"It is necessary to state at this point that the principal quest of my life was towards finding a pure locus of love. I believe that it is best if such a locus be a woman and if that woman be the one to whom one is married. But all in vain! I considered it to be good if in absence of a woman one be bound by true love to some man. It is for this reason only that I arranged to have friends and to the extent possible, my endeavour was that for my friends I be the only one locus of love. For me the nature of love was joyous and non-dual where the self is forgotten and is one with the other. After I came to age of understanding I might have entered into relationship with some women, but that was for the purpose of this quest and not out of any lust or desire. But I did not find fruits of my liking from either men or women and my love resulted into longing."  

Philosopher, poet, social thinker Manibhai Nabhubhai (1858-1898) makes a plea to comprehend and interpret his life in terms of this quest for “pure locus of love.” This quest was a ‘principal quest’ of his life and he spoke of the self in terms of this quest and longing. Our attempt here would be to comprehend the nature of this quest and its implications. This is sought to be achieved by examining his relationship with four women which came to occupy his life and his autobiography.  

Here we are concerned not only with his quest in the private domain but also with his engagement with his social context. If his personal quest was to find a pure locus of love where he could achieve abheda (non-duality), his societal endeavour was to provide a cohering principle to his society. This
principle was *abheda*. We shall try and comprehend the intertwined nature of the two engagements — personal and societal — with their own notions of *abheda*.

At the age of 28 Manibhai Nabhubhai decided to write his autobiography and resolved to maintain a diary of important events till the end of his life.

Giving reasons for this decision he says, “at this time, if not enemies, I had many opponents among those who held different views and they subjected me to countless unfounded criticism and were spreading misinformation.” He felt that perhaps no other persons was subjected to so much falsehood. Therefore, at one level the autobiography emerges from a sense of victimhood and a desire to paint a true picture. He asks; “which just person would not like to disclose the truth?” But speaking to a few friends did not give him any solace; the sense of isolation and loneliness was intense. He felt that “writing on my paper” will be more satisfying as it would allow him to express complaints before “neutral friends.”

The idea of a future reader is central to his awareness and enterprise. He did express fleeting doubts about the fate of his papers but conviction grew upon him that his work and thought had already left an indelible mark on his times, which will rescue his papers from anonymity. He states his hope, “some seeker will make use of these papers.” The idea of a future reader guides him to represent facts, leaving judgement to a ‘thoughtful’ reader. But this simple desire to find a compassionate reader was not realised for almost eighty years after his death. Gujarat had to wait till 1979 for the full text of his autobiography to emerge. Before his death he had entrusted his papers to his friend Acharya Anadshankar Dhruv. The text of the autobiography so deeply perturbed Anadshankar the he supressed it. For almost thirty years he maintained silence on the existence of the autobiography. The literary word of Gujarat speculated both on the existence of these papers and their possible contents. In 1930 Adandshankar acknowledged the existence of the text, but was unwilling to publish it. He said, “Many of our fellowmen believe that late Manibhai’s autobiography might be similar to De Quincy’s ‘Confessions’ or
Mahatma Gandhi’s autobiography. But it is not so at all ....it’s publication will not benefit any one. Even from a literary perspective there is nothing to read there, except of course his unique style.”

He did concede the eagerness of the people of Gujarat to read Manibhai’s work. He also acknowledged that times had changed. It was no longer an age of Victorian morality. Gandhi’s autobiography and his quest for Truth had come to dominate the imagination. He said, “We have come to appreciate the openness of present times, whether it is justified or not, but in the age of Gandhi’s autobiography it should not surprise us that our youth has come to prefer truth – be that bitter and painful – over comforting falsehood.”

To satisfy the curiosity of the people of Gujarat he decided to publish selections from the autobiography but kept the right of determining the nature of selections solely to himself. He said, “it is necessary to expunge large parts of the autobiography.” He published in six parts the text which was the “common property of Gujarat” in his journal ‘Vasant’. This abridged text comprised eighty-one pages. During his lifetime Anandshankar neither published nor parted with the full text. After his death, his son Prof. Dhrubhai Dhruv guarded the text. Although he did allow one researcher to study the text. Prof. Dhirubhai Thaker copied the entire text. Long after the death of Prof. Dhrubhai Dhruv Dhirubhai Thaker published the complete text in 1979. What had perturbed Anandshankar so deeply about the text?

Manibhai was born in the Sathodara Nagar Brahman family of Vadodara. The family depended upon service and petty business for its livelihood. Manibhai’s father did not take up any job. Instead he expanded his father’s business of money-lending. Although never rich, the family had comfortable existence and were able to acquire some property.

His father had married twice. Manibhai’s mother was the second wife. Manibhai has no recollection of the first wife, except that she was “bad tempered.” He does not even remember whether she gave birth to any children.
Manibhai was born in his mother's maternal household and till the age of 13 - till the death of his maternal grand mother - spend most of his time with the maternal family. Being the only child he was showered much attention and affection. At the age of four he was admitted to a vernacular school. At the age of seven, after receiving the Yogapavit, he was admitted to a Government Gujarati school. Learning was not a primary concern for Manibhai. His father did not bother about what or how he learnt at the school. For Nabhubhai school was a place where his son would pick up some functional literary which would allow him to assist in the business.

For Manibhai the most powerful and clear memories of this period are not of school or learning but of awakening of desire and sexuality. Among his friends was the future poet Balashankar Kanthara. Like Manibhai none of his friends were keen on education, pranks, street fights and learning about sex and sexuality was more primary. These friends introduced Manibhai to the pleasures of homoerotic desires. "They use to find pleasure in sleeping naked with each other. Even to me they use to give pleasure in this manner but till today I have never enjoyed or liked such acts, instead I hated it."8 Not only peers but also the elders were keen to introduce Manibhai and other boys to the pleasures of the flesh. "There is a Bania in our town, he is our neighbor, his preoccupation is to teach young children habits of masturbation etc. All my friends were his students, he used to even pay money to them to encourage them in such acts."9 Manibhai says that family restrictions did not allow him to spend much time with his friends and therefore was "not addicted to such things." Despite his lack of addiction his early homosexuality had "one very sad consequence. My Adolescent desires become very heightened and due to knowledge of sexuality in childhood coupled with non availability of women, even I desired (but only sometimes) to indulge in various relationships with men."10

Apart from this early exposure to homosexuality, there are no other indications which suggest homoerotic or homosexual practice in the adult life. But this experience and its memories were never forgotten. They came to haunt his adult sexuality and his relationship with women.
Manibhai notes with certain relief and satisfaction that he was soon able to come out of this 'bad' company. With the efforts of his teachers he became engrossed in his studies. His commitment to his friends became less, they continued their efforts to entice him, he succumbed once in a while but he was free from the grip of 'bad habits'. He infers that in every school and in every village there are people who lead young people astray. They are responsible for the fallen state of our country and lack of education in it. He pleads with parents to take better care of their children.

Friend Balashankar gave Manibhai the taste for poetry. Along with a few other friends they established a 'Suasdhara Mandali' (self-reform society). They taught themselves the craft of writing poetry, they also discussed the comparative merit of poets like Dalpatiam and Narmad. At the age of 15 they established "Prarthana Samaj" in Manibhai's house. The samaj, he says was established to satisfy their fondness for songs and poetry, where in addition to the hymns of prarthana samaj they also sang, songs composed by Balashankar and Manibhai.

Manilal continued his education and with the encouragement of his teachers, in 1876 Manilal appeared for his matriculation examination, but failed to pass his Sanskrit test. During this period they were forced by parental pressure to abandon Prarthana Samaj. But parents could not contain their fondness for giving and listening to lectures and recitation of poetry. To satisfy these urges Manibhai and a few others established 'Natisubhechak Sabha' and started a small library.

During this period Manibhai's lust also resurfaced. His close friend Balashankar had introduced Manibhai to his wife Manilaxmi. This attractive young woman used to participate in the deliberations of the two friends. Manibhai also had the freedom to converse with his friend's wife even when Balashankar was not present. Manilal says that a Parsi friend encouraged him to have a relationship with her. Manilal gave her a letter. The existence of which was revealed to Balashankar. Their close friendship broke down and it was to take many years before Manibhai could regain the trust of his friend.
Manibhai sees in this episode a manipulate scheme of the Parsi friend. According to Manibhai, this friend could not tolerate the closeness of Balashankar and Manilal. He encouraged Manilal to 'posses' Balashankar's wife and also told Balashankar of Manilal's plans. This early tendency of attributing agency for undesirable acts to a force other than the self, was to become more pronounced in later life. Seventeen year old Manilal also tried to 'possess' a few other women but did not meet with much success. This was also the period where his faith in rituals was intense, thrice a day he used to perform puja and recite the Gajat Mantra. 

At the second attempt he passed his matriculation examination.

Since he was entitled to scholarship, Manilal's father relented and allowed him to join the Elphinstone College, Bombay. In 1877, eighteen year old Manilal left Nadiad for Bombay.

At the age of thirteen or fourteen Manilal was married off to Mahalaxmi or Puli who was four years old. This marriage took place under some what curious circumstances. Manilal's marriage was fixed - or so he thought - with some one else. But his friend and participant in homoerotic relationship Laxmilal wished to marry her. Laxmilal's aunt - a widow - had sexual relationship with this girl's father, who was persuaded to give his daughter in marriage to Laxmilal instead of Manilal. Manilal's marriage was fixed to Laxmilal's sister Fuli. Fuli's father was also indebted to Manilal's father. Because of this Manilal's family had to pay only Rs.5000/- as a bride price and not the expected 10,000 to 15,000 Rupees.

Manilal knew Fuli's brother as "an illiterate, a drunkard, addicted to opium and an expert in theft," her mother "was a cheat, a debauch and of very bad nature." Consumption of liquor was common among women and children of that family. A girl brought up in such an environment was married to Manilal.

Even before Fuli and Manibhai could cohabit the seeds of distrust and conflict were sown. At the time of the death of Fuli's grand-mother Manilal was called back from Bombay by his father-in-law. While he was returning his
father-in-law did not - as custom demanded - pay Manilal expenses for travel nor give him a suitable gift, instead he gave him a headcloth costing “merely three to three and a half rupees.” Manilal refused to accept such a lowly gift and “this sowed the seeds of conflict.”

On a *Dussera* day eleven to twelve years old Fuli was sent to twenty-one years old Manilal’s house to spend a night. A series of bad omens marred the festive occasion and left a permanent imprint on Manilal’s mind that some force was saying something to him in a code. As Manilal sat talking to his friends a snake came out and passed him from a very close distance, they failed to catch it. Just as they were about to start the feast the snake was spotted, this they managed to catch it.

The incident embittered his mind, and “truly speaking from that day itself my wife turned out to be so painful that it would have been so better if the god sent snake had bitten me and relived me from all future agony.”

One two successive *Dusseras* following this one Manilal encountered a snake and a caterpillar. The ‘bad omen’ became a superstition with him. On the night of *Dussera* Fuli went to sleep with him. “My wife came to sleep, she had come with a bottle of perfume. I asked her as to from where she had got it. She said that she had stolen it from her brother. I saw the seeds of thievery in her ladyship. This woman had no quality which could either satisfy me or give joy. At that point I thought that she is illiterate, but I will educate and cultivate her. But in my experience till today, I have found her to be a totally illiterate, cheat, manipulative, cunning, liar and a debauch woman who will not hesitate before cutting someone’s throat. The reader should try and imagine how I could have loved this woman.”

For the time being Manilal decided to concentrate upon his studies and forget the unhappy incident with his wife. But they had to face each other again when Manilal came back to Nadiad after the examinations. They spent
two three months together unhappily. But Manilal could not bring himself to love her. This inability to love her and search for a locus of love became constant themes in Manilal’s life. It was at this juncture that Manilal outlined his principal quest as a search for a true locus of love, wherein he could experience abheda.

A striking feature in this is the centrality that his own self assumes in the quest. His expectation is that he should be the only locus of love for the other person - be that a woman or a man. This ability of the other person becomes the only point of validation in the relationship. It is their failure to do so results into longing and continuation of quest for Manilal. He is silent about what he invests into such relationships. For him authenticity of his own self seems to a situated on the axes of quest and longing.

After acquiring a B. A. degree Manilal spent four years from 1881 to 1885 in Bombay, where he worked in the education department. During these four years Manilal took Fuli to Bombay about three to four times, with a hope that she would have improved her nature and predilection. All such visits ended in Fuli going back to her parents house for long durations. In this period Manilal appears to have given up even the thought of her education and cultivation. He even required the presence of Fuli to be mediated by his family. Therefore, everytime Fuli went to live with him, the entire Dwivedi family also traveled with her to Bombay.

Though she was not to be the locus of love, Manibhai did not give up efforts to reform her. Physical punishment took the form of education and cultivation. “Thinking that she might improve though beating, I gave her severe thrashing two-three times.” Since this method did not work he gave up hope of reforming her altogether. The autobiography does not record any memories of joy or details of domestic pleasure. Manilal records that Fuli became pregnant and gave birth to a son. Manilal seems to be completely detached and indifferent to this entire process. There is no record of his feelings while his wife was pregnant and gave birth to their first born son. He
does not even mention even the year in which the son was born or what he was named as. This episode is recorded in one sentence: “woman became pregnant; a son was born and is alive at the time of writing this.” Such a lack of detail is not a feature of his autobiography. Most transactions, relationships and his own feelings on them are recorded in great detail. It is only while dealing with Fuli that prose becomes economical, details get blurred. This indicates that this relationship though haunted Manilal, its details had ceased to have any significance for him. He appears unwilling to make any emotional involvement in it. He does not even feel the need to reiterate or record Fuli’s bad character in most cases.

In 1885 Manibhai joined Samaldas College, Bhavnagar as a Professor of Sanskrit. At this time his relationship with Fuli had touched a new low ebb. He had decided to never call her to stay with him. Some friends prevailed over him and she accompanied by Manilal’s family spent a month in Bhavnagar. “For one entire month she harassed us and if I had not been careful she would have washed our dirty linen in public and thrown our honour in the dust.” At some point, while they were in Nadiad she ran away to her parents house. Manilal believes that she ran away because she had illicit relationship with some actors of a travelling Bhavai company. Manilal resolved to never recall her to live with him. “But when she ran away that woman was pregnant and hence she gave birth to the second son. Therefore, my mother would often weep and plead before me to allow her to call that woman, but it was my firm resolve to be free from that sin.”

Fuli’s parents tried to send her back to Manilal’s house when the second son was around one year old. Manilal’s parents were also willing to accept her back, atleast for the sake of the grandchildren. But Manilal’s resolve was firm, he did not accept her. He had heard stories about her debauch life, “and did not see any improvement in her. Therefore, I became suspicious that after entering the house, she might take my life or bring some other calamity through treachery and cunning.”
When Manilal was critically ill in 1888 his father-in-law pleaded a great deal with him to accept Fuli. Manilal agreed “because that woman has two children.” For Manilal it was a convenient arrangement, affection had no place in it. “My wife and I have never got along and there is no possibility of it now, because she is inherently bad.”

By October 1889 Manilal’s health had improved considerably and he was considering “having a relationship with her.” He had also ordered some ornaments for her. The term ‘relationship’ here indicates that he was considering resuming sexual relationship with her. He had suffered from syphilis and had to abstain from the sexual act. Also, he had foreclosed the possibility of any emotional relationship a long time ago.

Even while he was considering the possibility of a ‘relationship’, their life together was fraught with conflict and abuse. Manilal accused her of black magic and as punishment marked her with hot iron. One day she escaped from Manilal’s house through the back door, leaving both her children behind. Characteristically, Manilal, heaved a sigh of relief. “Now I will not have to deal with that debauch woman. This woman was engaged in debauchery since childhood. Some day, I might have been forced to kill her, instead it is better that she is gone. I do not have to see her face. Now if she likes she can open a brothel.”

This episode is indicative of Manilal’s personality. He has no affection for his wife, at the same time is quite willing an eager to have a sexual relationship with her. To secure this he also gives her gifts of gold ornaments. She is also held under constant suspicion. And when she escapes, she is charged as a debauch woman, some one who is capable of running a brothel. Manilal does not ponder over his role in the episode at all.

But this not the last that we hear of Fuli. There was a theft in Manilal’s house. Some one had stolen gold ornaments. Upon investigation, he realised
that his brother had sold off - under influence of some of his friends - these ornaments to raise money to start a cricket club. He confessed to this. But by some strange logic Manilal accused his wife of master minding this theft. Initially the police was involved with investigation. When Manilal accused his wife, even after his brother's confession, the police withdrew. Manilal attributed this disinterest to an elaborate sexual network that Fuli was said to be operating and of which the police force was a part. Manilal toyed with the idea of filing a court case but refrained realising the impossibility of proving the charge against Fuli.

For two months Manilal tried to pressurise Fuli to give back the ornaments. Since his efforts failed, he tried another trick. He sent emissaries to her and her parents that he was ready to accept her. Fuli and her parents refused to have anything to do with him. So finally he sent them a legal notice, alleging that she had stolen ornaments worth Rs. 1,500. The notice also mentioned that despite having requested many times to come back to him she has refused and now she is planning to run away with some other man. He warned her parents that "you may or may not send that prostitute but the question of ornaments must be answered, or else legal action will be taken." Of course, Manilal did not take any legal action for want of proof. But he mentions "that prostitute is openly doing the business." He also gives a detailed account of her various sexual liaisons and reports rumours about Fuli having aborted a foetus. "That prostitute has become very debauch, that is known to all, but she must have been carrying seeds of sin in her and she got rid of it, she has committed even a greater sin. She has aborted a foetus... On enquiry this story seems highly probable."

