

A LETTER

ON

**THE UTILITY OF THE STUDY OF THE SAMSKRIT
LANGUAGE,**

TO

THE HON'BLE JOHN BRUCE NORTON,

ADVOCATE GENERAL, MADRAS.

A HINDU.

MADRAS:

PRINTED AT THE PRICE CURRENT PRESS.

1865.

A LETTER

ON

**THE UTILITY OF THE STUDY OF THE SAMSKRIT
LANGUAGE,**

TO

THE HON'BLE JOHN BRUCE NORTON,

ADVOCATE GENERAL, MADRAS.

A HINDU.

MADRAS:

PRINTED AT THE PRICE CURRENT PRESS.

1865.

THE UTILITY OF THE STUDY OF THE SAMSKRĪT LANGUAGE.

To

THE HONORABLE JOHN BRUCE NORTON,

Advocate General, — Madras.

ESTEEMED FRIEND, — It is a happy sign of the times that matters connected with the State education of India receive increasing attention from the Government and from the people. Of those matters that on which I now propose to express my views is, I feel, not the least important.

The value of the Samskrit language has been variously rated by Indian Educationists. The main cause of this conflict of opinion would appear to be the *undue* importance at one time said to be attached to Samskrit *as an agent of education*. The absurdity of this estimation is so palpable that one may well wonder that its refutation stood in need of the eloquence of Lord Macaulay. If any man should try to maintain that one who has learnt *only* Samskrit books is an *educated* man, sufficiently answering the requirements of a civilised age, his opinion would not be worth listening to for a moment. If men with such views did exist at the time when the trio formed by Lord Macaulay, Sir Edward Ryan and Sir Charles Trevelyan fought so zealously in the cause of Indian Education, it is simply a matter of congratulation that those men have been deservedly worsted and their views consigned to oblivion.

The Anti-Samskrit party, however, seems to have been carried away much beyond legitimate limits by their zeal. Lord Macaulay's celebrated Minute is the best exponent we have of the views of the party. It has become the stronghold within which all decriers of Samskrit, mostly members and supporters of the several Missionary bodies, have taken shelter. The minute is replete with Lord Macaulay's force of language; and but for this eloquence, the weakness of certain views it embodies would have struck any reader.

The whole body of argumentation of the Minute may be divided into two parts: 1, that against Samskrit *as an educator*; 2, that against Samskrit

as a language. The former is as sound as the latter is flimsy. I say this with all possible deference to one whose name stands in the foremost ranks of English literature.

In para 5, the following sentence occurs. "But to talk of a Government pledging itself to teach certain languages and certain Sciences, though those languages may become useless, though those Sciences may be exploded, seems to me quite unmeaning."—That the Samskrit "language" is "useless" the writer has not *proved*. Further on we find the following :

"All parties seem to be agreed on one point, that the dialects commonly spoken among the natives of this part of India contain neither literary or Scientific information, and are, moreover, so poor and rude that, until they are enriched from some other quarter, it will not be easy to translate any valuable work into them. It seems to be admitted on all sides that the intellectual improvement of those classes of the people who have the means of pursuing higher studies can at present be effected only by some language not vernacular amongst them."

The first sentence in this para, well describes the object to be furthered by the study of the Samskrit language. It cannot be expressed better. The second sentence unhappily jumbles two *different* ideas evidently to build up a *wrong* assumption for the demolishing hand of the writer to deal a death-blow. In fact the writers' object seems to be to inveigle the reader into a comparison of Samskrit with English *as a vehicle of education*. But no reasonable man would ever lose sight of the fact that "the intellectual improvement of those classes of the people who have the means of pursuing higher studies" will be best accomplished by the direct study of the English language. It is *not* for this select portion of the Indian population "that valuable works" containing Western knowledge have to be "translated." Those who have the "means of pursuing" their studies in English will never stand in need of "translations." It is, as admitted on all sides, *the masses* whom *English* education will never reach, that require "translations" of *English* books into the vernaculars. On the natural influence of Samskrit upon the vernaculars of India, I shall have to speak more hereafter. In the meanwhile, Lord Macaulay

