

## I. THE LIFE AND WORKS OF ŚAṄKARA

There are many works which profess to be biographies of Śaṅkara.<sup>1</sup> The most famous of all is the *Śaṅkaradigvijaya*, written by Vidyāraṇya in the fourteenth century.<sup>2</sup> All these biographies were composed hundreds of years after Śaṅkara's death and are filled with legendary stories and incredible anecdotes, some of which are mutually contradictory. Today there are no extant materials from which to reconstruct his life with certainty.

Setting the date of Śaṅkara's birth is probably one of the most controversial problems in the history of Indian philosophy, not only because he is one of the greatest Indian philosophers but also because a solution is inseparable from the correct understanding of one of the most important and critical periods of the history of Indian thought. It has been customary to adopt the birth and death dates asserted by K. B. Pathak in 1882,<sup>3</sup> 788 and 820, but these dates have no firm basis. After reviewing and criticizing all the conflicting opinions, Hajime Nakamura proposed in 1950 that the dates should be shifted to 700–750.<sup>4</sup> This view has been accepted by such scholars as L. Renou<sup>5</sup> and D. H. H. Ingalls.<sup>6</sup>

During the fifth and sixth centuries the Huns invaded India from the central Asian steppes, and the political system of the Gupta empire, under which India had enjoyed her golden age of classical culture, was completely broken up in the sixth century. In the seventh century King Harṣa restored peace in North India, but after his death India fell into chaos again. Thus Śaṅkara was active in composing his works and propagating his teachings dur-

ing an era of political division and social unrest in India; Buddhism was on the wane and Hinduism on the rise.

Tradition says that Śaṅkara was born into a pious Nambūdiri Brahmin family<sup>7</sup> in a quiet village called Kālaḍi on the banks of the Cūrṇā (or Pūrṇā, Periyāru) River in Kerala, South India.<sup>8</sup> He is said to have lost his father, Śivaguru, early in his life. Śaṅkara renounced the world and became a *saṃnyāsin* (ascetic) against his mother's will, and went to Govinda (670–720)<sup>9</sup> to receive instruction. No reliable information about Govinda is available,<sup>10</sup> but he is traditionally said to have been a pupil of Gauḍapāda (640–690).<sup>11</sup> Gauḍapāda is notable as the author of an important Vedānta work, *Gauḍapādīyakārikā*, in which the influence of Mahāyāna Buddhism is evident and, especially in its last chapter, even dominant.<sup>12</sup>

It is said that Śiva, one of the principal gods in Hinduism, was Śaṅkara's family deity and also that he was, by birth, a Śākta, or worshipper of Śakti, the consort of Śiva and female personification of divine energy. Later he came to be regarded as a worshipper of Śiva and even as an incarnation of Śiva himself. But his doctrine is very far removed from Śaivism and Śāktism. It can be ascertained from his works that he had some faith in, or was favorable to, Vaiṣṇavism.<sup>13</sup> It is likely that he was familiar with Yoga, since he is the author of the *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa*, the exposition of Vyāsa's commentary on the *Yogasūtra*, a basic text of the Yoga school.<sup>14</sup> A recent study, though not fully acceptable, has suggested that he was first an adherent of Yoga and later became an Advaitin.<sup>15</sup>

Biographers narrate that Śaṅkara first went to Kāśī (Vārāṇasī), a city celebrated for learning and spirituality, and then travelled all over India, holding discussions with philosophers of different creeds. His heated debate with Maṇḍanamiśra, a philosopher of the Mīmāṃsā school, whose wife served as an arbiter, is perhaps the most interesting of the episodes reported in his biography<sup>16</sup> and may reflect a historical fact: keen conflict between Śaṅkara, who regarded the knowledge of *Brahman* as the only means to final release, and the Mīmāṃsā school, which emphasized the performance of ordained duty and the Vedic rituals, and to which belonged eminent philosophers such as Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, Prabhākara, and Maṇḍanamiśra. It is traditionally believed that Kumārila was Śaṅkara's senior contemporary and that Prabhākara was