One would have expected that Manilal will resolve not to have anything to do with this 'debauch' sinful, 'prostitute'. But our expectation turn out to be unfounded. One day he saw her in the market. She was forcefully taken to his house and kept under close observation. He did use force but did not beat her up. Giving reasons for his action, Manilal says that he needed some person to look after him and if the 'prostitute' stays, that problem can be solved. Secondly she and her acts will stop bringing disrepute to him and his family.
And lastly she might give back the stolen ornaments. To recover the stolen goods Manilal tried his utmost to please her. "To please that prostitute, I tried many different ways; I thought it proper to have that very distasteful act with her." But she proved hard to please. Her family tried to take her back. They lodged a complaint against Manilal for illegal detention. While these proceedings were going on Fuli broke open the lock of the house and ran away. This enraged Manilal. "From now on I will never touch that prostitute, I don't want even a shadow of that prostitute to be cast on me." He declared for the final time that from now on she is not his wife and cursed her for many births is to come. "Now no one, not even god, not the government, nor the people can give rights of my wife to that prostitute. Many curses on her, may they haunt her for many births; even those who support her shall never be happy."

This is the last recorded episode between Manila and Fuli.

Manilal's reflection on his conjugal life give us some clues to understanding his personality. It was a child marriage. When Manilal and Fuli started co-habiting Fuli was still an adolescent, but Manilal was mature young person. There is no sign of affection from the first encounter. She is judged harshly, the superstition of the snake provides strength to the judgement.

It is only in the initial few entries that Fuli is mentioned as 'my wife', he uses a distancing devices and she becomes 'that woman', and lastly she is referred by derogatory term 'prostitute'. Conflict, manipulation, violence and betrayals punctuate this journey from 'my wife' to 'prostitute.' There are no indications of affection. Two children are born during this process; their birth is recorded in the most cursory method. We do not even know the names of either from the autobiography.

It appears that Manibhai while writing this was pushing out any memories, which might have been a source of joy even for some time. When such events are recorded for example the birth of the first born son, it
happens in the most hazy manner. While incidents of conflict and pain are recorded in their minutest detail.

Instrumentality mediates this relationship. Two incidents bring this instrumentality sharply into focus. Having resolved to have nothing to do with her, Manilal wanted her to stay with him during his illness. He also wanted to resume sexual activity after suffering from syphilis. In order to do so he orders ornaments for Fuli. When she declines his overtures and runs away she is castigated as a prostitute.

The other incident is more illustrative. Through contrived logic Manilal is convinced that Fuli is involved in the theft of ornaments. He threatens to start legal proceedings but beyond issuing threats to that effect he does not act. He knew that there is no evidence to prove his change. He abducted her, kept her in the house forcefully and tried to please her in various ways. This he does after calling her a sinner. When this fails he gives her a curse.

Even from his own account Manilal emerges as someone who had an instrumental view of human relationship. There is no display of affection. Only anger, frustration and manipulation loom large. This is also a feature of his recollections of his parents.

Mambhai spent his early childhood at his maternal grandparents house. The parents are largely absent from his memories of the early period. They do not seem to have had any decisive influence on his education or the course of his life. The only mention about his father in the memories of childhood are with respect to his lack of interest and comprehension in Manilal’s education.

Parents do feature in the autobiography of the later period. The most striking feature about them is that all the memories and incidents which are recorded are of conflict and strife. There is not one pleasant memory of theirs that finds place in the autobiography.
Manilal describes his mother as an autocratic person. His father is described as a miser and extremely selfish individual. He mentions that both of them had more affection for his younger brother. Most of the conflicts were about money or their greater affection for his younger brother. Manilal notes that his mother often accused him of wanting his younger brother dead. The context of this repeated accusation is not entirely clear. But he does record in some detail his financial transactions with the parents.

Manibhai also felt that during his long and repeated illness, his parents did not really care for him. He notes, “I have no one ... my father never came to me, who knows where he roams around all day. He constantly asked me for money. What more can I say about that rascal? He loves only money!”

At some point in during the year 1888 their relationship soured. Manibhai considered setting up a separate house. Manibhai accused his mother of wishing him death. The problem he says, was resolved when he decided to give his parents monthly Rs. 15/- towards household expenditure. Manibhai makes careful note about money spent on household things.

In 1889 his father died. Manibhai says that the father died while he was away from Nadiad. After making this statement he moves on to discuss matters of financial transactions, the money that had to be spent on the death rituals and the amount of inheritance he was likely to receive. After the death of his father, there are no reference to his mother in the autobiography. As if the mother also passed away with the father. The relationship with parents, it appears was solely mediated by monetary transactions. It is the lack of generosity and selfishness of the parents that Manibhai remembers and records.

As noted earlier eighteen years old Manilal went to Bombay in 1877 and joined the Elphinstone College. He spent eight years in Bombay, a period “which I passed in happiness, in pleasure and in acquiring lot of knowledge.”
He joined the college as a resident student. Bombay with all its possibilities was a seductive place. There was no place for religious observances in the college, consumption of liquor, of non-vegetarian food and visiting prostitutes was common to all groups of students. The caste rules were not observed strictly. Manilal notes that he was harrassed by fellow students and hence had to give up his puja and strict food taboos.

His sexual desires found release in Bombay. They were awakened in Nadiad but were "suppressed because I did not get a chance nor did I have the company." In Bombay he found both chance and company. He became friends with two 'debauch' individuals - Chaganlal and Bhupatrai. With their help for the first time in his life Manibhai visited a prostitute. We do not know whether he visited her only once or for more times. But during the vacation, while at Nadiad he realised that he had developed ulcers on his penis. "I did not know that this disease it called syphilis or that its consequences will be bad." He did not treat it and the ulcers healed on their own. Back in Bombay, he suffered a sever attack of rheumatism. Friends studying medicine diagonised it as an after effect of syphilis, but did not prescribe any long term medication. Clearly Manibhat was not the only person in college who had acquired syphilis. He mentions the names of many of his co-students who suffered from syphilis.

After this attack, Manilal did not indulge for one whole year, "only because there was no one who could help me in this matter." But he found a friend who introduced him to a prostitute, Manilal visited her and after some visits his syphilis resurfaced.

In 1880 he acquired a new friend - or as he calls not really a friend but a devotee - Chotu, who was his caste fellow from Nadiad. This one relation was to last and play a major role in Manilal's life. Manilal's quest to find a pure locus of love continued. He had two very close friends - Mohanlal and Chaturbhai. But in a short whole Manulal felt that for them other matters took precedence over the unqualified attention to Manilal. He is sever in their condemnation,
"When I was very ill for a year and a half, they would just stare at me but did not even break a twig for me - even when I was wrenching with pain and fever, these two gentlemen would leave me alone to satisfy their petty self-interest (like going to give tuitions to some one). From such incidents I could judge their selfishness.""}

This pattern repeated itself. Manilal, demanding undivided attention to his needs and desires was scathing in criticism of his friends who could not fulfil this all the time.

It is also not true that the relationships he entered into were purely to find a locus of love, quite often they were objects of desire and lust. He while writing about transient friendships he speaks, how he tried to become acquainted with men whose wives were attractive and in his judgement available for 'taking'.

During his stay in Bombay Manilal came in touch with Tribhuvandas Kalyandas; who later became a well known Chemist. This relationship lasted many years, but was always discordant. Unlike many of Manilal's friends or devotees, Tribhuvandas was Manilal's equal in terms of the intellectual capabilities. He was also a fiercely moral person and tried to reform Manilal. Manilal could not tolerate some one who could event attempt to assert moral or intellectual superiority. Manilal felt that Tribhuvandas was attracted towards him not out of love or friendship but because of the superior qualities of his own intellect. The real issue of contention between them was Manilal's attitudes towards women and more specifically towards Fuli. Manilal accused Tribhuvandas of having 'British attitudes' towards women. "He could not tolerate my occasional debauched ways and therefore this respect for me fell." Despite this they continued their intellectual debates. Manibhai also had in Mansukhram Sufryaram an elder patron, who impressed with Manilal's intellect, took interest in Manilal's well-being,
The syphilis that he had acquired at a very early age and which was never fully treated came to haunt him again. In 1881 he had experienced chancers on the penis. For one year the syphilis lay a symptomatically latent in his body. By the beginning of 1882 he has a relapse. Secondary lesions erupted all over his body. Particularly painful were cysts on his feet and hands. In the days before penicillin doctors had no real cure for syphilis. Manibhai had to suffer the pain for almost one and a half year, after which he got some relief. But clearly the disease was there to stay in his body, which started to wither under its impact.

While describing his sexual life in Bombay, Manilal makes a strangely contradictory statement — “During my stay in Mumbai, I never had intercourse with a prostitute.” But we know from his earlier statements that he was a regular patron. Manilal had not given up his quest to find a pure locus of love. He was attracted towards a married woman. She was attractive, young and “most likely not able to have children.”

From her behaviour and mannerism he deduced that she was “debauched” and hence “available.” Manilal had a relationship with her for almost eighteen months. He wrote poems to her and spent long hours in her company. “I became so addicted to her that almost everyday from 11.A. M to 3.P.M. I used to stay at her house.” They only talked. Manilal thought that he had finally found in her “the locus of love, meaning someone who worships me unconditionally.” Here, for the first time Manibhai clarified his meaning of the term “true locus of love.” The entire obligation to merge the self who complete surrender rests with the other. This is Manibhai’s understanding of the non-dual nature of love. It is not the love between two human beings that provides the frame of comprehension. Love is cast in terms of a relationship between the creator and the human person. It is the vocation of the human person to acquire the resources where the self can merge with the One.

Manibhai through transposing the logic of advaita on man - woman relationship placed a tremendous burden on the woman.
Manibhai says that he did not care for sexual pleasure in this relationship. This was also the time when Manilal was considering a move to Bhavnagar from Bombay. As his departure became certain “she started giving her body to me, but even in that it was only the outer body contact.” This was not enough for Manilal, if she had to give her body why should there be restrictions on touch? He says “a very natural question came to my mind, in this unprecedented love what could be the reason for imposing limits?” Manibhai decided to break all limits and impose his will. He tried to force the “ultimate relationship” on her, but he did not yield. This denial, unwillingness to fully merge herself with him made Manilal suspicious. He felt that her love was a charade and that perhaps she had such relationship with many others. He made realised that some had “more rights” than he did. “From this, I started despising that woman, you have cheated me, you seem to have such relationships in every house.”

Manilal lost interest in her, though they continued to meet. Manilal sees himself as a looser in this episode. And the loss was not of honour, not even of failure of love, but more tangible. “If I was criticised so what, If I lost prestige so what; but since this was a primary relationship, I could not enter into similar or even sexual relationship elsewhere in a place full of such possibilities.”

At this point he speaks the absent reader, urging the reader to judge him and forgive him. He gives defence of his life and actions.

“Dear Reader! Doesn’t this prove that if one gets a woman one likes, one will never be a debauch, womaniser! Oh! There would be unprecedented joy in his life, what joy the knowledge and awareness that some one is giving up life for me and I for her gives! Supreme bliss, Supreme bliss, Supreme bliss! Not only I did not get a woman liked, but I got some one I disliked, therefore my love filled heart vacillates at a few places in this world, I do not see any wrong in it. But Reader! even if you can’t believe this and hold me wrong, you will certainly forgive me.”

With this hope Manilal continued his quest to find the locus of love.
Even while he is bemoaning the loss of opportunities in Bombay, he continued to have sexual encounters.

He mentions having 'used' a close friend's youngest daughter. During a brief visit to Nadiad a woman seeking job approached him; he found her debauched, therefore did not give her the job but did 'use' for. This was also the visit during which a curious incident took place, which indicates fears about impotency and loss of masculinity. Manibhai says that he was seduced by Puli's aunt. He says that he would have negated her advances but "thinking that since I do not keep my wife, this might be a scheme to examine me and test me out" and he relented. Moreover, since he was 'hungry and starved' he 'accepted' her. This indicates that Manibhai might have suffered from deep seated fears about loss of masculinity and consequent impotency. In order to prove his virility to himself and to others he engaged in multiple sexual acts.

But these two encounters in Nadiad gave him Gonorrhea and he suffered for three months. The last relationship in Bombay was with a Parsee woman, who approached him for a job, which he gave her. "Apart from these, during four years in Mumbai, I have not done anything else."

In January of 1885 he left Mumbai and joined Samaldas College at Bhavnagar. In Bhavnagar he found people distant and dry. He complaints that in the native states, there is no use for the word "love". He had decided that in Bhavnagar he will not look at even the face of any woman. But he could not forget his love in Bombay and wrote many poems to her. At the first available opportunity he rushed to Bombay. He found her still in love with him, but even now she did not yield and did not allowed him to have ultimate relationship with her. One day she told him; "From tomorrow it will be Purushotam was, then I will not allow you to even touch my body, so you can have whatever fun you want today." This set Manilal thinking. He did not like any limits in love. This woman on the other hand was binding his passions within limits. Manilal also reflected on his own behaviour; this 'debauched' woman had sense of limits and notions of her duties but he "a learned
Brahmin roamed around her like a dog through out the year. He decided to break this relationship. With a heavy heart he returned to Bhavnagar.

Soon after his arrival to Bhavnagar in January of 1885 a 'strange' thing happened. He started receiving letters from a woman called Diwalibai, some one whom he had appointed as a teacher of the primary school in Bombay. She composed poems. She and Manibhai corresponded with each other regularly. We have letters written by her but Manilal's responses are not available.

Her first letter is dated 28.1.1885 and is a response to Manilal's letter, which must have been written soon after he left Bombay on 20.1.1885. She mentions how much she and all her colleagues miss him and moves on to describe her intellectual activiters. She says that she had started composing Sitakhyan. The letters written in March are very short and express her desire to meet him as and when he happened to be in Bombay. These letters were 'practical and worldly' as Manilal called them in his autobiography. But the letters of July show a different emotion. She expresses a desire to be with him, and urges him to, keep her close to him. She also tells him that she is not "hankering for that and desire. My natural inclination for such desires is weak."

Manilal did not respond favourably to her propositions. Apparently he did not even met her when he spent almost a month in Bombay. She mentions this in a letter to him written of 6.7.1885. She accuses him of being stone hearted and not caring for the feelings of a devotee. She tells him that she will go Bhavnagar but not meet him. She confesses of her intense emotion for him, tells him how she kissed his letter in presence of her husband. She pledges her total devotion to him and promises to be so even if he did not care for her.

From the next letter we get some sense of what Manibhai's response might have been to Diwali's intense longing. It appears that Manibhai wrote to her that he does not understand her letters. She tells him that she knows what he has failed to comprehend. Manibhai might have proposed to her an
“intimate relationship.” She declines it, and says, “I do not want what you describe as intimate relationship, but I wish to feel your presence through the letters and have intellectually pleasing conversation when together.”

In the letter following this one Diwali is not so categorical about her intentions. She is torn between conflicting desires and emotions. She can no longer contain her self. She is ready to abandon her most precious jewel - her maryada and jaj for him. She is torn between her desire for Manibhai and her own niti. Niti teaches her duties and obligations. They impose limits on her desires. Her intellect tells her that what ever be the nature of her commitment to Manibhai, for him she is a passing fancy. This relationship cannot be invested with any sense of permanence. “You are like a wasp and will go to which ever lotus is attractive. What is it that I have that will hold his attention and desire for ever?” But despite the awareness that “I am going against morality and religion”, Diwali cannot decide between prem and niti. She urged Manilal to make the choice for her.

From the eighth letter we realise that Diwali's intensity has finally moved Manilal. As Diwali puts it 'Love has finally blossomed' in his heart. But Manilal is equally ambivalent. He tells Diwali “Your welfare lies in your niti and not in devotion to a lowly being like me.” At the same time he hopes that if he were not married their love would have lead them to freedom - moksha. He asks her to decide between prem and niti. Diwali decides in favour of prem. Manilal stops responding to her letters.

Diwali challenges him, questions his commitment to love. “You proclaim ‘love’ everywhere, in your lectures, in your books, in your journals - do you do this without understanding the true nature of love?” Manilal’s response is weak. He wrote; “I desire love, but fear sin.” He asks her to forget him.

Diwali's final letter brings news of her approaching death. She was suffering from tuberculosis. Shortly after this Manilal received the news of her
death. Manilal laments her loss. He laments also his failure to recognize true love and reciprocate it. "I despised my self and my intellect. Love - the quest for which gave me so much dishonour and pain came looking for me but could not enjoy it." Manilal resolved to never love any woman to mark the memory of Diwali.

What could be the reasons for Manilal's indifference and unwillingness to accept such intensely unconditional love? The answer perhaps partly lies in Manilal's notion of love, and perhaps partly in the personality of Diwali. For Manilal true object of love was a person who is devoted to him, loved and worshiped him unconditionally and was ready to merge with him, without reservations. He was free from any such obligation. Love for him is essential asymmetrical. He is invested with masculine power of seduction and is the victor, while the other person - be a man or a woman - unconditionally submits before his power.

Diwali's love is not such. Her attempt was to establish intellectual and emotional parity. She is the one to propose, to pursue and to court. And she does this with intensity which perhaps made Manilal unsure. She is authentic in her love. She, though torn between nish and prem, is willing to break limits and allow prem to emerge victorious. In face of such authentic intensity Manilal is unsure and ambiguous.

Diwali knew that he will be unfaithful, because his conception of love demands it. There is no scope for mutuality in that notion. Diwali challenged his notion of love and told him that he did not understand the true nature of love. The mirror that she was holding before him was honest, the visag that Manilal might have seen it - if he had the courage to do so - would have been authentic. Manilal proves incapable of gazing at his own visag. He can only lament the loss and make pledges of abandoning the quest for love. But he knows that even such pledges if at all authentic are momentary.

Syphilis which was latent so far resurfaced in 1886. The doctors diagnosed it as syphilis tertiary. This time it affected his mucous membranes,
especially the nasal sinuses. The lesions which appeared were deep and painful. The ulcers corroded the nostrils. This ulcers affected his respiratory tract. First the tonsils were affected. One tonsil got corroded so did the soft palate. He lost his ability to speak, could not swallow any food. His condition became critical. He was taken to Bombay and then to Nadiad for treatment. For almost one year he suffered. During this period his friends did not live up to his expectations. He is most critical of Tribhuvandas, in whose house in Bombay he spent many months for treatment. He accused Tribhuvandas of not showing enough respect or love for him and attributed this to Tribhuvandas’s lowly origins. He says one should not expect anything better from a carpenter. Tribhuvandas’s crime was that he warned his own family members of the infectious nature of Manilal’s disease and cautioned them to take precautions.

The only person who remained devoted to him was Chottalal. But his love was not yet tested.