"What then shall that language be? One half of the Committee maintain that it should be the English. The other half strongly recom-

mend the Arábic and Samskrit. The whole question seems to me to be, which language is the best worth knowing? Having thus most ingeniously decoyed the reader to a comparison between a language which embodies in itself the fund of knowledge contributed by the most powerful intellects in the course of several centuries and others which though highly polished have for ages been neglected, and which never put themselves forth for such a comparison, the writer goes on to say ;

“ I have no knowledge of either Samskrit or Arabic. But I have done what I could to form a correct estimate of their value. I have read translations of most celebrated Arabic and Samskrit works. I have conversed both here and at home with men distinguished by their proficiency in the Eastern tongues. I am quite ready to take the Oriental learning at the valuation of the Orientalists themselves. I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. The intrinsic superiority of the Western literature is, indeed, fully admitted by those members of the Committee who support the Oriental plan of education.” I shall here simply ask, will the largest library of Chaucer’s time stand a comparison with the “ Encyclopædia Britannica ” ? Is, therefore, the literature of that age wanting in interest to us ? In the instance of Samskrit, we have the additional reason of its suitability as an improver of the Indian dialects. “ It will hardly be disputed, I suppose that the department of literature in which the Eastern writers stand highest is poetry. And I certainly never met with any Orientalist who ventured to maintain that the Arabic and Samskrit poetry could be compared to that of the Great European nations.” Here nothing is easier than a *direct and complete refutation* of the writers’ assertion by citing the words of the most eminent Orientalists. I shall confine myself to the quoting of the opinions of two of them—Professor Horace Hayman Wilson, and Professor Monier Williams, the late and present Boden Professors of Samskrit. In the preface to his translation of Kalidásas’ poem of *Mèg’ha Dúta*, Professor Wilson says : “ The metre combines melody and dignity in a very extraordinary manner ; and will bear an advantageous comparison in both respects with the best specimens of uniform verse in the poetry of any language living”. Again in annotating verse 754. [“ Nor ask that promise nor expect reply”] he observes “ We cannot help pausing here, to remark the ingenuity of the poet in

the conduct of his work. He sets out with excusing the apparent absurdity of the Yaksha's addressing himself to a Cloud as to a rational being, by introducing a pleasing and natural sentiment : see verse 32. The Cloud has now received his charge, and something is expected by way of reply expressive either of refusal or assent. To have given the Cloud anything like the faculty of speech, would have been straining probability overmuch ; and we see in the above lines with what neatness Kálidása has extricated himself from the dilemma." I beg to call attention to the following passages from Professor Monier Williams's Introduction to his translation in verse of Kálidása's Sákuntala. Referring to Sir William Jones' discovery of the existence of a dramatic literature in Samskrit he says ; " It may readily be imagined with what interest the keen Orientalist received this communication, with what rapidity he followed up the clue ; and when at length his zeal was rewarded by actual possession of a M. S. Copy of one of these dramas, with what avidity he proceeded to explore the treasures which for eighteen hundred years had remained as unknown to the European World as the gold fields of Australia." * * * " But when to the antiquity of these productions is added their extreme beauty and excellence, as literary compositions, * * * * *—we are led to wonder that the study of the Indian drama has not commended itself in a greater degree to the attention of Europeans, and especially of Englishmen." * * * * * " But it is not in India alone that the Sákuntala is known and admired. Its excellence is now recognised in every literary circle throughout the Continent of Europe, and its beauties, if not yet universally known and appreciated, are at least acknowledged by many learned men in every country of the civilised world. The four well known lines of Goëthe, so often quoted in relation to the Indian drama, may here be repeated :

" Willst du die Blüthe des frühen, die Früchte des spätern Jahres,
Willst du was reizt and entzückt, willst du was sättigt und nährt,
Willst du den Himmel, die Erde, mit einem Namen begreifen,
Nenn ich Sakuntalá, Dich, und so ist Alles gesagt."

" Wouldst thou the young years blossoms and the fruits of its decline,
And all by which the soul is charmed, enrapture, feasted and fed ?
Wouldst thou the earth and Heaven itself in one sole name combine ?
I name the. O Sakuntalá ! and all at once is said."

Augustus William Von Schlegel, in his first lecture on dramatic Literature, says : " Among the Indians, the people from whom perhaps all the cultivation of the human race has been derived, plays were known long before they could have experienced any foreign influence. It has

lately been made known in Europe that they have a rich dramatic literature, which ascends back for more than two thousand years. The only specimen of their plays (Natakas) hitherto known to us is the delightful Sakoontala, which notwithstanding the coloring of a foreign climate, bears, in its general structure a striking resemblance to our romantic drama."

