck, and head straight and unmoved, perfectly determined, and not working in any direction, but as if beholding the end of his nose, with his heart in supreme peace, devoid of fear, with thought controlled and heart in me as the supreme goal, he remains. How different from all this is that prayer of Christ, “I pray not that Thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldst keep them from the evil.” Or those various words spoken to his disciples:

“Let your light so shine before men that others seeing your good works shall glorify your Father which is in heaven.” “Work while the day lasts, for the night cometh in which no man can work.” Who can imagine Paul spending all those years of opportunity in sitting on a leopard skin, watching the end of his nose instead of turning the world upside down! In that true sense in which Christ lived within him, He filled every avenue of his being with the aggressive spirit of God’s own love for dying men. The same spirit, which brought Christ from heaven to earth, sent Paul out over the earth. He was not even content to work on old foundations, but regarding himself as under sentence of death, he longed to make the most of his votive life, to bear the torch of the truth into all realms of darkness. He was none the less a philosopher because he preferred the simple logic of God’s love, nor did he hesitate to confront the philosophy of Athens or the threatening of Roman tyrants. He was
ready for chains and imprisonment, for perils of tempests or shipwreck, or robbers, or infuriates mobs, or death itself.

No Hindu fakir was ever more conscious of the struggle with inward corruption than he, and at times he could cry out, “Oh, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” but he did not seek relief in idleness and inanity, but in what Dr. Chalmers called “the expulsive power of new affections,” in new measures of Christ like devotion to the cause of truth and humanity. In a word, Christ and his kingdom displaced the power of evil. He could do all things through Christ who strengthened him. Nor was the peace which he felt and which he commended to others the peace of mere negative placidity and indifference. It loved confidence and trust. “Be careful for nothing”—we hear him saying to his friends at Philippi—“be careful for nothing; but in all things by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, make known your requests unto God: and the peace of God, which passeth understanding, shall keep your minds and hearts through Christ Jesus.” And yet to show how this consists with devout activity, he commends, in immediate connection with it, the cultivation of every active virtue known to men. Thus, “Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things.” Themes in Eliot’s Poetry:—

Eliot’s poetry revolves round two main themes—(a) The Theme of Redemption and possibility of Spiritual Rebirth and (b) His notion on Time. Eliot believed “Nothing material is subject to utter destruction. Everything undergoes a transformation under
the influence of Time’. So, in Ash Wednesday, he wrote—”Redeem the Time, Redeem The unread vision in the higher dream”. In ‘Elder Statesman’, he wrote— “It is worthwhile dying, to find out what life is”. In ‘Brunt Norton’, he echoed Patanjali and wrote—”Time present and time past Are both perhaps present in time future? And time future contained in time past If all time is eternally present All time is unredeemable. In ‘East Cooker’, he wrote ‘The only wisdom we can hope to acquire Is the wisdom of humility, humility is endless. This may be called an echo of the Bhakti Philosophy in the Sam Veda— “O Learned persons, worship God with humble homage, strengthen Him internally with contemplation and concentration (Devi Chanting). ‘And what you do not know is the only thing you know And what you own is what you do not own And where you are is where you are not. ‘This is the humility of knowledgelessness and extreme self sacrifice which lead us to mix with the Almighty’ said J.J.Synee. Yassyamatam tashya matam, matam yassya na Veda sw Abidyatam bijanatam bigyat mabijanatam To whomsoever it is not known, to him it is known: to whomsoever it is known, he does not know. It is not understood by those who understand it: it is understood by those who do not understand it”.