On July 1, 1887 he completed his autobiography, which contained the story of first 28 years of his life, after which he maintained a diary.

While completing the first part of the autobiography he reiterates that the purpose of writing this was to reflect on his own self and is satisfied that he has made some progress in this self-enquiry. He says that he has yet not found a love object and is not likely to find one. The question of lust is more easily resolved. He lists women who were available. But he is still committed to the idea of love “the principle thing is love, lust is secondary.” And since he can not have love, he should try and curb his lust. At the same time he confesses that such thoughts have occurred to him many times but he has done little to implement them.

By 1888 his health had started improving, with the help of an artificial palate his speech had also improved; and he resumed his job at Bhavanagar in January of 1888. But by May that year his condition was again critical. The ulcers in his nose and throat became more painful and had to be taken to
Bombay for treatment. By January of 1889 he is hopeful that the treatment will cure him completely. By June that year his health improved considerably, so did his speech. We have already noted that he wanted to resume sexual activity soon after this and made efforts to please Fuli which failed. But he arranged to have other women.

In 1891, Manilal's old devotee proved his devotion. "Chotalal has reached the zenith of love. I do not know whether in accepting it I have done right or wrong but he has given his wife to me without hesitation, it is as if we three are one. For this I shall always be his servant, shall always be beholden to his love." Thinking that he has at last found a pure locus of love, he decided not to have sexual relationship with anyone except Chottu's wife Ramlaxmi.

We do not know whether Chottu of his own volition offered his wife or that this was done at the demand of Manilal. But in a short while Manilal became suspicious of Chottu's motives. "I still am suspicious that there must be some self-interest there." He had already met Ram for "that purpose" seven or eight times and had given her twenty five to thirty rupees. Chottu at this time was working at Nandod, near Bharuch at a salary of Rs. 15/- per month. Nandod is at some distance from Nadiad so Manibhai arranged a job for him at Vadodara. The salary there was only Rs. 10/- so he decides to give him the remaining Rs. 5 every month. Manilal though suspicious is inclined to believe that Chottu has done this out of true love. "There does not seem to be any self-interest in Chottu. The act seems to have been done out of unprecedented, unswerving love, and out of pity as I did not have a woman." But still decides to test him before reaching a conclusion, "time itself will be ultimate test, I need to watch it for some more time."

After one year of staring this relationship he notes with satisfaction that Chottu has, "increased the relationship very much. Even the woman is very loving. The union of three of us is progressing very well." He also notes that so far he has given them Rs. 175/- but he does not either want or expect them to return the amount.
In 1892 Manilal felt that he should abstain from all sexual relations for his spiritual development. But he argues that if he had a wife, he would have to continue sexual relations and since Ram behaves as if she is his wife, there should not be any harm in having sexual relationship with her.

He also notes with great satisfaction that Chottu and Ram have come out unblemished from all his tests. He also ties to absolve himself of sin of having slept with the wife of a student-devotee. "This is a gift of pure love. I do not believe that it is a sin to enjoy the gift of pure love. The meaning of love is non-dual." From the cosmic he moves to the economical, "I incur a loss of money in this relationship, I must have spent two hundred rupees. But they do not ask often."

Six months after this note he again complaints of not having made much spiritual progress and blames it on his lust. He also given his reason for accepting Ram. Chottu had a mistress in Nandod. The reason for accepting his wife is that I should make her happy in every way, make her mine and free Chottu of Ladi. After that I will stop the relationship with Ram - which is that of a husband and wife. He feels that he has made substantial progress in this noble cause. But at what cost? At the cost of his spiritual progress, at a pecuniary loss of at least three rupees. But finally he reasons that there should not be any calculation of cost in a "love relationship."

Ram and Chottu also show great courage, they went to Patan where Manibhai was completing the assignment of documenting Jain texts.

After about two and a half years of this relationship Manibhai started feeling that this relationship was a practical arrangement for Ram and Chottu and was not our of true love. "Ram loves me very much. But knowledge that I am the provider for their life motivates this love. It is not pure love. Even Chottu thinks in this way." This assessment is prompted by an incident, which for Manilal was indicative of their lack of pure love. Manibhai was
staying at their house. Chottu’s sister was to visit them. This made them anxious. Manilal to test their love offered to stay with someone else for a few days, which they readily accepted. Manibhai says, “what love! Is this love or selfishness! The sister was treated with my money, but I had to be driven of the house.”62 This fills him with anger. But he decides not to judge them too soon or too harshly. Soon he reached a conclusion that “this world is full of thieves, cunning, unjust and selfish people “63

This judgement was prompted by a conflict with Chottu, who accused Manibhai of creating a distance between Chottu and his mistress Ladi. Chottu apologised and they resumed their arrangement. A few months later Chottu complained that people were criticising him and Ram and therefore they will not come to stay with him. Manibhai felt deserted and lonely and wrote melancholic poems. He also took an account of his losses in this relationship. “I had to bear the expenses of his house... I had to clothe his wife and also pay her train fare.”64 He calculated that he had spent not less than Rs. 1000/- on them so far. Soon they resumed their relationship, but only after Manilal gave Chottu the permission to continue his relationship with Ladi. Manibhai says that he had to option but this, as Chottu was meeting her any way and by imposing restrictions Manibhai was teaching Chottu the path of untruth. Chottu was delighted at this and “started worshipping me like a god,”65 says Manibhai.

Chottu, Ram and Ladi went to Manilal’s house to spend a few weeks there. They stayed there for almost 20 days during which Manibhai had sexual relationship with Ram as well as Ladi. Manibhai says that he accepted Ladi “because I wanted to test his mind With what feelings he offers me a woman whom he loves more than his wife.”66 This arrangement continued for some time but one night all three of them left his house and did not return till next afternoon. Anxious Manibhai sent him a note, in reply Chottu wrote “Apart from you the entire world calls me a eunuch and accuses me of having given my wife to you for money; therefore the decision that I have taken is correct.”67 Manibhai was heart broken at this betrayal. He sent him a letter and
a **gazal** in response to his note. "When we got into this relationship through your wife, it was the divine form of love and such divine love is not sinful. To make you comprehend this I have written many letters to you... but you have not been able to comprehend this. I am taking a pledge that from today your wife is my sister... After this experience of love I will not be inclined for any other love and I will be able to concentrate on spiritual progress."  

After this betrayal Manibhai says that he lost all interest in worldly love. Ramlaxmi, with whom he had experienced a divine form of love became for Manilal a sinner. He says that he has no desire to see the face of such a sinner.

Although he had lost heart and did not desire any more experiences of love, Manibhai arranged to have a few women—languidly prostitutes, some times young girls from the neighbourhood— to satisfy his lust. This is the last recorded experiment in love.

In 1882 Manilal along with some graduates from Gujarat living in Bombay, organised a debate on the question of widow remarriage under the aegis of a debating society, ‘Gujarati Social Union’ of which Manilal was also a member. Manilal describes in the autobiography the form that the debate assumed. "I remember the incident when it was decided to take up the question of widow remarriage. The time given for it was one hour, because everyone had assumed that there will be uniformity in the views expressed. But I opposed it. And the debate assumed such proportion that instead of one hour, it continued for one month." The debate remained inconclusive even after a month. Manibhai published *Nari Pratishta* in 1885, which was based on the position he had taken during the debate. *Nari Pratishta* remains central to Manibhai’s ideas on social reform. All his other writings on the women’s question and the social reform movement use this text as a referent. In *Nari Pratishta* we get the first glimpse of a style of rhetoric, of argumentation, of polemics that was to give a unique place to his prose in the history of modern Gujarati writing.
The essay begins by an attempt to suggest that men and women are inherently different and therefore the quest for equality between the two is misplaced. Manibhai says that women represent the nurturant force (Pothak Shakti) and men, the productive force (Utpadak Shakti). Without their coming together the world cannot be. One is useless without the other, both are incomplete in themselves, and it is in the act of their coming together that unity is achieved. He also deals with the question of women being described as the left half (Varna) of a union. According to Manibhai the term Varna denotes delicacy, beauty, need for care and protection and is not suggestive of any inferiority.

The question of equality for him is a misplaced one. For him the relationship between men and women is of mutuality, not of equality, not even of superiority of men over women. To establish this Manibhai examines the duties of men and women. He begins by stating that the physical attributes of human male and female are determined by the roles that they have to perform; i.e. for women it is the nurturant and passive role, for men it is the productive and active role. “Breasts and uterus are the main organs for the nurturant force of women.”71 Those advocating women’s equality are, according to Manibhai, seeking to give to women the roles that men perform. “The votaries of equal rights of men and women are suggesting that if men work so should women. If men run a business women should also do the same and all the liberties that men take, women should take as well.”72 Manibhai argues that the creator has not intended that women should perform such tasks. He gives the biological argument. The cycle of menstruation does not allow women to perform to their full capacity, and pregnancy and childbirth introduce major disruptions in the life of women. These are also the functions which can not be performed by men. Therefore, “One cannot but see that the creator has not made women for any hard labour.”73

He further argues that if god had intended otherwise he would have given to women productive organs in addition to nurturant organs; and to men nurturing organs over and above the productive ones. But since He has not
done so, the intention was to have two separate spheres of activity. Manibhai concludes "that it can be seen very clearly that god has not created men and women with equal rights." 4

The question for Manibhai is that if women are neither equal nor inferior to men but are different, how should they relate with each other?

He argues that to understand this, one must ask the question about the final vocation of human beings. Human consciousness for Manibhai is engaged in a constant search of permanent bliss. This bliss is not to be found in the world of material objects. The pleasure that these objects provide can only be temporary and ultimately must result in a sense of loss and incompleteness.

For Manibhai the ultimate bliss resides in the inner world. This can be achieved only when the apparent distinctions between different souls is obliterated and each soul sees in the other the self, which he expressed through the vedantic idea of atmanat sarvabhuveshu. He says that “the duty of human beings is to achieve constant progress by making the feeling of love stronger day by day and attain moksah by subjugating the care for the self to the care for all, and thus being one with the unlimited and permanent supreme being.” 75

Idea of love assumes a central space in Manibhai’s thought. It is through love that one unites with all and the creator. The question before him is how is this love to be attained and made stronger. He suggests that we should examine the mental profile of men and women to answer this question. "Women have intense feelings" he says, “men are superior to women in physical force, women have feelings.” 76 Because of such different but complementary qualities the union of man and woman is superior and essential as compared to the union of man with man or woman with woman. This bond for Manibhai is more joyous because men and women, given their separate spheres of activities do not come into conflict or competition with each other. Thus this union is capable of giving a sense of permanent bliss.
The purpose of four fold *ashram dharma* for Mambhai is also to arouse and strengthen the feeling of oneness. *Grhaastha*, by living together with a woman learns to strengthen the feeling of love and once having acquired it proceeds to the *vanaprastha* and *sanyas* to activate the union with all and the creator. “Thus the woman is considered a fount of love. It is she who cultivates a man and teaches him to use his physical strength and mental capacities for the good of others.”

It is not only as a wife but equally important as a mother also women play a central role in arousing feelings of love and selflessness. For women to perform their duties effectively it is imperative that they remain away from the worldly affairs of men. Because, “worldly affairs blunt the minds and dry up the fount of love.” They also bring impurities. The participation of women in the affairs of men may also give rise to competition and jealousy thereby “pollute the spring of mutual love.”

Thus Mambhai argues that women who are fount of love and pure feelings must remain outside the affairs of men, so that they can perform their duty of helping men on their path of attaining oneness with all and unity with the creator.

Once having established that participation women in the worldly affairs of men would be an impediment in the fulfilment of duties, Mambhai goes on to state that men are duty bound to fulfill all material needs of women. Mambhai argues that since women help men on the path of progress and aid the process of fulfilling their ontological vocation women are superior to men. Therefore it becomes the duty of every men to provide for and to protect women.

Mambhai goes on to discuss the question women’s education. Women are natural founts of love and superior feelings, appropriate education enables them to discharge their duties better. He expresses dissatisfaction with the prevalent system of women’s education. The aim of education should be to
cultivate women in such a manner that they can perform their duties with greater awareness of the role. The principle function of women either as a wife or as a mother is to act as a fount of love. The first and central duty of women, says Manibhai, is to spread love through all her actions. Therefore, education must strengthen and enliven the natural qualities of women. Manilal divides such education in three broad categories: knowledge of karma (functional knowledge), of vyahar (practical, worldly knowledge) and of dharma (knowledge of duties).

He says that since women are not required to earn their maintenance do not require knowledge about how things function. This is the sphere of men's activity. And in case, under exceptional circumstances women are forced to earn for themselves, the knowledge of dharma would help them fulfil this need.

Manilal devotes more attention to the Vyahar. Women he says will not benefit by knowing the names of all the kings and monarchs who have ruled over India. They need to know as mothers and wives, how their own body functions and how to manage the house. Therefore, they should be given some education about physiology and knowledge of domestic economy and house management. But this knowledge would be without any meaning if it is not accompanied by an understanding of the morality (Niti). It is niti which must govern all decisions. The decision about niti has to be based on principles prevalent in India and not in the West. For Manibhai Western morality is anchored in the good of an individual; while Indian niti has the good of all as its central concern. It is Western morality, he argues, which teaches women notions of divorce and widow re-marriage. As long as 'T' is at the centre it is wrong morality. The Indian morality rests on the principle that as long as difference exists between 'T' and the world, that can not be moral. This principle, argues Manilal, is superior to any other notion of rectitude. On this idea of morality Manibhai articulates his notion of social reform.

He defines what reform is not. "To cover ones ears at the talk of religion, to disregard caste differentiation and be indiscriminate in ones
behaviour, to pratter in English and wear shoes and stockings is not reform, to answer back in smart repartee, to invite and entertain friends, sweet talk relatives and abuse them behind their backs, to wear glittering sarees and squeaky shoes, and insist on soft breeze of a fan is not women's education; true education lies in following one's own dharma to achieve the oneness with the supreme being; and if this education is not given thus it will never be fulfilling, this is my firm belief.'

He is aware that morality can not be taught by books and lectures. What is required is moral people, where life and deeds will provide examples for right conduct. For Manibhai the presence of the moral people will also resolve the dilemma of social reform. The reformers, believe that without reform in the domestic sphere, no reform at the level of society is possible. Manibhai argues that domestic reform will not take place on its own accord. To wait for that to happen is foolish. What is required is that elders and leaders conduct their life morally and set examples for others to follow. This will cause the domestic sphere to change.

But the decision about the nature of morality has to be determined by the principles of dharma. Dharma is an overarching system which is the cause of all action and which governs all modes of activity. Dharma governs notions of right and wrong, of moral and immoral. Therefore, even in imparting education the knowledge of dharma becomes central. The nature of all other forms on knowledge will ultimately depend upon the knowledge of dharma.

Dharma teaches the right path. The right path is to unite with all and the creator. This is the true vocation of human beings and this is what is taught by Dharma. Hence, in the final analysis the purpose of education is to give knowledge of dharma. The dharma for women is to be the fount of love and help other attain union through love. The education must help bring in focus what women are naturally inclined and endowed to do. Manilal was certain that education as he had conceived of would enable women—both as mothers and as wives—to be the pure fount of love.
For women to perform their duties the question of their marriage becomes central. While defining the purpose of marriage Manilal says, "the objective of marriage is to blur the distinction between the self and the other and thereby be one with the creator and all beings through the fulfillment of mutual love." 

For such a marriage three considerations are important: age, knowledge and desire. Considering the question of age Manilal states that according to the science of physiology men achieve maturity at the age of twenty-five and women at the age of sixteen. This is the ideal age for consummation of marriage and procreation. The act of procreation sucks away life giving energy, therefore he argues that marriage must not take place before man and woman achieve maturity. If this is not followed, he warns of dire consequences. "Withering away of the body, low life expectancy, weakening of mental capacities and barrenness by the third generation," will be the results of child marriage.

If marriage is to lead towards unity both husband and wife must have equal mental capabilities. Manibhai insists that though parents decide the matters of marriage they must take into account the wishes and desire of their children. He warns that, "To throw them in a marriage without their consent is to treat them like stones, like cattle and reduces them to machines for procreation." He also cautions parents against insistence on marriage of a daughter in kulin households. He believes that most such marriages bring pain and unhappiness to women.

Manibhai thus established the ground from which the question of widow-remarriage ought to be considered. He established that men and women are different. Men represent the active and productive element while women represent passive and nurturant element. The biological functions of women do not allow them to participate in the world of men. He adds psychological arguments to this as well. The function of women is to be the source of pure love. Love which will enable men to achieve unity with all beings and his creator. Lastly he considers the legitimacy of widow re-marriage...
in such a marriage. He formulates the question thus: “If for some reason a marriage does not give happiness or satisfaction, is it legitimate for man-women to marry again or seek satisfaction and happiness in some other ways; considering the reasons for marriage and mutuality of man-woman relationship? In other words is there a place for widow re-marriage or not?”

Once having posed the question he begins to look at its implications. He states that of all the things which differentiate human beings from animals, the element of love is central. It is this love which leads to moksha. “The institution of marriage must function under this love. To those united by fulfilling love, in event of separation - which may even be caused by death - the thought of re-marriage would naturally appear like sin.”

Having established the ‘sin-like’ nature of even the thought of re-marriage in a system governed by love Manibhai examines the arguments advanced by votaries of widow re-marriage. He states that the arguments in favour of widow re-marriage are three: 1) the question of livelihood for widows, b) in case the widow has children, the problem of providing for them and c) the unfulfilled sexual desire. He argues that these are animal instincts. It is the element of love which keeps these instincts under control and allows for the union with the divine. If marriages were to be governed by animal instincts widow re-marriage would be both natural and legitimate. But since the purpose of marriage is higher and larger than this, widow re-marriage has no scope.