Alexander Von Humboldt, in treating of Indian poetry observes: "Kalidása, the celebrated author of the Sakuntala, is a masterly describer of the influence which Nature exercised upon the minds of lovers. This great poet flourished at the splendid Court of Vikramáditya, and was therefore, contemporary with Virgil and Horace. Tenderness in the expression of feeling and richness of creative fancy have assigned to him his lofty place among the poets of all nations." * * * *

Lord Macaulay is undoubtedly a great authority in Literature, but his opinions on the value of Oriental Literature, when opposed to those of Sir W. Jones, Goëthe, Schlegel, Humboldt, Wilson and Williams, are not deserving of any great deference.

Further on, we find the celebrated passage so often quoted. "The question now before us is simply whether, when it is in our power to teach this language, we shall teach languages in which by universal confession, there are no books on any subject which deserved to be compared to our own; whether when we can teach European Science, we shall teach systems which by universal confession, whenever they differ from those of Europe, differ for the worse, and whether, when we can patronize sound philosophy and true history, we shall countenance, at the public expense, medical doctrines which would disgrace an English farrier—Astronomy which would move laughter in girls at an English boarding School—History abounding with kings thirty feet high, and reigns thirty thousand years long—Geography, made up of Seas of treacle and seas of butter." Laying aside for a moment the unfair assumption on which the whole Minute seems to be founded, that it is pretended that Samskrit affords the means of *education* in this advanced age, I would pause here to ask in what respect is the Astronomy of Hipparchus and Ptolemy, superior to that of B'háskarácharya and Aryab'háta, and whether Herodotus's description of the large ants and the golden coasts in Southern Asia would not as much "move laughter in girls at an English boarding School" as Veda Vyása's "Seas of treacle and seas of butter."? And, for this reason, is Greek neglected in England?

The paragraph following this draws a comparison between the position of the English language in India, and that of Latin in ancient England. This is hardly the *whole* truth. The question in India is between *three* languages, one dead, and two living; viz. Samskrit, English and the vernaculars; while that in ancient England was between *two* languages *both then living*, viz. Latin and the local language. The proper comparison would be between the classical languages *as now taught in England* and Samskrit and Arabic required in India. If there is any difference in the degree of necessity of these languages in these two countries, that difference will be in favor of the Eastern Classical languages with reference to India, for, while Latin and Greek have done all that is necessary towards amplifying the English language, Samskrit has not yet been cultivated with that degree of intelligent discrimination which is necessary for the successful and adequate improvement of the Indian vernaculars. That the vernaculars do require improvement is fully admitted by Lord Macaulay himself: "In one point I fully agree with the gentlemen to whose general views I am opposed, I feel, with them, that it is impossible for us, with our limited means, to attempt to educate the body of the people. We must, at present, do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern, a class of persons, Indian in blood and color but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the Country, to enrich those dialects with terms of Science borrowed from the Western Nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population." With one exception the whole of the above sentiments are very sound, and they put the question in *the* light in which it ought to be put. I take exception to the words, "to enrich those dialects with terms of Science borrowed from the Western Nomenclature." I admit that in some cases English words will have to be introduced as they are, but in the great majority of cases existing or newly combined Samskrit words will answer admirably. Those who have read the late Dr. Ballantyne's "Synopsis of Sciences" will not doubt this. At any rate, the older sciences would require very few introductions of purely English terms. When we turn from Science to Literature, the sufficiency of the Samskrit language to express the needful ideas is even more evident.

I have noticed the leading features of Lord Macaulay's Minute. He starts on the *assumption* that it is maintained that the Eastern classical languages contain the materials of *education* in the true sense of the word. If such an opinion existed at the time that Lord Macaulay wrote his Minute, it does not exist now, and consequently the arguments of the Minute so far as are founded on this assumption, if called for at the time, are perfectly aimless now. To perceive the question more clearly, assume for yourself that some body maintained that the ancient Latin and Greek books afford all that is necessary for the education of an Englishman of the nineteenth century. It will be as easy to cry down this opinion as the one which Lord Macaulay has built up and then smashed. In his sneers at Samskrit, the writer's zeal or rather his rhetorical animus seems to have carried him a little too far. A man living nearly 2000 years A. D. will, of course have much to find fault with in books written nearly 2000 years B. C. But then he must make due allowances, and be just in his observations. I shall adduce only one instance to shew that this has not been the case. Lord Macaulay supposes that the "medical doctrines" of the ancient Hindus "would disgrace an English farrier." Now, against this I shall cite the following verse from the great Epic, *Mahà B'hàrata*.

