

and philosophic principles which are bound to contribute immensely to the moral formation of youth.

Father Walker is to be congratulated on the noble task he has set himself: we wish him every success. Already we are in his debt for this study of Macbeth.

M. COSTELLOE

THE BHAGAVADGITA. By Professor Sir S. Radhakrishnan. (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d.)

This is yet another good translation of the Bhagavadgita. But that is not the important fact about it. The point is this: Professor Radhakrishnan has lived in England for a long time, and he has realised the gap in our knowledge about this great Indian Scripture. So he gives in 78 pages an Introductory Essay that has been badly needed in the West.

What is the Gita? A religious classic. 'The teaching of the Gita is not presented as a metaphysical system thought out by an individual thinker or school of thinkers. It is set forth as a tradition which has emerged from the religious life of mankind'. The Gita belongs to the pre-Christian era. Professor Radhakrishnan quotes the chief commentaries on the Gita: Samkara's ancient commentary (788-822 A.D.) holds that 'while action is essential as a means for the purification of the mind, when wisdom is attained action falls away'. Ramana-nyaya, another old commentator, holds that its main emphasis is on devotion; differences are shown as determined by the view-point adopted.

The Gita presents Krisna, the teacher, as identified with Visnu, the Lord of the Sun. 'The unity that lies behind the manifold universe, the changeless truth, is represented by Krisna, who takes manhood into God. Krisna is the unification between the eternal and the historical. There is no antithesis between eternity and time in the Gita. Time derives from eternity and finds fulfilment in it'. The eternal 'I' confronts the pseudo-eternal 'not-I'. 'When the element of negation is introduced into the Absolute, its inwardness is unfolded in the process of becoming. The two principles of being and non-being are shown in the Gita, although this teaching does not uphold dualism, because non-being depends on being.

Three different ways bring men to the Supreme Goal: the way of knowledge (Inana—wisdom, mind); the way of love (Bhakti); and the way of action (Karma). Arjuna, representing man in the Gita, is guided through all these ways. Professor Radhakrishnan agrees with the old commentary of Samkara: Karma and Bhakti are both means of spiritual freedom.

Regarding the translation itself, as I am not able to translate the original Sanskrit, I can only compare some of the modern translations. My personal impression is that, in some ways, Professor Radhakrishnan's rendering could be less intellectual and give us more of the atmosphere of this Scripture. Here is an example. Sloka 51 in Chapter XI is translated as follows:

(1) *By Annie Besant*: 'Arjuna said: Beholding again Thy gentle human Form, O Janardana, I am now collected, and am restored to my own nature'.

(2) *By Swami Swarupananda*: 'Arjuna said: Having seen this Thy gentle human Form, O Janardana, my thoughts are now composed and I am restored to my nature'.

(3) *By Profesor Radhakrishnan*: 'Arjuna said: Beholding again this Thy gracious human Form, O Janardana (Krishna), I have now become collected in mind and am restored to my normal nature'.

And the goal of the teaching of the Bhagavadgita? According to Professor Radhakrishnan it is this:

'The Gita insist on the unity of the life of spirit, which cannot be resolved into philosophic wisdom, devoted love or strenuous action. Work, knowledge and devotion are complementary, both when we seek the goal and after we attain it. We do not proceed on the same lines, but that which we seek is the same. We may climb the mountain by different paths, but the view from the summit is identical for all. Wisdom is personified as a being whose body is knowledge and whose heart is love. Yoga, which has for its phases knowledge and meditation, love and service, is the ancient road that leads from darkness to light, from death to immortality'.

TONI SUSSMAN.

MORAL INTUITION AND THE PRINCIPLE OF SELF-REALISATION. By C. A. Campbell. Annual Philosophical Lecture, Henriette Hertz Trust. British Academy, 1948. (Cumberlege, Oxford University Press; 5s. 6d.)

This Hertz Trust lecture is divided into two parts. Part I deals with the question of moral intuition, and especially with the conditions which are required before it can be accepted as valid; Part II is concerned to show that a principle, known as the 'principle of "self-realisation"' fulfils these conditions.

As a conclusion to Part I we are presented with the statement 'that whatever the ultimate principle of man's moral consciousness may be, it cannot be one in which the aspect of social universality is intrinsic'. Whether this assertion is true or not it certainly requires more precise argumentation in support of it than Campbell provides, especially since he relies so much upon anthropological evidence. To treat the findings of anthropologists (different customs, codes and systems of morality, etc.) as though they were, in themselves, the data of ethics is highly misleading; the real difficulty, indeed the essential task, is to distinguish between the denotation and the connotation of valuational terms; it is only then that the 'findings' can become data of ethics.

The basis for Part II seems to rest upon Hume's notion that 'disinterested benevolence' belongs to 'the original frame of our temper'. It is a little surprising to find anyone accepting such a view in 1948.

D. NICHOLL.