He does not agree with the economic argument for widow re-marriage. The women who have been educated and married as he had outlined would be able to care and provide for themselves and their children and for some reason they cannot do so, then the responsibility of providing for them would rest upon the entire society. He sums up the argument by stating that; “It appears that men who advocate widow re-marriage on grounds of livelihood are trying to satisfy their own animal passions by arousing and encouraging animal instincts of women.. we do not even pause to think how sinful it is to preach such ideas to widows.”
Dealing with the question of woman's sexuality Manilal argues that women who have uncontrolled passions and are full of sexual desire are not fit to be wives. Thus he dismisses the argument of women's sexuality. Passion can be contained by love, he says. "The power and strength of love is so unfathomable that one can live by it." He accuses the advocates of widow re-marriage of polluting the river of love and describes their acts as 'adharma' and 'sinful'.

The path of rectitude for him is to create conditions where the question of widow re-marriage does not arise at all. Only this path will bring happiness and well-being. He also argues that even in societies where widow re-marriage is permissible, it is considered a dishonour, therefore we should not encourage women to re-marry.

Concluding his arguments he states that, one should marry only once and it ought to be governed by love. Such a marriage will lead to the path of moksha. Finally he states that it is desirable for men also to not re-marry.

After its publication in 1885, a critical review of Nari Pratishtha was published in Buddh Prakash of January-March, 1887. The anonymous reviewer criticised Manilal mainly on two grounds. One, it is not sinful to re-marry and second, the argument that love forecloses the possibility of remarriage is invalid.

Manilal responded to this change. He argued that he had never even suggested that widow re-marriage is sinful. He had, he claimed suggested that a woman who is bound by love could find the idea of re-marriage 'sin-like' and not 'sinful'. Explaining the difference between the two he argued that those who are not bound by love may not find the idea of re-marriage 'sin-like'. His tract was written for people who wished to understand the true meaning of marriage. Those who did not wish to do so, may well marry again, for which he has no objection.
His reviewer had raised objections on his notion of love. The reviewer claimed that love need not be indivisible, and a girl who is widowed at a young age may love and marry another man. The reviewer had said, "a poor, illiterate girl who does not understand ideas of sin and merit, may not, in the event of the death of her husband, find the idea of re-marriage sinful... love is not indivisible, it can be portioned like other things; and its locus can also shift from one center to another." 

Manilal dismissed this argument. He claimed that the critic had not understood the nature of love at all. If the nature of love was as it was claimed, the issue of desirability of widow re-marriage would not arise, as re-marriage would bring merit. But the nature of love is not such, if it were to be so the order of things would be shaken. "Learning the nature of love to be such Ram-Sita will tremble with fear in the heaven, the ghosts of Rajput woman who had consigned themselves to the pyre will reawaken, the divine ideas of Kalidas, Bhavbhuti, Jaydev, will be shaken and Shankar, Krishna and Vallabha will jump out of the heaven." Arguing that since his reviewer had not bothered to understand the true nature of love it was not possible to answer unfounded criticism, he closed the debate.

The ideas of NariPratishtha find an echo in his other writings on society and social reform movement. These essays were published in his journal Sudarshana. Essays like Ghar, Grashasthadharma, Streedharma reaffirm the views expressed in NariPratishtha. In two essays titled 'Stree ve chint' and 'svamantara' he takes up the issue of freedom of women. Beginning from his position that the sphere of activity for men and women are different, he argues that the advocates of women's freedom have posed the problem incorrectly. The question is not whether women should be free to participate in the affairs of men. Rather, the question is whether the freedom that is being denied to them is on account of their being women or on account of lack of capabilities. He states that women have all the freedom in their own domain of activity and the arguments for their participation in other affairs are misplaced. He argued that women have all the freedom in our country except that of divorce and
remarriage of widows. If any freedom is denied to them, it is on account of their capabilities. "Therefore what are the duties of the reformers? Are they to train woman and give them lessons of good conduct or to make laws which allow them to divorce their husbands?" Most of his shorter essays on social condition are written in the similar vain. Their emphasis is on Polemics. He wrote almost thirty such essays, but there is no effort to re-examine the views expressed in \textit{NariPratishtha}.

In most essays the reader is urged to refer to \textit{NariPratishtha} for a fuller understanding on issues of reform. He thus saw it as a definitive text on his ideas about the women's question in the reform movement.

The death of Narmad forced him to contend with the reform movement in its entirety and assess its impact.

He asks, why is Narmad important? Is it because his contribution to the reform movement? Is it because of his poetry? To answer these questions he deals with the reform movement. He says that Narmad represented the best that the reform movement had to offer. When the society was engulfed in darkness Narmad and his friends in Mumbai launched the reform movement. The agenda of reform consisted mainly of three areas.

1. Caste Reforms and the question of crossing the seas.
2. The women's question, which was largely focused on the question of widow remarriage;
3. And finally the religious reform; where the worship of multiple gods and of ritual practice were sought to be replaced by monothesism.

Manibhai says that this agenda was reinforced by the western ideas and the British rulers supported it. These, therefore became the principles around which the reform movement was organised. The reforms did achieve some breakthrough. Many people crossed the seas and fought the injunctions of caste, societies were formed to advocate non-idolatrous worship. Schools for women's education were opened, the questions of women's equality came to
the fore and some widows also re-married. Places like Mumbai, Surat, Ahmedabad, Nadiad came under the influence of reformist ideas. It gained in social prestige; “Every one knew that to get approval of learned men or to be counted as one of the learned one had to be called a reformer.” Such was the impact of Narmad’s work.

Manilal then tried to define the idea and the content of reform. “The meaning which we associate with the word reform was acquired in those days. Lack of belief in caste taboos, advocacy of widow re-marriage, the belief in equality between women and men, lack of belief in re-birth and resultant quest for this worldly happiness and disregard of religious practices as superstition, were then as also now considered to be the signs of reform.”

Because of such beliefs the “reformers became in the matter of religion atheists or what in English is called the sceptics. In matter of this world by happiness they were like Charvak or what is called utilitarian in English.” They taught lessons of unrestrained behaviour, which people learnt very fast. The reformers wanted to destroy, a much easier task. This agenda won support and acclaim from the British. The English education also supported the reform agenda. Hence people realised that to be educated also meant to be one of the reformers. “People realised that reform and English education goes hand in hand. Not only this, many felt that social acceptability and acclaim can not be had, unless one was branded as one of the reformer”.

Manibhai does not deny the great impact on Gujarati Society that Narmad and his reformer friends had. But the question for him is how to measure the impact of the reform agenda. He says that evaluation can be either in terms of quantity or in terms of quality.

Judging by quantity the reform movement was a success. “Many women joined the schools. Some even got rights equal to a man, widows re-married, there was an erosion of religious and ritual practices...”
In terms of the impact on quality of social life Manibhai had his doubts. He asks whether the women's education has made women more good and moral? Has not the weakening of caste taboos lead to immoral conduct? And women who do not understand the ideals of marriage speak of their rights and demand widow re-marriage. But it was the decay in religious and ritual practices which perturbed him the most “The erosion in matter of religion is limitless... The high priests of reform spoke about the nature of the divine, without understanding it. They could never grasp what is Sanatandhama or the will of the god. But claimed that their explication of the divine principles was valid... They banished ritual practices and idol worship and themselves became objects of worship. Therefore, Manibhai calls such reform “atheist reform”.

This reform has, for Manibhai its uses. People have understood the folly of reform, he felt. “People laugh with disdain at the talk of reform. Everyone has lost faith in the reformers... One cannot but state that the play of reform is almost over.”

This failure was largely because of the fact that “the teachers of reformers were the British. Their religious leaders were Christian missionaries... Our teachers and spiritual masters are- and have been since time immemorial - Manu., Vyasa, Parashar and Shankar.” By following them the true reform has been started. Even the old reformers if they were to be alive would embrace this. Manibhai says “I am absolutely certain that if Karsandas and Girdharlal were to be alive, they would go and pray at Bhuleshwar and keep a fast on Akeadasbi.”

By following the English teachings the reformers never understood the true nature of religion and lead people astray. The greatness of Narmad lies for Manilal in the fact that he had the courage and the conviction to give up the false path which he himself had established and embrace the new realisation with equal vigour. For Manilal, Narmad the poet is not important. He even wonders if Narmad can be called a poet. He grudgingly agrees to give him the status of a poet but calls him “inebriated or a poet without leashes and...
control." He concedes that Narmad, as a prose writer, is more important than the poet. But in the ultimate analysis, the greatness of Narmad for him lies in the fact that Narmad had a change of heart and he had the courage to give up his old convictions and embrace the new.

In an essay written almost ten years after Narmad's death, Manibhai expressed similar views. He described the earlier efforts at reform as this worldly reform. He also felt that these had failed. "I feel that the reason for their failure lies in the fact that they did not have enough literature, did not understand the condition of ancient times; while the advantages of new ideas were apparent to them which they embraced without understanding the true nature and historic feelings of the people of this community; of this land." 100

The "true nature and historic feelings of the people" for him are captured in the idea of abbeda. "The duties of man are to be one with the world with his heart and his mind. The soul is one, the differences are only of the body. This feeling of love and unity has been described as dharma by our sages." 101 But Manibhai argues that our reformers did not understand these original, glorious ideals and tried to introduce western ideals. In this folly lies their failure. The reform must be carried out, he emphasized, on lines out our dharma. "When the whole country realises this feeling of oneness and unity, the state, the worldly affairs, the society, literature, education, all actions will be organised around it and there will be no contradiction." 102 The only agenda for reform should be to achieve the feelings of oneness and unity and obliterate all contradictions.

Manibhai's views on the reform on native lines become clear if we examine his position on the question of the age of consent bill and the controversy surrounding the Rakmabai case. 103

Manibhai was extremely critical of the Bombay High court judgment which sustained Rakmabai's contention that she cannot be forced to cohabit with a man with whom she had been married to as a child, and for which she
had not given any consent. Mambhai criticised this judgment as being against the tenets of Hindu Dharma Shastra. Marriage, for Hindus is not a contract which can be terminated at will but is a sacred sacrament. This judgment in his view had reduced the sacrament to a contract and opened up ground for divorce and by implication for widow re-marriage. He was critical of the reformers who supported Rakmabai. "Many a reformers must be very happy because they feel that the judgment of the High court has opened the way for divorce and by implication for widow re-marriage... If the sacred relationship of marriage is only for pleasure and merrymaking, than what is the need of celebrating marriages in public?"

For Manilal there are lessons to be learnt from the episode. The problems, he argued, arise because of the evil practice of child marriage. "Because of child marriage among the Hindus, only two or three, out of hundred couples are happy." To avoid situation like that presented by Rakmabai case the society must act according to the prescriptions of the Shastras. The Shastras according to him prescribe the age of marriage as twenty for men and twelve for women.

In an essay written in 1890 he defended the provision for restitution of conjugal rights. Reformers argued that the provision has no basis in Hindu Shastras and was an innovation of English law which had entered our civil procedure code. They further claimed that the Dharma Shastras do not provide for imprisonment or other forms of punishment for women. Mambhai dismisses both the arguments without engaging in Shastric debates. He argued that if one were to make an attempt it would be easy to find Shastric proof for restitution of conjugal rights. But he does not do so. Instead he refers to a newspaper report from Surat which claimed that the Gaekwad state had a provision for restitution of conjugal rights. Mambhai argues that if the Gaekwad state had such a provision then it cannot be an innovation of English laws, it must necessarily have Shastric validity.

He challenged with the reformist argument that women are not properly and it is "barbaric" to take possession of them against their will. Such practice
they argued is not befitting a civilised people. Manibhai says that people who take such position must examine the nature of Hindu marriage. Hindu marriage is not a contract but a sacred sacrament in which there is no ground for divorce on 'flimsy' grounds. He says that our tradition forbids divorce even on 'grave' issues like adultery and desertion. He again advised the reformer to strive and spread education and good conduct. He claimed that law cannot be an agent of social change “To coerce people through law is detrimental, law cannot provide dynamism to a society, it can only govern… a few hundred people forcefully imposing a law on the world is tantamount to Islam spreading its religion with the power of the sword.”

As the division bench of the Bombay High Court revised the earlier judgment of the same court and instructed Rakmabai to live with Dadoji at least for a month, failing which she would face imprisonment for a period of six months, Manibhai felt that his position had been vindicated. “People all over India are satisfied with the judgment of the High Court, they feel that the order given to Rakmabai to co-habit with the husband is just… (Reformers) have praised Rakmabai to the skies and transformed her into an angel and turned Dadoji into a demon… but true Hindus understand where the truth lies and how hollow the charlatanery of the reformers is.”

His position on the Age of Consent Bill is ambiguous. In NariPratishtba he had said that proper age of marriage for women is sixteen and for men twenty five years. In his other writings he had consistently opposed the practice of child-marriage. For him it was one of the most important social evils which had to be fought. The age of consent bill sought to increase the minimum age of marriage from ten years to twelve years for girls. Manibhai attacked the proposed bill on the ground that it was going against the British policy of neutrality on matters of faith. However, his attack on the reformers was more sustained. He attacked the reformist reading of the Hindu shastras. Manibhai argued that the shastras prescribe that a girl must be with her husband at the time of her first menstruation. By prescribing the minimum age of marriage at twelve the reformers were forcing Hindu parents to go against the
prescriptions of the *shastras* and thus commit sin. He further argued that the age of menstruation varies from nine years to fifteen years. And hence the age of ten is the proper age for marriage. The law, he claimed, had to set a minimum age of marriage and not the maximum. Therefore, those who wished to marry their daughters at a later age were free to do so. Hence, there was no ground to raise the minimum age.

Manibhai attacked Behramji Malabari, as an outsider to Hindu community, who without understanding Hindu customs was trying to reform it. He advised him to look after his own community, “poor Hindus will take care of themselves.” According to Manibhai, Malabari and his friends were trying to introduce the western idea of love marriage among the Hindus. “The English custom of adult, unmarried men and women coming in contact with each other and marrying only if their hearts meet, appears to me totally useless and harmful.”

He called upon Hindus to be weary of outsiders like Malabari and their intentions. At the same time, Manibhai continued to attack the practice of child-marriage. He described it as the bane of Hindu society. At the same time, he opposed the idea of legislation regulating the minimum age of marriage. Legislation, he argued cannot provide change and dynamism to a society. “The issue of child marriage, is not as prevalent as it is made out to be. To legislate on a matter which is decided naturally by menstruation, is harmful.”

In an essay “Apana Kartavya” (our duty) Manibhai argued that the legislation was forcing the Hindus to make difficult choices: choice between following the prescriptions of the *shastras* on one hand and on the other following the dictates of the law. He called up the Hindus to oppose the bill at all costs. He asked them to carry out debates in the family, community, villages and send petitions opposing the bill to the government. “Those who value the peace of their children and have faith in the religion, and do not want the government to interfere in the matter of religion and family, must awaken and...
fight this with all their wealth, body and mind, we will not get another opportunity.”

Towards the end of his life, in 1897 Manibhai wrote two essays, *Navin and Prachin* and *Prachin and Navin*, in which he offered a perspective on the idea of reform.

He begins by examining the notions of *navin* (new) and *prachin* (old). He says that so far we have identified ‘reform’ by the name of *navin* and the old traditions by the name of *prachin*. The nature of societies is to change, all societies evolve and change, things assume different form. But in this transition some thing seeks to retain its form, and this becomes *prachin*. While some other things change with other changes and are called *navin*. By using the metaphor of the seed and the tree Manibhai sought to explain the idea. A tree grows from a seed. The form that it takes depends not only on the seed but also on the conditions of its growth. If we were to disregard the external conditions affecting the tree, the essence of the tree lies in the seed. The *prachin* is like the seed and the *navin* like the tree. He argues that the world cannot be without both *prachin* and *navin*. *Prachin* brings stability, but with it come stagnation, inertia and slavery. *Navin* is the path of activity, industry, enterprise and freedom. “*Navin* produces, activates cares. *Prachin* nurtures, gathers and cares. Realistically speaking there is no contradiction between *prachin* and *navin*: both are natural to all and are essential.”

Manibhai says that conflict between *navin* and *prachin* arises when they take extreme positions. As long as they are on the middle path there is no conflict. “When *prachin* becomes stubborn, refuses to move even an inch and wants to remain stagnant, it becomes destructive. When *navin* wants to run ahead blindly, disregarding the *prachin*, wants to destroy the *prachin* it also becomes destructive.”
If both are essential and symbiotic is it then beneficial to speak of them in terms of opposition and contradiction? Manibhai says that prachin is what is natural and navin is the form that it takes. Therefore it is not possible to conceive of navin without prachin. "Navin which emerges, takes form, from the prachin can be beneficial. A community’s capacity for truth emerges from prachin, the strength to further this capacity comes from navin. But without the prachin, navin cannot fulfill its goals."115

The conflict between the two arises from their interpretation of the truth. The truth for Manibhai lies in non-duality, abheda. Manibhai laments the fact that both the prachin and the navin have given up the quest for truth. "The true path lies in between the extremes of navin and prachin."116 The present can be converted in the future only by unlocking the mysteries of the prachin. "But if the key is brought from anywhere but from the wealth of the prachin, the lock cannot be opened."117

But, Manibhai says, we have lost our capacity to reflect on our condition. The reason for our present fallen condition lies in the fact that the feeling of abheda which moved our ancestors has been lost from our hearts. As a result we have forgotten our duty and fallen in a state of corruption. "House, society, morality, literature - all are ruled by corruption and pollution."118 At such a time the western world came to rule over us and they started "ruling our minds, our hearts, our homes and temples, our religion and duties, our past and our future. Fallen due to lack of faith in the past, having forgotten our duties, we enticed by the western notions adopted them in our thought and actions."119 In our eagerness to adopt the new, we forgot the past. The advocates of the prachin also became stubborn without understanding the truth of abheda. Manibhai says that infact the practice of the prachin has led, in our times to bléed, instead of abheda. He says that, being an advocate of the prachin, he has to confess that the practices of the advocates of the prachin has done a lot of harm, and "they are far far away from the truth."120 He admits that all his life he has fought against the navin but the path adopted by prachin is not his path and therefore "at this juncture I am more inclined towards the navin then the prachin of today."121
Having made his confession, Manibhai felt compelled to clarify his position further. He says that the truth as he understands it lies above the opposition of namn and prahin. He disowns the accusation leveled against him that he never had a consistent position. "Many accuse me that your principles are not firm. That you do not have a single yardstick. You write for popularity, you change your opinions and your words and deeds are not consistent." He says that people say such things as they do not understand what he stands for. He stands for abheda - the truth. He belongs to neither the namn nor the prachin. "Neither of these parties are "mine." I belong to truth. Abheda is my principle."