"Prast'hita hridayat sarve tiryagur'd'hva-mad'ha-stat'ha,
Vahantya-nnarasan nadyo-dasapranaprachoditah."

"All these arteries proceeding from the heart, laterally, up and down, carry the fluid of digested food and are influenced by the ten Pranas."

The last words have evidently reference to the process of respiration. The *discovery* of the circulation of blood, known to the author of one of the earliest Hindoo works *did honor*—*immortal honor* to Harvey. But Lord Macaulay thinks otherwise. *He* thinks that the Hindu medical doctrines "would disgrace an English farrier."!

I agree with Lord Macaulay that *high education to the few* should be given in the English language. I agree with him that the education of the masses must proceed through the vernaculars sufficiently refined and enriched. I do *not* agree with him in that that refinement and enrichment should be solely dependent on the English language. The importation of purely European terms should be as rare as possible. European terms should be used only when there are not even approximately expres-

give terms in Samskrit. The latter far more easily blend with the vernaculars than the former, and never sound uncouth.

One of the chief objections put forward by the opposers to Samskrit teaching is ~~the~~ prevalence of pedantry which it is assumed, it will breed. I have no clear idea of the sense in which the word *pedantry* is here employed. Is it that works on Sciences written in the vernaculars with the help of Samskrit will abound with words not ordinarily comprehended? If so, English Scientific works have brimful of *such* pedantry. Take any work on Botany or Anatomy for instance, and Latin words which cannot be made out without the help of an explainer might be counted by scores. Is it that in conversation "high" words will abound to such an extent as to disfigure it? I cannot see why, as in European languages, there should not exist in the improved vernaculars of India *two* styles of recognisable difference—one colloquial and the other fitted for writing books in. Again, it is evident that if there is any validity in this objection to Samskrit teaching on the score of its breeding "pedantry" the force of the objection will only be higher in the plan of introducing "Western Nomenclature" wholesale.

Another objection, started by the Anti-Samskrit party is that the Aryan Samskrit is quite alien to the Dravidian languages of the Southern portion of the Indian Peninsula, which are supposed to have a Scythian origin, and that therefore Samskrit can do nothing towards improving them, but on the contrary would only encumber them. There is no need here to go into an Ethnological enquiry. Fully recognising the Dravidian theory, it is evident enough that Samskrit has exercised a most unequivocal influence over these languages. "The dialects of the aboriginies" says that distinguished native of Bengal—Bábu Rájendralála Mitra "shew a considerable stock of Samskrit vocables." Indeed I may well challenge any one who holds Anti-Samskrit views to write a single sentence of ordinary length and on an ordinarily important subject, in any one of the Dravidian vernaculars without employing a single word of Samskrit origin. The influence of Samskrit has been far from being confined to a mere admixture of terms or vocables, resulting from the contact between the conquering and the conquered races. But it has been so great as to change *alphabets*. To quote again the Bengálí Babu; "in importing foreign words the rule has hitherto been to assimilate them to the languages into which they are imported, and not invent a