**Let us now examine Eliot’s works in this regard briefly.** In ‘Little Giddings’, he wrote— “What we call the beginning is often the end, and to make an end, it is to make a beginning the end is where we start from.” Similarly, in ‘East Cooker’ he wrote—”**For us there is only the trying the rest is not our business**”. “**Yatassya hi Dhrubo Mritue Dhruva Janma mritashya cha**”. In ‘East Coker’ he wrote again— “In my end is my beginning”. And in “The Dry Salvages’, he continued—
'You shall not think ‘the past is finished’ or ‘the future is before us;’ And do not think of the fruit of action Fare forward. The only hope, or else despair Lies in the choice of pyre or pyre to be redeemed from fire to fire. Direct influence of Patanjali is revealed here. Prof. J. J. Sweenly says that these unified sensibility of thought and feelings are directly associated with The Gita and Isha Upanishad. Again, in The Cocktail Party, we notice the echo of Patanjali in the following lines: ‘I see that my life was determined long ago; And that the struggle to escape from it Is only make-believe, a pretence That what is, is not, or could be changed.’ But ‘The Waste Land’ is a criticism of life from the Christian, Hindu and Buddhist point of view’ says F.L. Mayo. In Buddhist Philosophy, we are told three stages to achieve: Nirvana—Attachment—Detachment—Indifference. and these are told in the lines— “In my beginning is my end”. In Gerontion, he wrote—‘I have lost my passion, why should I need to keep it. Since what is kept must be adulterated, I have lost my sight, smile, hearing, taste and touch: How should I use them for your closer contact? In Hollow man—‘this is the dead land this is Cactus land Here the stone images Are raised, here they receive the supplication of a dead man’s head under the twinkle of a fading star’. and in ‘A song for Simons’—I am tired with my own life and the lives of those after me, I am dying in my own death and the death of those after me Let the servant depart Having seen thy salvation. The lines are direct echo of Brihadaranyaka Upanishada—where we find the Sloka: Datta, Dayadhvam, Damyata Shantih, Shantih Shantih. Devaguru Prajapati invited God, Man and Demon using the word DA three times. The First DA-Dayamat) meaning ‘Steady’, the second DA-DATTYA
meaning giver and third \textit{DA-Dayadhayam} meaning kind in his Home Jagya and then uttered the term \textit{Shantih} for three times to pacify them at the completion of the JAGYA. These \textit{Shantih, Shantih, Shantih} are the ending words of all the \textit{Upanishadas}. The very term is rooted in the Vedas and it is the summary of all the Upanishadas. Though Elizabeth Brue holds that these three \textit{Shantih} are just formal ending words having no sense of peace, Swami Dayananda in the Shanti Prakashan part of his famous book \textit{Sanskar Vidhi} expresses the opposite view.

According to him the uttering of this, word \textit{Shanti} three times after any work gives a peaceful calmness to our mind. It pacifies all sorts of anguish, anxiety, hesitation, doubt of our mind and makes us calm and quiet.” Calm of mind, all passions spent”. The correct utterances of these terms gives calmness of mind filled with enormous strength. And this calmness mixed with strength gives a serene pleasure. Shanti Shanti Shanti from one’s own Mystical Divine Supernatural self Spiritual. In 1921, Ezra pound wrote to Eliot, “One test is whether anything would be lacking if the last three words are omitted”. “I don’t think it would”. In reply, Eliot wrote in January 1922, “Criticism accepted, so far as understood, with thanks.” The term is misinterpreted by most of the European critics because of their lack of knowledge of the \textit{Upanishads}. The term \textit{Shantih} is the European equivalent of the word \textit{Amen}. In European concept, Time is Linear and as such, it has a beginning and an end. Therefore, Time is not infinite. But in Indian concept, Time is Circular or Cyclical. It is contemplated as temporary Time Symbol of Death and Decay and Eternal Time \textit{Mahakaal} symbol of Salvation of the Soul. Burnt Norton, East Cooker,
Dry Salvage and Little Giddings—in all poems we find a relation between Temporary Time with that of Eternal Time.

Following Indian Concept Eliot mentioned ‘The Still Point’ in Brunt Norton, which is nothing but the Param Brahma in the Upanishads. In Veda, this still point is termed as Stambha or the Cosmic Pillar. In Atharva Veda, The Puran, and in the Mahabharata, it is called Fixed Point or the Dhruva or Param Brahama. ‘Time is no healer: the patient is no longer here’ or ‘the time of death is everywhere’. By sentences like these, Eliot meant the eternal march of Time and soul’s creation or death at every moment. Buddhist philosophy, too, does not admit any eternal soul. There is some resemblances between Greek Philosopher Heracletus’ and the Buddhist Monk’s sayings to this context: “You cannot step twice into the same river, for other and yet other waters are ever flowing on’, and “That which we regard as our own age is something which is constantly being formed a new in the succession of events which constitute our existence. So far as the concept of Time is concerned, it can be said unhesitatingly that Eliot was influenced by Patanjali. Eliot believed that Time is ever flowing. It cannot be divided. It has no parts. Our life flows through the continual march of time. Like Patanjali, Eliot also believed that the only way to free oneself from the clutches of Time i.e to attain Salvation, one should take recourse in meditation, penance and Yoga.
Chapter II

References


18. Pius XI, Miserentissimus Redemptor (08/05/1928) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atonement_in_Christianity


24. Wiki-075. Isherwood, Christopher (1964), "The Story Begins", Ramakrishna and his Disciples, p. 9 wiki-075b