Manibhai wrote a long essay "Purva ane PaschimU with a subtitle, "Deshi upar Aurogya Kelavani m Asat" [The East and the West The impact of English Education on the Natives]. This essay was serialised in his journal for over six years, from November 1891 to January 1896. This essay provides the most comprehensive account of Manibhai's position on the impact of the West and the reform movement. It is in this essay that he fully developed the idea of abheda as dharma for his times and society.

Manibhai begins by stating that the coming together of the East and the West is the most unprecedented event. He says that his objectives while writing this essay is to provide a proper assessment and not take a partisan view. But what could provide the yardstick for such an assessment is the question before him. He says that such an assessment can be done only by asking question about the human condition and the vocation of human life. Such an assessment for him must begin by understanding, what he describes as Vishaya nityam (the rules of the macrocosom). The primary question before him is about the nature of the universe and its purpose. In reply he formulates a principle which will guide him; "The creation of this universe can be understood as an endeavour where human beings strive to achieve greater happiness, either by controlling the laws of nature or by submitting to them."
This formulation helps him to propose ideas about ‘good’ human conduct. For him conduct which is in accordance with the laws of the macrocosm, or conduct which brings one closer to such rules is good conduct. Any other conduct, no matter what pleasure it gives at a given moment is not desirable conduct. Therefore, assessment of any civilization and its institutions must be based on such norms. A civilization which is closer to the rules of nature, which does not lead its people on paths away from rules of the universe is a better and more desirable civilization.

Manibhai states that, “There is no hesitation in stating that the times of ancient India were such; because the higher civilization and its proximity to nature has been proved beyond doubt.” Having established the superiority of ancient Indian civilization Manibhai begins to examine the nature of the state, the family and religion. For Manibhai, the ancient society was characterised by correspondence between thoughts and action. The present times have witnessed a divorce between higher ideals and life as it is lived. The higher ideals of ancient India, for Manibhai are encapsulated in the notion of abheda. People lived their lives through abheda. The only difference that they recognised was the difference arising out of the Karma. Otherwise the entire human race, the country, the village, the community, the family and the household were all united through abheda. The unit was a household. They did not divide the household in its constituent elements, that is the individual members of the household. “Self. This word was rarely used. If the idea of I, mine were not totally absent, they were subordinate.” The family was the basis of society. The society and the state were also governed by the same ideals as the family. Manibhai says that the measure of the good in a society is the status of women. He claims that we cannot say that women were ill-treated in ancient India. The notions of women’s rights and freedom are unclear even in the present, so he says we have no means to know what meaning such ideas had. But “fortunately such illusory notions about women do not seem to have occurred either to women or men at that time.”
Women and men had distinct domains of duty and the notions of
“transgression of domains” had not occurred to them. They lived
complementary lives. Before examining the ideas about marriage, widow-
remarriage Manibhai finds it beneficial to speak about religious thoughts and
practice which governed life.

That which allows us to comprehend the purpose of human existence
and lead life so as to fulfill it, is *dharma* according to Manibhai. *Dharma* allows
as to understand human vocation, while *mita* allows us to choose a path to fulfill
such a desire. According to Manibhai the essence of *dharma* lies in *abheda*. “The
creation of the entire universe lies in the unity. A power which is *without a
beginning or an end*, which precedes even the creation of the universe, which
will be even after the universe has ceased to be, which is *ever present*, governs
the universe. A power for which all difference - of *varna; jati*, men-women are
non-existent.”

The vocation of human life is to strive to eradicate apparent
difference and be one with the ultimate power and all beings. “The principle
was not equality or freedom or all but the unity of all beings.”

This principle governed human life and institutions. Therefore, Manibhai
argues that our discussions and assessment of these institutions should be
anchored in this understanding.

The purpose of marriage in such a society is not primarily procreation
of progeny. It is to further the human vocation of being one with the creator
and all beings. It is for this reason that ancient India put a great emphasis on
*Virya Shuddha* and *Kshetra Shuddha*. Ancient society considered woman a locus
of love. Her function was to teach other to give up selfishness and learn to
unite with the creator. Her nurturant function was more important. Manibhai
clarified that though the husband was called her teacher or god, it did not place
the woman on an inferior position. This was done so as to teach women that
“they should not pollute their love by devotion to any other person.”

Given the nature of marriage, re-marriage had no scope. Manibhai says that there is
no clear prescription on the re-marriage of a man in our *sihstras*. Though, he
would like men also to refrain from re-marriage. But, the shastras clearly proscribe re-marriage for women.

Based on the arguments outlined above Manibhai states that “we can understand from the condition of women in ancient Indian society that such a society was the most superior society. We are yet to experience such a superior society in the present times.”

Having established the superiority of the social organisation of ancient India Manibhai proceeds to speak about the state. Since the state was also governed by ideals of ahimsa, despite not having modern institutions like parliament, rulers ruled for the welfare of all. The King acted as a father acts in a family. Manibhai does not consider it necessary to examine the state in detail, but mentions a general principle that it was the duty of the ruler to uphold dharma.

He concludes his description of the ancient Indian society by stating two principle which governed thought and Life in that society.

1) Ancient Indians considered dharma to be the principle aim and conducted all affairs in accordance with it.
2) Their action and dharma were governed by ahimsa, hence they accepted the superiority of unity with all over self.”

Having outlined the civilization and society in ancient India, Manibhai examines the West.

He answers the charge leveled against the Hindu belief system. For him monotheism is not necessarily a superior and more evolved faith as compared to the multiplicity of gods, sects and belief systems of the Hindus. “I can not accept the argument that monotheism is the ultimate point and hence the most superior form of religions thought and practice.” But he does not consider it necessary to assign reasons for his conviction.
In a very brief section he gives his analysis of the West. According to him before the “Lutherian revolution”, the West also had similar social organisation as ancient India. The family was the most important unit of society. But Lutherian revolution changed all that. It challenged the authority of the Pope. This challenge opened up the way for discoveries in physics and astronomy. These caused the original social organisation to weaken and the family ceased to be the most important unit. Lutheran revolution and discoveries in physics bought along with them atheism. “Luther was not an atheist but his reform, overtime became atheist. As physics did not recognise any other god than knife, axe and fire. As a result jadvaad became prevalent. Pleasure in this world and this life come to be regarded as superior morality. According to this morality pleasure became the truth, each one cared for themselves and let others fend for themselves. Such type of individuality became prevalent.\textsuperscript{135}

Thus, for Manibhai the West is characterised by atheism, this worldliness and individualism. Having stated this he does not go into the analysis of its social or political structure. The question for him is that what the coming together of India – with its \textit{abbeda darma} - and individualism of England be like?

He argues that a society which subordinates individualism has only two paths on which it can travel; “it can either lead to extreme slavery or most superior knowledge.”\textsuperscript{136} The ancient Indians had created institutions which acted as safeguard against the path of slavery. For Manibhai the most important institution is the \textit{varna} system. He argues that as long as the society was governed by the \textit{varna pratha} it did not face slavery. But overtime as the norms of \textit{varna pratha} became relaxed “arya people lost their vigour.”\textsuperscript{137} Explaining the causal relationship between the breakdown of \textit{varna pratha} and the loss of vigour Manibhai states that, as the \textit{varna pratha} broke down, people gave up the care for this worldly concerns and protected \textit{dharma}, “to protect and preserve the higher order of the soul they allowed the body to be enslaved.”\textsuperscript{138} He argues that the essence of \textit{arya dharma} lies in \textit{abbeda} and
subsequent subordination of individuality. Even when the body is in chains, the country is in bondage as long as this principle of abheda is not lost, that is not bondage. Even the victor is aware that the “victory is useless, it is momentary; it in fact is no victory.” Manibhai claims that the core of aryatva has not been uprooted. He claims with certainty and pride that it cannot be uprooted. “The sword of the Muslims, the treachery of the moguls, the cunning of the English has not been able to touch it, it cannot be touched, and will never be touched.” We sacrificed our bodies to protect our souls, he claims. He says it does not matter if for over five centuries we have not won victories, not shown great enterprise, not amassed worldly riches; “but by protecting the identity...we have preserved everything.” He is emphatic that what has surrendered is the arya praja not aryatva. The questions which bother him are many. The encounter with the West is of an unprecedented nature. There is no way of knowing what lies in the future. “Will the Indians become English? Will the English become Indians? Will aryatva be uprooted? Or will it influence all? What will be? What will be the condition of India?” To answer these questions, it what every measure that is given to him to do so, he examined the encounter between the West and India in three broad sphere: the political, the social and the religious.

The English came to India for commerce and are keeping India for reasons of commerce. He does not agree with the argument advanced by some colonial rulers that they are keeping India for its welfare and because it is their duty to do so. He considers such arguments as diversory and misleading. With the advent of the English power, the older systems and institutions of governance got eroded. The distance between the ruled and the ruler increased as the rulers were “foreigners, believers in a different faith and following different morality.” The system of governance is so powerful and their morality so attractive that Manibhai is compelled to say that, “there is no possibility what so ever of us emerging victorious in the encounter with the individualistic morality of the West.” He laments that we as a people have adopted measures to please the rulers. All our endeavours are aimed at securing their favour. As a result the differences within us have increased. The rulers
also have failed to understand our way of life, our dharma and have imposed alien laws, customs and morality. Manibhai does not see a resolution of this predicament. He is disappointed in the “native states.” The only hope is education. The advent of English education had heralded some positive changes in our society. The English laws have banned ‘evil customs’ like sati and female infanticide. But such measures are not enough for him.

His greatest disappointment is with the system and content of English education. He is clear in its condemnation. “The standard of education is based on individualistic morality which creates differences. Such education often leads to lowest depths of immorality and corruption.” He gives an outline of the ancient educational system. The central concern of this education was to impart ideals of good conduct and teach dharma. The pupil was expected to observe brahmacharya for the period of his education at the house of the guru. This gave the student strength of character. The system cultivated the mind, the soul and the heart. “Those who came out of such a system of learning were full of strength and vigour, possessed high intellect, followed the dharma and were of pure character and full of enterprise.”

The new English education is not beneficial for us because it is based on individualistic morality. The heart and the soul find no place in it, in fact the education poses doubts about the existence of the soul itself. Manibhai is certain that the education system will create people to serve the government. Even the higher education system will create only “clerks, accountants and copy writers.” Answering the charge that many learned people, many writers and poets had emerged out of the new colleges and universities, Manibhai says that, they have emerged in spite of the education that they have received. The education system was unable to crush their spirit.

The system of education which is governed by foreigners, who belong to a different faith, who consider their own faith the most superior and consider Hindus as superstitious idolaters cannot ever teach morality which is our own. “The students who go through the education consider the western
religious principles to be true and believe that our religion is false. They become atheists.\textsuperscript{148} Manibhai says that such students tend to loose touch with their own community and without understanding speak of reform.

The positive impact of the university education for him is that many people through Sanskrit education, have learned about the glory of the past. They have come to understand and appreciate the philosophy which lay under social forms and customs. But the situation of women's education causes him to despair. "From the present system of women's education rarely will emerge a good mother, a good wife or a good woman. In most cases women imitate the western women."\textsuperscript{149}

The education system has also created many peculiar predicaments, according to Manibhai. In one family there exist members who belong to the reformers, who advocate the namin, while others adhere to the prachin. This is causing conflict, disunity and dissensions within the family. What is lost in the process, is something which kept the family united - that is the sense of maryada, a notion of limits. He is distressed that the young educated men and women take pride in breaking traditions, transgressing limits. While describing such behaviour he says, "The shastras tell us to eat after bathing, but now that we can think for ourselves we will bathe after eating. People worship idols, now we will kick the idols. We will break cast norms. And such people consider themselves to be most learned. I have to say with a heavy heart that aryatva has been corrupted."\textsuperscript{150} At the same time Manibhai concedes that contact with the western world has not been without its beneficial impact. According to him one of the chief advantages has been that we have become aware of the condition of our women. During the muslim rule the condition of our women had fallen to great depths. But now, due to contact with the western world we have made concentrated efforts to bring the status of our women to the original state. It is the encounter with the West that has given us the capacity to diagnose the social evils and understand the glory of the past.
Manibhai is deeply perturbed by the innovations that the British had made in our traditional laws. For him introduction of alien ideas like the 'will' are against the basic ideals of Hindu society, as they are based on principles of individuality. Manibhai fears that western contact and especially western education is taking us away from our original dharma. The western education is this worldly, it raises doubts about the existence of soul. At the same time we have lost our ability to gaze into the past and understand the original ideals of our dharma. According to Manibhai such illusory teaching leads to either of the tree paths. "Some become atheists, they do not believe in any thing, they speak of equality of all and do not care for good conduct; some adopt the teachings of other religions and change their own religion, they adopt the wrong path and become anarya; they lead themselves into such religious which the learned would not even consider religion and they transgress all limits through their deeds, and the third group consists of people who have some sense of religion, but they follow new sects of charitans in the name of arya dharma."151

He argues that such new notions have disrupted the essential unity of the family. The practice of women following a religion of their choice is going to be the last nail in our family system. "The husband is sacred to the wife, he is her god; and still women roam around looking for a guru a god? Such things might be appropriate according to western notions of freedom but to me they are against the basic teachings of arya morality and will destroy our family system."152

For Manibhai the greatest threat that the West has posed to us is its attack on our family system. Their education, their religion, their morality is fundamentally opposed to our family system. For him our religion, our aryatva is anchored in our family. If the West were to succeed in destroying our ideals of family we will loose our aryatva; with that "we will loose pride in our past history and with that we will cease to be considered one people."153

For Manibhai, the west is carrying out its attack on our family through the attack on our religion. We believe in different gods and goddesses, follow
different sects but all such beliefs lead as to abheda, all paths teach as to be one with all and the creator. Manibhai argues that different paths and sects exist in our country because Hindu religion is most tolerant of differences. But the western Christianity is trying to attack the very foundation of our religious belief. Manibhai argues that Christianity has the force of the rulers behind it. The rulers believe Christianity to be the most superior religion, all other religions for them are false. The also claim that “religion of all civilized people ought to be Chrismantry.”154

Such systematic attempt by the rulers supported by the reformers has eroded the confidence of our people. As a result either people are becoming atheists or are embracing superstitious beliefs which masquerade as Hindu religion. The society is being divided into two groups: prachan and navin. The conflict and opposition between these two has spread to all quarters of our social life.

Manibhai says that the “greatest damage that they have done is that we have lost faith in our past glories, in social life we have given up the path of rectitude.” 155 This has eroded the ground from which national pride could have emerged. “With the loss of faith in our past glories we have lost that part of our self from which patriotism, unity, enterprise, etc., could have emerged.” 156

In such times the only way to conduct available to Manibhai is to presence what is ‘ours’, preserve our self-identity” (apanapanu). If we loose this self-sense then the only destiny is a state of slavery.

According to Manibhai, the only way this self-sense can be protected is through respect for the past, “this will stop only when within the heart of each Indian, respect for the past glories of aryavrat will re awaken.”157 Manibhai, having evoked the ideal of self-hood asks what is self-hood constituted by? He finds the basis of our self-hood in our religion he says, “our self-hood lies in our religion, in our ancient ideals of abheda and our welfare lies in adhering to it.”158
Manibhai claims that not just our good and welfare lies in *abheda* but the good of all - of the west and of England - also lies in *abheda*. He prays to all, to the writers, journalists, editors of newspapers, to those who give lectures and participate in debates, to the teachers and businessmen - to follow the ideals of *abheda* in all their actions. He concludes by expressing a hope that we will understand the superiority of our ideals and when we understand them the West will also begin to understand the superior nature of our ideals.

Manibhai’s thoughts did not go unchallenged. The most sustained critique of his work was Ramanbhai Neelkanth (1868-1928). For more than fifteen years Manibhai and Ramanbhai carried on a debate on a wide range of issues. The debate, sometimes acrimonious but often modulated by norms of civility is one of the most important debates in the history of intellectual thought in the 19th century Gujarat. No two people engaged each other over such a long time on fundamental issues of religion and social practice. This debate was carried on in the pages of *Sudarshan* a journal edited by Manibhai and *Jnana Sudha* which was edited by Ramanbhai.

Ramanbhai was perturbed by the establishment of ‘*Sanatan Dharma Parshad*’. In response he wrote two long essays on ‘*Sanatan Hindu Dharma*’. His attempt was to define the term ‘Hindu’ and examine the idea of ‘*Sanatanatva*’.

For Ramanbhai a ‘Hindu’ can only be defined by practice - ritual and social. Unlike the Semitic faiths Hindu religion cannot be defined by adherence to a given set of beliefs. He feels that the boundaries of Hindu religion have been fluid and this fluidity makes any attempt to describe central beliefs of Hinduism difficult. “Eating and drinking, wearing particular type of clothing, sleeping or, being awake, moving around, or just sitting, prattening or being silent, bathing, removing the hair, in arranging play things, in lighting lamps to them... Hinduism is contained in either doing all these or in not doing all these.” In this obsession with social and ritual practices Hinduism has lost
sight of ‘parmartha’ - the care for others. Ramanbhai is not willing to consider the arguments about the syncracic nature of Hindu beliefs. For him the idea of the Creator, the need for truth and the acceptance of the principle of consciousness are present in all religious systems. The ‘truth’ belongs to the human mind and not to a Hindu religion only. These aspects do not constitute the defining characteristics of Hindu religion. The problem for him is to define the boundaries which separate Hindu religion from other beliefs. Only by defining the boundaries that one can consider the nature of its constitution. 

He says “...It is constituted by those who live in a particular geographic region and claim to be descendents of Hindus. These boundaries are protected not by any religious principle but by the social practice as defined by caste relations. Apart from these it is difficult to provide any other definition which applies to all Hindu people.”

Ramanbhai based his definition of Hindu religion on three broad principles: a) specific geographical boundaries b) caste based social practice c) a claim to be descendents of Hindus. Defined thus the self-identity of Hindu religion is constituted for Ramanbhai by external principles. It is not founded on philosophical considerations.