new alphabet for their sake." But even this invention of alphabets has been the result of the influence of Samskrit over the Drávidian vernaculars. The four dialects which are acknowledged to be Drávidian are Telugu, Tamil, Canarese and Malayálam. With the exception of the Tamil, the rest have the full Samskrit alphabet, with differences simply in the form of writing. Even in the case of Tamil, a full alphabet corresponding with those of the other three does exist and is always resorted to in writing out Samskrit works. Perhaps many a Drávidian advocate will be startled if I go to the length of suggesting the *general* use of this alphabet; but it is my sincere belief that it would be to the advantage of Tamil itself which uses Samskrit vocables so abundantly, to adopt this alphabet. But to turn to the subject more directly under consideration; the very existence of an imperfect alphabet in Tamil, and of the corresponding but obsolete alphabets called Kol Eluttu and Tekkan Malayálam in Malayálam proves, beyond question, that the full alphabets now in use in Telugu, Canarese and Malayalam are simply modifications or counterparts, however distant, of the Déva Nágari or Samskrit alphabet. I lay stress on this fact simply to shew that the intermixture between the original Drávidian dialects and the Samskrit language of the Áryan conquerors has been so complete as to make disentangling impracticable. Will the Anti-Samskrit party push on its advocacy to the length of requiring the purification of the Drávidian dialects by the expurgation of Samskrit vocables and of words having remote Samskrit origin? I don't think they are prepared to do this. To attempt this would be tantamount to attempting to lower the Drávidian dialects as they are to the level of the jargon of the Khonds or that of the Todas. However much there may be a beauty in simplicity, I doubt whether the world is prepared to push its admiration of that beauty to such lengths. Thus recession is both impossible and undesirable. It is acknowledged by the Anti-Samskrit party itself that the vernaculars are, as they now stand, so imperfect as to be incapable of conveying Western Instruction, and that they require improvement. It has been shewn that the proper function of the English language with reference to the Indian vernaculars is that of supplying facts and ideas, and not that of supplying terms wholesale. It has also been shewn that Samskrit will, in most instances, veritably mend the dialectic deficiencies of the vernaculars, that Samskrit already exercises a most unmistakeable influence over them, and that the

enrichment of these with the help of Samskrit will be more natural and more acceptable than that by the help of the English language. What are we to deduce from these facts? Surely that the vernaculars should be improved by a *discriminate* use of Samskrit. I use the word 'discriminate' advisedly, for Samskrit only too much enters into vernacular composition in a very ill chosen manner. A *chaste* use of Samskrit alone I mean to advocate here. To effect such a reform as what I mean in the vernacular literature, a set of standard books on all the modern subjects of education should, first of all, be produced in the vernaculars by a set of men well educated in English and possessing a good knowledge of the Samskrit language. The true and legitimate object of Samskrit instruction is the production of such a set of men. The producing of a set of men of a particular standard of qualification is not the work of a day or a year, or one which can be carried out in a very circumscribed field. An earnest attempt sustained through half a century may effect this.

It is impossible to see on what score can this cultivation of Samskrit, as a language be objected to. Captain W. N. Lees, in his paper on the Romanising scheme read before the Bengal Asiatic Society during the last year, makes the following remark. "In those days there were two schools of educationists in India, the Orientalists and the Anglicists. The former in their discussions, was represented by James and Thoby Prinsep and Dr. Tytler. The latter by Messrs. Macaulay and Trevelyan, Dr. Duff and other missionaries. The question they fought, though nominally the battles of the alphabets, was quite as much a battle of languages; and this question has perhaps also been too much mixed up with the real one by Dr. Sprenger. Missionaries again,—and I do not suppose they make any secret of it—advocate the adoption of the Roman alphabet, rather because they believe it will aid them in the work of conversion than from a conviction of its greater suitability for the purposes of writing the Oriental languages, and from that source, therefore, we can hardly look for wholly unbiassed conclusions."

It may be inferred from this that the objection of the Missionaries and their partisans to the Samskrit language is founded on a belief that it will retard the work of conversion. Probably it is supposed that a knowledge of Samskrit and a knowledge of the Hindu system of Theology to which Samskrit is *the key* will render a Hindu's mind unfit for the reception of Christianity. Is then Christianity a plant which will

grow only in a soil of ignorance of other creeds ? The Hindu system of Theology is, *in the view of a Christian*, false. But neither the truth nor the falseness of a creed can be comprehended unless the exact features of that creed are studied. Are the Missionaries prepared to say that Christianity quails before a study of Hindu Theology ? I don't think they are, and it would be unjust to suppose so. But their manifest opposition to the study of Samskrit forces upon one's mind the impression of the existence of some such vague apprehension among them. I have only to observe here that an objection founded on any such apprehension has no weight whatever.