To argue this proposition Ramanbhai examines the question of the Book. Unlike the semitic faiths Hindu religion cannot claim a particular book as a foundational text. Most Hindus would like to refer to the Vedas as foundational text. Ramanbhai does not believe in the primacy of vedic texts. For him the prevalent social practice and religious beliefs are far removed from them. The later texts also question the validity of the vedic thought and practice. By establishing that prevalent practice and thought are removed from the vedic texts he questions the primacy of these texts. He compares the vedic religion to the last Mughal emperors. “All around us religious sects are negating the vedic religion and still make claims of being founded on vedic principles and thus they take for themselves the name, vedic religion.” Since various sects and later texts question the thought and practice as outlined in the vedas, Ramanbhai is unwilling to consider them as defining the basic character of...
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Hindu religion. Similarly he examines the later texts and finds them also wanting in their capacity to define basic tenets.

The 'original' religion has lost its character and the philosophical speculations have shown eclectic tendencies. The religious practices, the philosophical meditations and social practice have all been transitory and multiple. Therefore Ramanbhai asserts that "Hindu religion has lost its eternal permanence." 162

If that is so, a question arises as to on what is the claim of sanatanatva based? For Ramanbhai the claim of permanence is superficial, only namesake. He says, "Hindu religion is sanatan only to the extent that foreign religions have not taken root in the country and native religion has not changed its name." 161

He not only questioned the claim of sanatanatva of Hindu religion but also denounce social and religious practice which used the idea of tradition as its justification. He argued that religious practice was bereft of thought, had no concern for the suffering and hence the care of others. It was limited to the preservation of caste rules and adherence to sectarian beliefs. He is critical of the practice of untouchability and of unequal social and ritualistic relations. These have in his opinion drained Hindu religion of ideas of welfare and upliftment of others. Social and ritual practices on such an idea of tradition does not imbue him with any sense of glory or pride. "What remains is only a name, devoid of any inherent character. We can call it sanatan dharma, but what superiority does that prove?" 164 To worship and glorify what is only in the name, appears bereft of meaning to Ramanbhai. Ramanbhai is at pains to clarify that he does not wish to imply that there was an absence of religious and philosophical thought in India. He concedes that this tradition can inspire a sense of pride. Nevertheless, in glorification of the past one cannot remain oblivious to the deeply problematic present as such practices take the people away from the path of truth and righteous conduct.
Ramanbhai's condemnation of the *Sanatan Hindu Dharma* deeply disturbed Manibhai. He responded to the essay by an essay of the same title. The question for him is what are the reasons for the present fallen state of Hindu religion? If, as Ramanbhai agreed, there existed a vigorous tradition of philosophical thought in the past, why does it appear fragmented and devoid of meaning now? For Manibhai, contact with the West is responsible for the present deform.

Responding to Ramanbhai's formulation that Hindu religion is defined only by geographical boundaries and social practice, he asks if it were to be so where in lies the source of pride about the past? What inspires us to worship the ancient religion? The fact that Hindus take pride in their past is sufficient proof for him of the *sanatanatva* of Hindu religion. "It is in the blood of those who call themselves Hindus, that mere mention of the glorious past awakens them and they understand their duty and doing so become eager to engage in them. This exists. And there in lies the *Hindutva* of Hindus. It is so, and by that fact the *sanatanatva* of Hindu religion is proved." 16

For Manibhai, it is this deep sense of pride about the past which defines the self identity of Hindus and Hindu religion. This pride constitutes for him the core of Hindu religion. He argues that just as the life of Jesus is central to the self understanding of Christianity and that of prophet Mohammed to Islam, this sense of pride about the past and reverence for it is central to the self understanding of Hinduism.

His attempt is to define the self-understanding of Hindu religion not on basis of any religious thought or ritualistic practice, but on the basis of a sense of reverence and pride in the past. He to formulates the idea of a Hindu. For him the term Hindu denotes three sets of beliefs.

a) acceptance of the presence of a consciousness in the universe and faith in the idea of re-birth.
b) absence of animosity towards other religions, the practice and observance of the samskaras and conduct of life according to the ideals of varnasram dharma, and finally, c) "To be in disagreement with a statement that various schools of thought, religious beliefs, sects or Brahminical texts are contradictory to each other."

In his lengthy response Ramanbhai expressed his appreciation of the manner in which Manibhai has engaged in an intellectual debate, and holds up Manibhai's essay as an example of critical prose. It was required of him to respond to Manibhai's explanation of the term Hindu.

The idea of re-birth and the acceptance of the principal of consciousness are shared by many other beliefs. Ramanbhai argued that which is commonly shared cannot be a defining characteristic of Hindu religion. He feels that absence of hostility towards others is not on explanatory category. The absence of conversion to Hinduism is also because of the caste system.

The question of samskar is more complex. Ramanbhai formulated his argument on basis of social practice. According to him the samskar are observed only by Brahmin men. For women and all other castes only the sacrament of marriage is observed. Hence, what is not socially practiced cannot be central to the self understanding of that community. He uses a similar argument for the ashram dharma. The prevalent ashram dharma emphasises only the difference between the house holder and the renouncer and not all individuals are expected to mark the passage of their life by observance of the ashram dharma. Therefore, for Ramanbhai neither samskar dharma, nor ashram dharma can be used as defining the character of Hindu religion. The question of geographical boundaries is implicit in the question of Hindu Law. Hindu Law is applicable to ‘those residing within specific geographical boundaries and descendents of those who called themselves Hindu.’ The last defining characteristic given by Manibhai is ‘so beautifully ambiguous’ that Ramanbhai decided that he could not respond to it. In the end, he clarified again the purpose of such
debates. It is to prevent “Hindus from sleeping into a dream world under the delusion that our ancestors were great.”

This debate resurfaced some years later. Manibhai published a short essay, which was presented before the Sanatan Dharma Parshad. In this essay he made three propositions. a) The reform movement owes its origin to the western influence. b) The reform movement had not benefited the society but instead has caused severe deformities therein c) The deformity had been caused because the western reform movement takes people away from “eternal universal laws.”

What takes people away from “eternal universal laws” can not be good and therefore must be opposed. He says “It is an evil for our country and each and every individual in it. Not only this but it renders the human life and the very purpose of life meaningless.” The question therefore is, what is the true path? Where is to be found? And how does it fulfill the human vocation? For Manibhai “that feeling lies in what we can Aryadharma.” Manibhai is convinced that the fragmentation of religious practices, the existence of many, divergent sects and plurality of belief systems at variance from each other is only what appears on the surface. Beneath this chaos lies unity, the principle which binds them is one - that of non-duality. The fragmentation is attributed to the “difficult times” from which the society is passing through. The differences and contradictions in philosophical thought are for him ‘desirable’ and ‘beneficial’, as they represent the different capabilities of the mind. He asserts that truth can and should only be one - which is non-dual - and the objective of Sanatan Dharma Parshad for him should be to dissolve artificial differences and establish one truth. Without the unity of religious thought and practice the country and its people can not rise. He says, “If this country has to rise one day, it can do so only when the conscience of the entire country unites. This unity cannot be attained without the unity of religious feelings.”

Ramanbhai responded to this short intervention by an essay which aimed to respond to the larger question of religious reform. The essay titled
"Svadharma - Paradharma" posed the problem of conversion to a different faith. The essay begins with the explication of a line from the Gita: *Svadharma Nidhanam Shreya, Paradharma Bhayavanah.* What are the various ways in which a statement which exhorts one to perform one's *svadharma* and considers *paradharma* as undesirable be understood is the problem that Ramanbhai seeks to address. Ramanbhai says that this statement could be understood in terms of social structure as well as in the spiritual realm. Social structure depends upon each individual performing his/her duties. But these duties cannot be the same for all times and all contexts. Each individual must interpret the *svadharma* and act accordingly. Therefore, Ramanbhai asserts that socially the distinction between *svadharma* and *paradharma* is not inviolable.

The spiritual realm is concerned with fulfilling the ontological vocation of human life. This vocation, according to the statement from the Gita can be best fulfilled by following *svadharma* and by not allowing or following what is *paradharma*. In this manner, how is *svadharma* to be determined? One possible and most common interpretation would imply that *svadharma* means the religion in which one is born or the religion of one's ancestors. But this has no space for individual will. If individual will is legitimate then the human person can determine the path for fulfilling human vocation. In such a case the possibility of adopting other religion opens up. Therefore *svadharma* can become *pradharna* and *paradharma* can become *svadharma*.

Ramanbhai wanted to open up this possibility. If the individual has no choice in determining the path of salvation can that be true *dharma*? If an individual through the exercise of free will and intellect feels that the path of salvation lies in what is *paradharma*, why should a prohibition exist on adopting *paradharma* as *svadharma*? Does not the idea of religion provide for the possibility of exercising intellect? And if the quest for truth has no space, can that instinct be truly called religious instinct? These are some of the questions that Ramanbhai deals with in the essay. Ramanbhai suggests that opposition between *svadharma* and *paradharma* may not be an appropriate category to resolve this dilemma.
For Ramanbhai the path of salvation lies in following the path of truth. He sees the quest for truth as central to all human religions. All religions emphasise knowing. This knowing for Ramanbhai entails knowing the true path. He argues that if human vocation is to be fulfilled by knowing the true way, it is imperative that individuals are free to exercise their discrimination and intellect in choosing the true path. In such a case the difference between *svadharma-paradharma* is invalidated. Is truth to be negotiated by considerations of *svadharma* and *paradharma*? Therefore, Ramanbhai contends that, “.... if one finds truth not in *svadharma* but in *paradharma*, the insistence that one must follow *svadharma* and thus shun the true path is contrary to truth and religion; it is an obstacle in the path of human salvation .. such rules disregard the righteous path. It is against religion.”172

Ramanbhai argues that if one believes in the unity of human soul then the quest to fulfill human vocation must also be similar. Acceptance of such a proposition nullifies the difference between *sva* and *para*. Because, if a religion is mine, my welfare lies in following it; but it cannot lead to the welfare of the one who does not belong to it. It is equivalent to binding truth to notions of self, other, community and practices. One community or religion can not claim truth for itself. Therefore, it is given to human beings to strive for truth. If truth is the principal quest, the distinction of *svadharma* and *paradharma* are rendered irrelevant. He believes that faith has a place in religion, but that faith has to be located in truth and not in *svadharma*.

Mambhai had raised the question of *adhkar* (right emanating from competence and capability). He had explained the difference in religious beliefs and practices within the same religion by referring to *adhkar* that people have. Ramanbhai mocks at this argument. Acceptance of the idea of *adhkar* would amount to accepting that truth is conditional upon *adhkar*. He says, “In following the path of the religion of truth, someone’s *adhkar* is to conceive god as pure and sacred, this *adhkar* for someone else is in believing god to debauched and engaged in adulterous relationship with many women, some may take god to be a giver of good boons; according to *adhkar* the god might...
be formless and omnipresent or could be small enough to be contained in an idol; to believe in these is to make mockery of truth in the guise of adhikar. By spreading contradictions and falsehood, unity and truth cannot be attained.”

He reminded Manibhai that Mrs. Anne Beasent’s acceptance of Hindu religion was celebrated by him. Should only Hindu’s follow the ideal of svadharma - paradharma, he asks. He concluded the debate by emphasising once again the invalidity of the idea of svadharma and paradharma. For him the primary opposition was between truth and untruth. Apart from these two debates on the nature of Hindu religion and on the possibility of adopting a different faith Manibhai and Ramanbhai engaged in a somewhat bitter argument on the question of religious reform. The debate was largely centered around the reformist Prarthana Samaj, whose principal advocate in Gujarat was Ramanbhai and before him his father Mahipatram.

Manibhai characterised Prarthana Samaj as “a more palatable reformulation of Christianity.” This statement was made in an essay on women’s education. It was presented as a statement, and he chose not to explicate it further. It was required of Ramanbhai to answer this often-repeated charge against Prarthana Samaj. Ramanbhai clearly enumerated the theological differences between Christianity and Prarthana Samaj. According to him, Christianity is centered around three basic principles, the idea of the unity of the trinity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the idea of revelation and the belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Prarthana Samaj, as Ramanbhai described it, had fundamental opposition to these. He argued that if one were to accept the idea that man is made in the image of his maker, by implication the maker has as form. This is against the idea of an omnipresent formless god of Prarthana Samaj.

The Samaj was also opposed to the revelatory nature of truth and the notion of a messenger. They disbelieved all the claims of revealed Texts - the Bible, the Kuran and the Vedas. Their fundamental principle according to Ramanbhai is, that there is no text or a book which was either given or
revealed by the god. Quest for truth is the only path of true religion. Moreover, the Prarthana Samaj did not believe in the idea of conflict between god and satan and also in the divinity of Christ. In conclusion he summarised the differences. "... If we were to accept that (Christian) view then, the ideas of the unity of the divine principles, the formlessness of the divine, the just and omnipotent nature of divine are questioned. The ideas of the unity of the divine principle and its formlessness are basic to Prarthana Samaj. Hence, there are fundamental differences between Christianity and Prarthana Samaj."173

Continuing the debate on the Prarthana Samaj Manibhai sought to question one of its basic ideals; the efficacy of prayer. He posed basic questions. What is a prayer? Why should one engage in the act of prayer? Manibhai argued that the act of prayer has no efficacy and that it is a useless activity. The universe moves on its own principles. Gods are not going to be more generous or kind to the one who prays, nor do they expect humans to express their gratitude and pray in supplicancy. Since "the creator is not going to alter anything of the eternal principles of the universe,"176 prayer for him has no efficacy.

His opposition to prayer also arises out of the assumptions regarding the divine principle. The act of prayer assumes that creator is separate from us. Without this assumption prayer can not be. Manibhai did not accept such a view. For him the nature of creator is Brahmam and that is present in all beings. The nature of this Brahmam is knowledge. The human vocation is to know, the nature of Brahmam and be one with it. The moment of this knowledge is one of pure bliss. In this act of knowing prayer, supplication or a sense of gratitude has to place.

Having declared prayer useless, Manibhai tried to give it a limited role. To be one with the creator one requires pure conscience and disciplined will. To acquire these the act of prayer may be used, he concedes. But this legitimacy is conditional, one's motive must be to be one with god. It is argued, he says that acts of prayer and rituals like yagna bring fruits to the one engaged
in them. It is not as if some one grants these boons, but the observance of such rituals makes the will powerful and it attracts desired results on its own volition.

Ramanbhai was disturbed by this attack on prayer and by implication on the Prarthana Samaj. The impersonal tone of the intellectual debate is discarded. He attacks Manibhai. He characterises ‘Sudarsan’ as a magazine published by “the enemies of social and religious reform.”177 Going beyond this he states, “It is not surprising for a man who considers himself divine to discard the act of prayer.”178 Regaining his poise Ramanbhai turns to intellectual concerns. He claims to understand Manibhai’s position. Since he does not believe in god, the prayer is not meaningful. Ramanbhai has objections to the idea of all pervading and all present Brahman. If all beings are of Brahman no one human can utter ‘I am Brahman.’ It is given only to the entire cosmos to say that. Humans have a form, a body. Brahman is not of a body or a form. How are humans to know that one with a form and the One without form are the same and the one embodied and the One without the body are also the same?

The god has not created the universe with an expectation of prayer, this was Manibhai’s argument. Ramanbhai finds such a position ‘childish’. For him the act of prayer is meaningful when posited on the human endeavour. Prayer is for humans and not for gods.

Manibhai had questioned the efficacy of prayer as according to him the prayer can not alter the eternal principles of the universe. Ramanbhai does not see the prayer as a means for achieving certain tangible results. To clarify this he examines a preposition that prayer cleanses one of the past sins. This is not to be interpreted as, one has been absolved of all sins by the god. Through the act of remembering one’s deeds one comes to know of one’s action. One becomes more conscious of them and learns to distinguish between good and evil. Prayer helps one to acquire self-knowledge and discrimination; and shows the path of righteous conduct.
Widening the scope of the debate Ramanbhai takes up the question of *Jyana Marg* and *Bhakti Marg*. Can one understand the nature of god by following the path of knowledge, which is devoid of *bhakti*? He argues that to understand the nature of divinity one has to follow the path of good, righteous conduct. To know the good conduct prayer in some form is necessary. Thus, for him knowledge is meaningful only when combined with prayer.

What meaning does one derive from this wide ranging debate? One can argue that the debate remains superficial, that neither of them are willing or able to transcend their ideological grounds and engage with each other philosophically. The debate becomes meaningful only when placed in the context of the 19th century colonial Gujarat. This debate cannot be imagined without the colonial presence and its awareness in Manibhai and Ramanbhai. This debate was part of the process of reform of Hindu society, its beliefs and customs. Both Manibhai and Ramanbhai are advocating reform. But the nature of reform and its contents are under dispute. They are acutely aware of the presence of Christianity with its linkages to colonial power and its cultural policy. They are aware of the criticism of Hindu religion and social practices, with its absence of the Book, idol worship with prevalence of many gods-goddesses and variegated forms of worship. The Christian faith with its Book, monotheism, and well organised Church created deep ambivalence within the reformers. Manibhai and Ramanbhai engage with each other in the framework of the discourse of reform process.

In their separate ways both search for a 'pure' form of religion and structure of worship.

This search takes Manibhai towards *Advata Vedanta*. *Vedanta* with its notion of a formless, omnipresent *Brahma*, its emphasis on the path of knowledge and absence of elaborate ritualistic structure appeared attractive not only to Manibhai but many other minds with reformist tendencies in the 19th century. *Vedanta* allowed the possibility of following a native belief system.
without having to bear the burden of multiple gods, idol worship, ritual practices, sects which appeared heathen and superstitions. Moreover it was supported by an elaborate and nuanced philosophical system. This also helped to answer the charge against Hindu religion that it emphasised only empty rituals and had little space for philosophical reflections.

Manibhai's life mission was to establish *vedanta* as the only 'true' and 'pure' form of Hindu religion. He therefore argued for reforming Hindu religion of all ritual practices, idol worship and its various belief system. By cleansing the belief systems which seemed to divide Hindu society he hoped to unity the society through the unification of belief system. This also allowed him the possibility of reform on native line. He hoped that by reforming Hindu religion and society of all 'des' elements and establishing the *advaita vedanta* as the 'margin' principle he would be able to achieve the purity of the original formulation.

Ramanbhai's search for pure religion leads him towards a national and universal principle which can unify humanity. This search culminates in *Prarthana Samaj*. All religions have an idea of a creator who regulates the affairs of the universe. He sought to base his quest on this principle. Through *Prarthana Samaj* he comes to believe in the formless, bodyless principle which is omnipresent and omnipotent. This principle does not require revealed truths, nor the mediation of a messenger. Since it is formless, idol worship and all other ritual structures erected around it are rendered illegitimate and hence useless. The distance between the god and the human is that of knowledge. Through good, righteous conduct acquired by prayer this distance is sought to be reduced and finally eradicated.

For Ramanbhai any other form of religious belief is without rational foundation. The quest has to be for truth and since truth can only be one, no one group, text or practice can lay claims of exclusivity. The truth can be attained not through dogma, revealed or otherwise, but by relentless use of intellect. This allows him to simultaneously negate both Christianity and *vedanta*
and yet adopt principles which lead toward knowing the true. The distinctions of 'self' and 'other', of adopting other's belief through an act of conversion are not important for him, in so far as they hinder the path of knowledge. In his quest for reform and purification, he is not perturbed to adopt non-native ideas or strategies.

Despite their bitter differences both Manibhai and Ramanbhai are united in their quest for 'pure' form of religious belief. Both regard prevalent practice as polluted and of lesser value. For both desi forms of worship in which vast part of Hindu society had faith is not legitimate.

The different conception of what constitutes religious reform also informed their ideas about social reforms. Their debate centered around the 1895 annual sessions of the Indian National Congress at Pune. Till 1895 the annual session of the Congress was followed by a session of the social reform movement. In 1895 differences between the conservatives and the reformers lead to the two sessions being held separately.

Ramanbhai believed that political reform and social reform were part of the same process, and it was neither possible nor desirable to artificially divorce the demand for political reform from the necessity of internal social reform. He was critical of a class of new graduates who while demanding greater political participation of natives in the colonial administration were denying the legitimacy of the social reform process. Guided by a fake sense of national pride this group was trying to uphold that political reform has primary and that social reform was not a necessity as the Hindu forms of social organisation and belief were highly evolved and suitable to the native needs.

Manibhai considers the demand for parallel social and political reform to be fake. For him such a demand is a strategy to provide respectability to the social reform movement. He argues that the demand for social and political reform can be justified only when the rulers and the people are one. The situation under the colonial rule is different, the rulers are not only foreigners...
they are also of a different faith. Their norms and practices are different as also their ideas about desirable forms of social organisation. Given these conditions, he argued that “the belief that certain forms of political rights can be demanded only when the social organisation is reformed is not justified.”

Manibhai believed that social reforms must be carried out on native lines, as our religious beliefs and social practices “incorporate brightest ideals of all things.” He saw no justification in trying to break down such ideals. Moreover, Manibhai argued that without a sense of self belonging and self pride one cannot conceive of national feelings. If we, through the process of social reforms were to denigrate our family structure, social norms and religious beliefs, how are we to generate a sense of self belonging? Social reform for him will ultimately result in the loss of self sense. “Social reform is a path which will lead to the loss of self identity. It will close all possibilities of bettering our selves. It is a path, which will lead to the loss of our history. It is contrary to the well-established universal laws and ideals. It is an attempt which is bereft of any thought.”

Ramanbhai responded to this charge in a long essay. He denied the charge that the National Congress gave legitimacy to the reform movement, which he reminded Manibhai has a longer presence than the National Congress. He argued that one cannot espouse one set of ideals for the political realm and another for the social and religious realms. For Ramanbhai the question is that of the inevitability and primacy of social reform. He believed that one will have to accept that political reforms will not succeed without reforms within the society. He argued that the question was not of identity but of reform. The question of identity is part of these efforts at self improvement, and if one has to discard some parts of older notions for the betterment it does not lead to the loss of any sense of self worth.

The debates were typical of their times. Through these debates they made attempts to raise questions about notions of past and their bearing on the possibilities in the future. For Manibhai past represents a state of high
achievement and refinement. It is the past which is repository of all good and hence pregnant with possibilities. It is only by understanding and preserving that past that the present can be made sense of and ideals about the future arrived at. Reform for him thus becomes an attempt at removing all practices and beliefs not in conformity with the past ideals. Reform therefore is a process of purification where the measure is the ideals established in the past. Manibhai's attempt also involved disregarding the social, political and historical context of an idea. He argues that the ideas of past are accessible to us not only as history but also as possibility both in the present and the future. Ramanbhai is not perturbed either by the traditions of the past or the western encounter. He sees both as opportunities for the future. His attempt is to examine both the past traditions and western ideals and create possibilities for the future.

This deep engagement with the past lead Manibhai towards history. In 1889 Manibhai completed his most important philosophical work Siddhanta Sara, which he described as "an outline of history of thought in India, terminating with an attempt to point out the basis of a universal religion." Addressing his readers he states that the attempt is to search the truth, which is not bound by any sectarian or ideological consideration. Such truth can only be one he says, "truth which can be accepted and worshipped by all can only be one, infact it is one." His attempt would be to bring to light this truth. He also suggests that this search for truth is going to be conditioned by his own beliefs. "There are many system of thought — like religion and philosophy — in this word, but I believe that all these are the transformations of the same eternal principles. The path of arriving at these eternal principles is advanta philosophy of ancient India. I believe that this needs no proof, as it is its own proof. My attempt here is to establish these principles.”

For Manibhai the nature of truth is given, it needs no proof. He does not feel the necessity to elaborate these statements. If the truth as he describes it, needs no proof, then why does he feel the need to undertake an enterprise like
This endeavour becomes necessary for him because movements for religious and social reforms have posed questions before the ancient truth, its legitimacy and validity are under double "Ancient Wisdom of advaita has been put in the dock of the accused by the contemporary reform, my advocacy is to change the place of the judge and the accused."186

Manibhai sees his role as an advocate of advaita, his endeavour is to establish advaita as true and all other systems of thought as invalid. Siddhanta Sara is caught between the desire to write history and the need to defend advaita vedanta. One can approach this text as a history of philosophical thought. The possibility is that we like the poet and philosopher Manishankar Ratnaji Bhatt 'Kant' will emerge from such a reading deeply perturbed. We might like 'Kant' find the text full of aberrations and falsehoods, and at times the text may appear as a mere play of words.

In such a reading Manibhai does not emerge either as a serious student of philosophy or of history. The text can be approached only by being extremely sympathetic to Manibhai's endeavour and his 'advocacy'. Therefore, the attempt here is to understand the mode of argumentation, and the notions of history which informs Siddhanta Sara.

This book is divided in eleven chapters. The first chapter deals with the questions of the origins of the religious ideas. The eleventh chapter deals with the comparison of Indian and Western notions of religion and religiosity. The remaining nine chapters seek to provide a history of Indian religious-philosophical thought.

Manibhai begins by refuting the idea of genesis of the old testament, for him the universe is eternal-without a beginning or an end. The makes two propositions.

a) Religious sentiments are natural to human beings. Peoples and civilizations far removed from each other have religious ideas
b) These ideas of religion are essentially the same as they lead different peoples on the same path.

The manifest difference in religious practices are due to the different conditions and the contexts within which they operate. Notwithstanding these differences "religious ideas are universally the same, this is eternally true." If religious ideas are 'universally same' and eternally true, Manibhai argues that it is valid to propose that the source of all religious ideas is one and in essence all religious ideas are without difference. Manibhai argues from both ends of the propositions. If religious ideas are universal and eternally true their essential thought has to be the same. Secondly, in essence religious thought is similar because all human souls are enjoined with each other, they are universal. The fact that we can propose the possibility of universal religious ideas is a proof of their essential similarity. He says, "If, the universality of human souls were not to be an eternal truth and if different phases of time were not joined by history, then it would not be possible to imagine, even in a dream, that the source of all religions is the same. Moreover, the scholars would not have struggled to create a universal religion, if it were not so." [188]

For Manibhai the Vedas are the source of all religious ideas there in lies the origin of universal religion also. Vedas for him are all knowing. "The form that complete knowledge assumed is the Vedas and hence they are inspired by the god." Manibhai introduces a distinction between one that is created by the god, one that is revealed by the god and the one that is inspired by the god. He is not willing to claim, like many of his contemporaries, that Vedas were created by god. At the same time he is unwilling to grant the agency to human genius for having imagined and composed the Vedas. Therefore, he puts forth an idea similar to the semantic notion of revelation. If the Bible and the Quran are revealed truths, the Vedas are inspired creations. According to him the god inspired the rishis to compose the Vedas. Hence the agency is god and not the rishis. Since the agency rests with the god, Vedas are eternal. This 'fact' gives the Vedas equal sanctity as semantic texts.
Once having denied agency to human creativity he feels the need to reintroduce the idea. To re-emphasise the eternal value of *vedas* he says: “The endeavour that brahmins have undertaken to preserve the sanctity of *vedic mantras*, their efforts to retain the original chants from time immemorial itself proves the eternal validity of the *vedas*... This shows the power and glory of *vedic religion*. We can ask with ‘Kant’, “Kante, does it show the power and glory of *vedas* or the power of the brahminic memory.”

Having established to god inspired status and hence the eternity of the *Vedas* Manibhai has to contend with two other issues: first, how does one explain the ritual practices of the *vedas*, and its emphasis on the *Karma Margya*? And second, the *Vedas* refer to multiple gods, which are not formless. This led to idol worship.

Manibhai is comfortable with neither. His effort is to establish the idea of formless brahman, *jnana margya* and *advaita vedanta* as universal religion. Manibhai struggles to come out of this predicament.

Manibhai argues that the *Vedas* emphasis rituals not for their own sake but for a higher purpose — the *yagna*. *Yagna* and accompanying rituals according to him are not to propitiate the gods or seek boons which lead to increased material comforts. The *yagna* is a means of expressing gratitude and offering self to the gods. The offerings may take material form but the principle is to offer ‘body, mind and soul’ to the god. *Yagna* is symbolic of the ideal of self sacrifice. Despite the ideal of self sacrifice Manibhai has to deal with two practices associated with the *yagna*. One is the practice of offering animal and occasionally human sacrifice as part of the rituals. Second, there are references to the prevalent practice of consumption of alcoholic drinks — the *sura* — the *vedic* rituals. Are these both also to be associated with high ideals of sacrifice?

Manibhai is unable to condone the practice of violent sacrifice or of drunken rituals. He can not posit them as examples of the high intellect of the *aryan race*. He is disturbed by them but does not condemn them. He only
expresses his ‘surprise’ at such practices. He knows that animal sacrifice is symbolic of the sacrifice of the self and hence partakes of the high ideals of sacrifice. *Surapan* according to him opened the inner eye of the *brahmins*, “Sura, *Amrut* are all drinks of the gods, their consumption opened the inner eye of the *brahmins*, they could communicate with the gods, the gods would appear before them, grant them boons and they would achieve eternal life.” 192

Having explained the logic of ritual practices, Manibhai deals with the questions of multiple gods and goddesses and idol worship. He wished to explain them as subordinate to the principle of monotheism and formless *brahman*. “Did they conceive of all *devas* to be the god, or there was only one god and many *devas*, the *devas* being the manifest form of the god? If in their conception all *devas* were to be manifest forms of one god, it would be a sign of the highest form of intellect, this is the opinion of many contemporary scholars…. It is not possible even in the most fallen idol worship that there was no conception of one supreme god.” 193

Thus, Manibhai introduces a distinction between the god and the manifest forms, the *devas*. But if the highest ideal is the conception of one formless consciousness, what place does idol worship occupy? Manibhai deflects the argument. Having once described the idea of one supreme formless god as the highest manifestation of the intellect Manibhai does not hesitate to call it the first step in religious imagination

“It is more natural to consider the idea of one supreme god as the starting point of human intellect, rather than call it the epitome of human intellect.” 194

With rituals came the need to regulate social behaviour. This need was met by the organisation of society around the twin ideals of *varna* and *ashrama*. For Manibhai *Varnashram* is one of the most significant contributions of ancient India to the world. The world did not understand the ideas of *varya shuddhi* and *kshetra shuddhi* and hence, no such parallels can be found elsewhere.
other countries could not fathom the mysteries of \textit{vyayashuddhi} earlier. The ideas of heredity and descent established by Darwin, Lamark and Hickel were only known to the ancient\textit{ rishis}, they also employed these ideas for the upliftment of the humanity.}\footnote{195}

In his endeavour to establish the superiority of aryan social institutions Manibhai not only supports the prohibition on widow remarriage but also considers the practice of sati the highest and most desirable form of self sacrifice. “The practice of sati, which has been prevalent is a result of intense religiosity and unprecedented love and devotion. Husband can only be one, \textit{moksha} and \textit{dharma} can be attained only with his companionship, there can not be any other deserving of such love and devotion, then one must accompany him and join one’s soul with his at that very moment; this is the ideal of sati. This is the epitome of a woman’s natural instinct for love, it is a divine manifestation of such feelings, it is the greatest self sacrifice; it is the highest \textit{dharma}! Such sacrificial love is not known to other nations.”\footnote{196}

Thus, he is able to explain the desirability of social practices which were under increasing attack in his times, but the worship of multiple gods and goddesses becomes an impediment. Not having found a satisfactory explanation he returns to the question. Once he had claimed that the idea of one supreme god was the ‘epitome’ of human intellect and on another occasion he had described it as the “starting point’ of human intellect.

While dealing with the thought of the \textit{Upanishads} Manibhai is mote at ease. Manibhai argues during this period that the intellect developed further and found its highest ever expression in the idea of \textit{brahman} that is without beginning or an end, is \textit{nirakar} and \textit{mrgan}, is omnipresent, omnipotent and all knowing. Manibhai is able to create a hierarchy of the idea of the divine. At the lowest level is the conception of many gods and goddesses accompanied by idol worship. The idea of one supreme god – monothelism - is of a higher order, but the highest conception is that that of \textit{brahman}, beyond this the human imagination can not extend. “Not only in \textit{aryavarta}, but in all countries...\textit{Love, Desire and Moksha} 177
in these days of great discoveries, no new conception other than this has been provided, nor is it possible to do so. 197

Despite a highly evolved philosophical discourse of the idea of brahman, practice of idol worship and accompanied rituals persisted. Earlier Manibhai had described rituals as representing sacrificial character. With the availability of the idea of brahman he is ready to reexamine his earlier position. The task before him is to somehow establish a compromise between idol worship and the conception of brahman. He describes the former as superstition while the later represents philosophical intellect. According to him there is no conflict or contradiction between the two. Both are products of human imagination and intellect. Having emanated from the same source he calls superstition and philosophical insight 'sisters'. Both are required, at times superstitions may take primacy over the philosophical but in the end only the philosophical will triumph as it the only path of supreme bliss.

Manibhai thereafter undertakes a comparison between the philosophy of brahman and the monotheism of the Semitic religions. According to him monotheism represents the highest achievement of ‘animalistic intellect’. This is so because there the creator is conceived as separate and different from human beings. Brahman is not separate from the self, self is part of the brahman, this for him represents the highest possibilities of the human mind. If this is so, it proves the superiority of aryan imagination over the semetic one. He says: “Semitic imagination conceives the creator as different and separate in form and nature from the self. Aryan dharma has not accepted this conception. It is not going to accept it. Both believe in non-duality. The semetic religions decry the aryan dharma on basis of their non-duality. But their non-duality is the highest expression of animalistic intellect. Aryan non-duality is the highest expression of human intellect. Semetic people have to learn a great deal from aryan people if they wish to attain the supreme understanding of our dharma. All these is proven without a doubt, by the Vedas and the Upanishads.” 198

Empirical reality militates against Manibhai’s logic. He has to explain the emergence of the puranas, with its ideas of reincarnation of the divine and the
powerful doubts expressed by the Charvak, Buddhist, and Jain systems of thought and religious practice. Manibhai laments that before the idea of *brahman* could establish itself fully, doubts came to be expressed. Without entering in any details he attempts to wish away the doubts. Charvak system for him is a fallen system. It is animalistic. "Even the *shudras* refused to believe in such animalistic religion." If Charvak was unfit for the *shudras*, what about the Buddhists "who dispelled the web of vedic rituals?" Manilal’s response was simple; why consider them important if they had nothing to offer but doubts? "That religion had nothing new to offer, it was a rather simple effort to mould ancient religion in certain direction... It arose from brahminical religion. It has made some additions and alternations. It is a *nastik* sect." He is not able to dismiss Jain religion so easily. He had studied the Jain texts closely and was aware of the sharp critique of brahminical religion that they had to offer. He chooses to not discuss them at all, "as it is difficult to decide what to believe in them and what to dismiss." Instead, he focuses on the non-violence integral to Jain religion. He concludes that due to the emphasis on non-violence and the critique of sacrificial rituals offered by the Jain texts and practices, finally the *upanishadic dharma* emerged stronger.

Having explained away the doubts Manibhai takes up the question of the *puranas*. The question that has to contend with is, if with the idea of *brahman* the highest form of human intellect was revealed, why did the *purana* imagination become so powerful and pervasive? Manibhai argues that having reached the peak, descent was inevitable. It was not possible to go beyond or develop the philosophical system any further. "The ancient history of *aryavrata* was coming to an end." Not being able to either go beyond or sustain the philosophical thought the *rishi* develop puranic imagination. This imagination became so powerful that philosophical insights went ‘underground’. With this the aryan religion and people lost their ariyata and its glories. Puranic period for him is one of fall. He bemoans the loss of aryahood; "The sun of *aryavrata* was about to set; pure, sacred ariya’s were about to become Hindus." Thus Manibhai creates a distinction between ariya and Hindu, the former representing the highest ideals and the later a sense of decay and
corruption. With the advent of a Hindu puranic imagination philosophical thought lost is credibility. Philosophical discourse came to be replaced by idol worship, many avatars and devotion.