I have already shewn in what direction the utility of the cultivation of the Samskrit language lies. It will be seen also that I have advocated Samskrit study *only hand in hand with a thorough English education*. At present, high education is almost entirely confined to Government Institutions. The study of the Samskrit language must be initiated by Government. I am here more concerned with the Madras Presidency than with the other parts of India ; and indeed Madras is much behind the rest of India in the encouragement given to Samskrit. That the Madras Government sees the propriety of encouraging Samskrit learning is evident from the fact that it maintains a Professor of Samskrit and staff. But the provision falls far short of the requirements. If the Government would institute an enquiry with a view to ascertain the per centage of Students possessing a *good* knowledge of Samskrit among those who have gone through the College course of studies, the deficiency will become quite apparent. It may be that the present Professor has a fair knowledge of Samskrit and honestly devotes to its teaching what little time he can pick up after attending to his multifarious duties. But it is not such an extemporised Professor, with various other things to do, that can effect much. Besides, there is reason to fear that Mr. Percival is too much of a missionary turn of mind, and too much of an adherent of the Dravidian theory to set on Samskrit its due value. If Samskrit is to be taught, as it ought, a systematically trained professor from England or (better still) from Germany should be engaged. Under him, an intelligent Pandit well versed in the grammatical part of the language, should be placed. The study of Samskrit should be made a *sine qua non* for the attainment of the B. A. degree, as it is in the Bengal University. European and East Indian candidates may be permitted to take up some of the vernacu-

lars in the room of Samskrit, but the Hindus must be required to take up Samskrit, and the Mahomedans, Arabic or Persian. In the Matriculation examination, Samskrit may be wholly excluded. In the F. A. examination, it may be optional with the candidates to take Samskrit or some one of the vernaculars. It may be remarked here, that on the adoption of this arrangement, it will become necessary to raise the Matriculation test in the vernaculars to the present F. A. standard, and the F. A. test to the present B. A. standard. I am glad to find that it is intended by the Senate to make the Matriculation test less easily attainable than it is ; and the raising of the standard of the vernacular papers will be but in keeping with this intention. I would name the following Samskrit books for the B. A. and F. A. examinations.

FOR THE B. A. EXAMINATION.

Manu,
Naishad'ha—by Sriharsha,
Meg'ha D'ita, by Ka'lidasa,
Vyakarana Sutra, by Panini,
Kaumudi by B'hattoji Dikshita,
Kivalayananda by Appa Dikshita,
Kavyadarpana,

Any of the three dramas,

Sakuntala, Uttararamacharita, and Mudra Rakshasa.

FOR THE F. A. EXAMINATION.

Lag'hu Kaumudi,
Kiratarjuniya, or Mag'ha,
Rag'huvansa or Kumarasamb'hva,
Chandraloka of Ka'lidasa,
Bhoja Champu.

The Samskrit books for the M. A. examination as given in the last University Calendar might have been better chosen. Rig Veda is a subject there. In the first place, it is to be doubted whether Orthodox Hindus will be found willing to touch upon the Vedas in the University Examinations for all the honors of the University. In the next place, the linguistic value of the Vedas does not extend more than to a knowledge of the transition of the Samskrit language from the Vedic to the

Puránic style. The Védic style is quite obsolete and useless now. Vedántasára, another book in the list is also useless since the University Honors are not intended to encourage a study of the Hindu *Theology*. Then, the list does not contain a single work on the Samskrit *Grammar*, when there are several very erudite works on the subject, such as Manoramá and Kaustub'ha of B'hattoji and the B'háshya of Padanjali. Similarly, there is in the list a complete absence of works giving the rules of figurative and dramatic compositions with exercises and examples. The well known Commentary of Mudrá Rákshasa, and Chitra Mímámsá of Appa Díkshita may well be introduced to meet this want. However, as the M. A. degree is a very rare honor, the revision of the list is not very urgent. That is not the case with the B. A. degree. The Senate may well notify early that from 1868, Samskrit will be an essential in the B. A. examination of Hindus, and name the books. "Necessity is the mother of invention," and when the University demands Samskrit learning, it will come out. The substitution of Samskrit for the vernaculars by the Bengal University has not stunted the influx of candidates for the B. A. degree, and there is hardly any reason why this change should not as much suit Madras.

If I mistake not, the attention of the Madras Government and of the Madras University has already been drawn to the subject. It is likely that a strong difference of opinion prevails in the body of the Senate. But the *public* has not yet been favored with the views of the opposite party in a detailed manner. I hope some one will dispassionately express them. I grant that neither the Government nor the University should take a hasty step, but even the most considerate step pre-supposes *action*, however slow. It is this that I wish to see.

I remain,

Ever your true Friend,

A HINDU.