Manibhai, having denounced the puranas as representations of decay and corruption of aryatva, argues in its defence. Puranas he argued, did perform an important function. It prevented people from giving up their religion and embracing other more fallen faiths. Although, leading on a path of decay, puranas he claims gave ‘limitless goodness’. “Without the intervention of purans, today we might have become javanas or muslims, or even Dutch or English, can not even imagine what might have become of us – it is certain that we would have reached the most fallen and despicable state.” Thus, Puranas for him simultaneously represent decay and possibility of regeneration.

Manilal shows a great deal of anxiety on the question of idol worship. He wants a way out of that question without denouncing the practice. He no longer is willing to maintain the facade of scholarship. He had argued earlier that idol worship as symbolic worship is more preferred to idol worship without its symbolic universe. “If idol worship is not symbolic but real than it is meaningless, despicable, fallen, barbaric and animalistic; since it is symbolic it represents greater good, it explains the mysterious, it is sacred and represents the divine.” Those who criticise idol worship do not know its deeper significance, he argues that idol worship is an attempt to describe the incomprehensible and give form to the formless, ‘it is an eternal language of the eternal truth.” Having said this Manibhai does not wish to explain or justify its existence any further these questions become meaningless for him. “We are not bothered whether it was or was not, idol worship is true, it is the way it ought to be, it is real and meaningful…. doubts about its existence in ancient times are meaningless.”

Having dispensed with the burden of logic and proof Manibhai sings praises of idol worship and puranas. He argues that semetic people in their
quest to subordinate and finally eradicate idol worship and beliefs associated with it have deprived human race of invaluable knowledge. Citing the example of the library which was burnt down in Alexandria, he says, that if the followers of the pope and the iconoclast Arabs had not done so, "the knowledge of gravity, steam engine, electricity, magnetic field, astronomy, algebra, jurisprudence and the philosophy of religion" would have become available long ago, and because of that act of vandalism "human race has fallen behind by at least two thousand years." In his attempt to defend idol worship he neglected for sometime the fact that he ultimately had to subordinate such beliefs and practices to the idea of *advaita brahman*. Suddenly changing his argument he says, "Moksha lies in (this) philosophy, *purana dharma* can only give temporary respite in the heaven. Philosophy and *purana* are sister. They are not enemies. Only philosophy is eternal and true, *purana* are false, but there is no contradiction between them. *Arya rishis* had known this great truth three thousand years ago." Having stated that there is no contradiction between the true and the false, Manibhai gives up any pretense of scholarship. He had begun his argument by stating the source of all religious beliefs and practices are the *Vedas*. His endeavour, nevertheless is to establish *advaita brahman* as the eternal and universal religion. Having made valiant attempts at striking a balance between the idea of *brahman* and the practices and rituals which accompany idol worship, Manibhai appears exhausted. He no longer makes any attempt to disguise his exasperation. He alters the chronology to change the original source of religion. "The original source of religion is the *Upamansudas*, the *Vedas* are its second version, *purana* the third and various sects are its fourth version." Manibhai can now argue that first came the idea of *brahman* which got corrupted over time with the advent of many gods and goddesses, idol worship and its rituals which finally resulted in variegated sects. All the later innovations are subordinate to the original conception, they are false but not in contradiction with the original idea. "Notwithstanding the various idols and many sects, *Advaita* philosophy is the universal *arya dharma*. In most instances,
peoples of other countries also accept this, with some modification and hence, it is the universal human religion.”

Now Manibhai has to establish two ideas. First, that the peoples of other countries also accept *advata brahman* as the religious ideal, although with some modifications, and second *advata brahman* is the universal human religion.

He examines Christianity first. At the core of Christian belief is the idea of the ultimate unity of the trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Manibhai states that this idea is not original to Christianity, it was borrowed from Jewish conception. Its roots are in Babylon and Asirnya who got them from Egyptian beliefs. The Egyptian people had borrowed their religious beliefs from ancient India. Therefore, he says, the Christian idea of the Father in Heaven is the *advata* idea of *brahman*. Jesus is logos, Manu is Adam and Shatrupa is Eva.

Thus Christianity is a derivative of *advata brahman*. Concluding his analysis he states; “Asiryan religion is a transformation based on the Khaldian religion, which was based on the religion of the bramhns of aryavrata. If this is true, then the Bible is a fifth order derivative of the *aryadharma* and since it is a fifth order derivative in essence it is like any of our sects. That religion is nothing but superstition, it is a form of superstition.” Manibhai calls the Bible a fifth order derivative of *advata* and Christianity a sect of it, he goes a step further and describes Islam also a derivative of *advata* and Prophet Mohammed a worshiper of the idea of *brahman*. “Islam, accepts the general principles of Christianity… Mohammed’s Islam was against the idol worship in ancient Arabia, it preached of monotheism, but in essence it is devoted to *brahman*.”

If Christianity is a sect and Islam is devoted to *brahman*, *advata dharma* becomes the universal religion. He says, “The true eternal religion, whether that of the Bible, or of the Vedas, of the King or the Avesta, of the Ritual of the Dead or Homer, take whatever – is only one – that is *Advata Brahman*. “
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Mambhai succeeded in his endeavours

1. *Aryavrata* is the source of all religions
2. *Advaita Brahama* is the original religion — it is Universal.
3. All other religions are mere derivatives of it.
4. *Advarta Brahman* is the supreme religion, *moksha* lies therein.

All that is left for Mambhai to do is to proclaim its victory. “Truth is *Brahman*. It is *advata*. A Universal religion, a religion of extraordinary love, it is *advatta dharma*; I see it rising on the horizon, I can imagine its glories, may my imagination prove to be a reality, it is proving true, it is true.”

*Sudhanta Seava* is an extraordinary response to both the colonial cultural agenda and the reform movements inspired by a desire to cleanse Hindu society and religion of ‘undesirable’ and ‘barbaric’ elements and practices. It is not as if Mambhai is not deeply perturbed by the state of his society and religion. He also desires to alter it. But his desire is to introduce reforms which were harmonious with native traditions and practices as he saw them. Past for him becomes the measure to evaluate the contemporary. It also becomes for him an ideal for the future. History or tradition for him is an instrument which makes this possible. Past, history or tradition for Mambhai are not immutable. It is a past which is open to interpretation and even mutilation. Therefore, it is instrumental.

This past or history for him are imaginary, since it is imaginary, it is ideal and is a measure of all that is to follow. As an ideal it can not improve or grow it can only be corrupted. History in this sense becomes a story of decline and decay. The present thus is an inevitable corruption of the past. Since past is an ideal it is also the future. It is to be attained by cleansing the present. Thus the past and the future become the same. The past represents the original idea, the future holds within itself the Universal ideal that will emerge. *Moksha* lies in this sense both within the past and what is to come. The present, though oppressively real signifies continuation of a downward moving life cycle.
Manilal’s idea of history and the colonial — Indological notions of history share many similarities. For both the most significant India is the ancient India, it is the ideal state. Such a past is imaginary for both. Any movement from this past is decline and decay for both. The present represents the most fallen condition. Manibhais the Indologist were both uncomfortable with the non-sanskritic traditions. Both wished to define the past and the future by return to the sanskritic marg traditions. Present from them is decadent because the desi elements have come to dominate it.

Manibhai’s plea for advaita brahman is also a plea for return to the sanskritic marg tradition. Ironically, it is also his disregard and contempt for the desi tradition that binds him to his opponents the, reformers.

Manibhais quest is to attain abheda. In the personal domain it takes the form of desire and longing for a pure locus of love. Abheda also becomes for him the societal ideal, where it takes the form of advaita vedanta which is posited as the only true human vocation and the universal ideal to be attained.

Abheda with attendant notions of love informs the personal and the societal. It is by understanding the anatomy of love that we can comprehend the intertwined nature of quest.

For Manilal the nature of love is essentially non-dual. This is to be achieved by single pointed devotion to the partner. Such a union for Manilal embodies pure love. But, in theory and in practice Manilal’s conception demands total devotion from the partner. There is no mutuality of devotion that is entailed in such love.

Manilal’s quest was to find such a pure locus of love, love that will be devoted to him alone, love that will be non-dual. This quest lead him into relationships with various men and women. Out of these four individuals are crucial. These are Fuli, the unnamed woman in Bombay, Diwali and lastly Chottu and Ramlaxmi. We will examine each of these separately as they reveal crucial details about the theory in practice.
The marital relationship with Fuli is doomed to fail even before their conjugal life began. She was the sister of Laxmilal, Manilal's partner in homoerotic desire. Laxmilal married the girl Manilal desired to marry. The castration at the hands of one time partner in homoerotic practices must have weighed heavily on Manilal's mind. At one level it appears that Manilal is projecting the evil personality of the brother on to the child woman Fuli. Initially, she is judged by the debauched behaviour of the brother, his acts of cunning, his acts of thievery are all projected on to Fuli. The entire relationship with Fuli, at one level is captured by the movement from 'my wife' to 'that prostitute.' This movement is marked by incident of conflict and of violence. During the entire process Fuli resists all attempts of Manilal to domesticate her. She refuses to subjugate herself to any idea of being a wife, a mother. If one of the dharmas of a wife is Kama and Kama in marriage, she does not accept it. She resists sexual relationship in marriage, while she engages in - as Manibhai records in adulterous sex. Even motherhood cannot bind her to either the husband or to the marriage. Manibhai's efforts are constantly to assert his control over her - either through gifts or punishment. They are met with resistance and failure at every stage. Manibhai could not make Fuli commit herself either to him or even to the marriage. This relationship does not get consummated at the level of emotion.

The idea of total devotion and unwavering love also became untenable in this marriage. Manibhai does not realise that love as he desires it cannot be a pre-condition of marriage. This marriage is ultimately characterised by a constant struggle to assert control on part of Manibhai and to evade control on part of Fuli. Neither commit themselves to the marriage. It appears that neither can really make a transition to being a parent - a house holder.

The unnamed woman in Bombay, is ready to engage in adulterous, amorous relationship with Manibhai. Manibhai's notion of love demands breaking of all limits and all norms to commit to a higher level of principle that he called love. This woman although committing adultery wants both passion and commitment to be bound by her notions of rights (adhikar) and
her notion of limits (*maryada*). She participates in the erotic play but does not grant certain rights to Manilal, the rights of having an ‘ultimate relationship.’

Even rights that are granted are sought to be mediated through a notion of limits and rectitude. Thus she will not allow any erotic play during the *Purshottam Mas.* This willingness to break social norms by entering an amorous relationship outside marriage and still wanting to limit it by notions of *maryada* and rectitude unsettles Manibhai. Though he participates in the relationship he is unable to demand and receive single pointed devotion from the relationship. In the ultimate analysis Manibhai realised that if the relationship has to continue it cannot be done solely on his terms, or the way he conceptualised such a relationship. Even in this relationship Manibhai fails to establish control and it has to be terminated.

Perhaps in Diwali Manibhai had a woman who came closest to his notion of pure locus of love. Diwali’s love for Manibhai is not purely motivated by sexual desires. She is attracted by his intellect and wishes to be a part of his intellectual world. She reflects on the possibilities of such relationship. She is aware of the choice that is entailed - the choice between *prem* and *niti*. She also comprehends the implications of Manibhai’s idea of love. She knows that he will be necessarily be unfaithful, that she will not be able to hold his attention for long. She confronts Manibhai with these realisations. Despite this awareness she is ready to break the bonds of *niti* and choose *prem*. She knows that only through an act of transgression that she will be able to reach out to Manibhai.

But in doing so, she changes the conventional idea of love that Manibhai holds. Perhaps, she draws upon the idea of amorous adulterous love, where a woman can also be the one to initiate, the one to court and seduce. In doing so, she establishes parity with Manibhai.

The authenticity of her love and the intensity of her desire pose a challenge to Manibhai. Manibhai can see an authentic reflection of himself in
the mirror that she holds to him. This is not a visage of himself that he wants to see. Therefore, all that Manibhai can do is to be ambiguous and non-committal and finally bemoan her loss.

The relationship with Chottu and Ram is more complex to fathom. Perhaps Chottu from among all of Manilal’s friends and devotees understands the codes that Manibhai was proposing. He understands his role as a devotee and offers his wife as a gift. But it is Manibhai who fails to comprehend such devotion. He accepts the gift and at the same time wishes to unearth the real reasons of such devotion. Therefore he fails to perform his dharma as a guru, but ends up being a yajman.

In exchange he provides for them. Perhaps, Chottu’s act can also be construed as an act of wish fulfilment. His desire to have a homoerotic relationship with Manibhai is satisfied through Ram laxmi. Since he cannot be a woman, he offers a woman that he possesses to Manibhai.

Manibhai sees this transaction as not being governed by morality. Therefore, he is able to teach to Chottu and Ram that in the highest form of love, notions of sin and of rectitude have no place. He calls it a divine experience but also maintains accounts of expenditure like a yajman.

Perhaps at some level Manibhai is also aware that Chottu’s act cannot be understood purely in terms of devotions. The constant need to test Chottu and Ram, the need to expand the scope of gift and devotion by inclusion of Ladi signifies this. Even in devotion, Manibhai feels the need to control Chottu and Ram. When they wish to be free from this control and submit to the norms of social behaviour, they are castigated as selfish and sinners. The relationship ends the moment Manubhai fails to exert control over them.

What emerges as a ruling metaphor in all the four relationships is the idea of control. For Manibhai, devotion to him must be unconditional and unlimited by any notions of niti, maryada or even social pressure. At one level
he demands that the other break all norms and bonds at the same time the expectation is that they must submit to him unconditionally and forever. He at the same time wants to be free from all commitment.

Thus the quest for true and pure locus of love becomes quest for power and unconditional submission. In all the four cases he fails to exercise this power and demand unconditional devotion. What he is left with is a deep sense of betrayal and impotency.

The absence of limits that he desired of love, Manibhai achieved in lust. His lust is not governed by any norms. It is characterised by a total absence of maryada or dharma. A close friend's wife, wife's aunt, women seeking jobs, neighbourhood women, large number of prostitutes, servants and even daughter of a close friend become objects of lust. So do the wife and mistress of a student-devotee. His lust has no bounds. What can perhaps explain such indiscriminate lust?

One can only other tentative hypothesis in this regard. The early experience of homoerotic desire is significant. A culture which sees such desire as a feminine trait is likely to arouse deep sense of insecurity in men. One possible way of contending with femininity could be hyper masculinity as Ashis Nandy suggests. The form that hypermasculinity takes in Manibhai is not mere suppression of feminine self but a free play of masculinity that is unbound by any norms of rectitude.

The other possibility can be deduced by Manibhai's strong urge to establish control. Faced with failure in the realm of love to do so, and faced with increasing sense of impotency he tried to regain masculinity through lust.

The limitless play of passion overshadowed his loves and life. Even the realm of language was finally subjugated to realm of passion.

One of the most striking feature of the autobiography is the layering of languages that a reader encounters. In his philosophical writings, the prose is
chiselled, highly sanskritised. The local expression has no place in his public writings. Such is the prose of the autobiography in most parts. Only when talking about matters of desire and lust that his language undergoes a complete transformation. The local idioms become available to him. The autobiography is replete with words like 'Randi' (prostitute). The act of intercourse is described by a whole range of colloquial terms — 'vapati' (used) 'tidhi' (took her) 'ghasii' (rubbed her), ma'ra kari (enjoyed). What underlies all these terms is the idea of possession, of unlimited consumption. It also is suggestive of instrumentality.

The other feature of his language is total absence of detail while dealing with women's bodies. Nowhere does he talk about the physical attributes of women; not even the four women with whom he had long relationships. If at all the body figures, it does in the generic category of 'beautiful or attractive. The body and its expressions come into play only when he has to decide whether a particular woman is 'debauched' and therefore 'available for taking'.

This perhaps indicates that in the free play of lust all women with their distinctive bodies become blurred. What is important is the pleasure that he derives out of it.

This free play of passion results in syphilis. It becomes a symbol of the withering away of both his body and his moral universal. The disease symbolises Kama without dharma. The free play of passion results in decay and death. It is perhaps not incidental that the part of his body most affected by syphilis was his mouth — throat and the palate. It restricted his consumption of food at one level while at the other it led to loss of speech for sometime. When it returned the words were unclear. This interfered in his profession as a teacher and did not allow him to continue his vocation.

Both in the realm of love and lust. Manibhai's yearnings can be seen as a failure to establish control. In love he demanded submission and wanted total control, that was not to be. In lust he could not exercise any limits or control over himself.
This notion of love also anchors his social thought. Love is posited both as an ideal and a medium to attain that ideal. Women and femininity come to occupy a role that is both central and instrumental simultaneously. Both in the personal domain and social thought the role that women play is that of being medium through which the abheda is sought to be attained. It was this attributed role to women that made Manibal oppose the reformers on the women's question. His idea of womanhood and his notions of history also show marked similarities. Both become a source by which the selfhood of his society is sought to be defined. It is for this reason that both history and women have to be conceptualised in their pure, imagined form. Simultaneously they are available for re-interpretation and mutilation.

Manibhai's quest in both private and public realms appears to be one which allows him to arrest fragmentation and eventual dissolution self both personal and societal. It is a quest for unity of self with larger domains of tradition, dharma and self sense of a people.

There is an apparent failure to arrest fragmentation at the level of the person. He failed in his search for a perfect and ideal locus of love. He did not achieve the advaata that he desired. Free, unrestricted play of lust results in syphilis.

If in the private longings advaata was an ideal to be attained, in the public realm advaata becomes a mode through which he wants to make sense of the present and to create an ideal future.

At one level it is this desire for unity which binds the public and the private realms. In the public endeavour advaata is both a mode and an ideal. In the private realm it is svedharma. One can also perhaps argue that it is a personal quest to be one one with the self and to be united with the other and ultimately with the creator which governed his life and thought. Having failed to achieve unity and facing disintegration of the self he strives to forge a unity at the societal level. At the same time the personal failure is a reflection of a
much larger failure to achieve unity and universality at the societal level. Since he is unable to hold on to the personal self that he wished to protect and preserve, he strives to hold together the ‘self’ of his society, its dharma and its past. It is also possible that his failure at the societal level hastened the pace of his self fragmentation.
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