Kumārila's pupil, though he later established the Prabhākara school in opposition to his teacher.<sup>17</sup> Maṇḍanamīśra was another contemporary who held Advaitic views different from Śaṅkara's. It has been remarked that "during the age of Śaṅkara and for some centuries following it, Maṇḍana's authority on questions relating to Advaita was recognized to be at least as high and important as that of Śaṅkara himself."<sup>18</sup>

Śaṅkara would not teach his doctrine to city dwellers. In cities the power of Buddhism was still strong, though already declining, and Jainism prevailed among the merchants and manufacturers. Popular Hinduism occupied the minds of ordinary people while city dwellers pursued ease and pleasure. There were also hedonists in cities,<sup>19</sup> and it was difficult for Śaṅkara to communicate Vedānta philosophy to these people. Consequently he propagated his teachings chiefly among *saṃnyāsins*, who had renounced the world, and intellectuals in the villages, and he gradually won the respect of Brahmins and feudal lords.<sup>20</sup> He made enthusiastic efforts to restore the orthodox Brahmanical tradition, without paying attention to the *bhakti* (devotional) movement, which had made a deep impression on ordinary Hindus in his age.

It is very likely that Śaṅkara had many pupils, but we know only four from their writings: Padmapāda, Sureśvara, Toṭaka (or Troṭaka), and Hastāmalaka.<sup>21</sup> Padmapāda wrote a commentary on Śaṅkara's commentary on the first four *sūtras* (aphorisms) of the *Brahmasūtra*, called *Pañcapādikā*, on which in the middle of the tenth century A.D.<sup>22</sup> Prakāśātman composed a commentary entitled *Pañcapādikāvivaraṇa*. The Vivaraṇa school which Padmapāda started was the most influential among the later Advaitins until it was overshadowed by the Bhāmatī school. Sureśvara is known as the commentator on Śaṅkara's commentaries on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* and the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*. His independent work *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* is "intended to reiterate the views embodied in the *Upadeśasāhasrī*" of Śaṅkara.<sup>23</sup> Toṭaka and Hastāmalaka are the authors of the *Śrutisārasamuddharaṇa* and the *Hastāmalakaślokāḥ*, respectively, but their influence upon the development of the Advaita Vedānta seems to be negligible.

It is also traditionally believed that Śaṅkara founded four monasteries (*maṭha*), at Śrīgeri (Śrīgerimaṭha, South), Purī

(Govardhanamaṭha, East), Dvārakā (Śāradāmaṭha, West), and Badarīnātha (Jyotirmaṭha, North). The most important of the four is the one at Śṛṅgeri in Mysore Province. In founding monasteries he was probably inspired by the Buddhist *vihāra* (monastery) system.<sup>24</sup> In any case, the monasteries must have played a significant role in the development of his teachings into the leading philosophy of India.

More than three hundred works—commentaries, expositions, and poetry—are attributed to him.<sup>25</sup> Most of them are not accepted as authentic.<sup>26</sup> His masterpiece is the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, the commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*, which is the fundamental text of the Vedānta school. In fact, we should define Śāṅkara as the author of the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, and use it as the yardstick against which to measure the authenticity of other works ascribed to him.<sup>27</sup> Śāṅkara also wrote commentaries on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Chāndogya*, *Aitareya*, *Taittirīya*, *Kena*,<sup>28</sup> *Īśā*, *Kaṭha*, *Muṇḍaka*, *Praśna*, and *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*.<sup>29</sup> Those commentaries are probably all genuine, but the commentary on the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, which is traditionally ascribed to him, may be spurious.<sup>30</sup> The commentaries on the *Gauḍapādīyakārikā* and the *Adhyātmapaṭala* of *Āpastamba-Dharmasūtra* seem to have been written by Śāṅkara himself.<sup>31</sup> As I have already mentioned, he is probably the author of the *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa*.<sup>32</sup> These works are all commentaries on one or another text. The *Upadeśasāhasrī*, which is translated here, is the only non-commentarial work whose authenticity has been conclusively demonstrated.<sup>33</sup>

Penetrating insight, analytical skill, and lucid style characterize Śāṅkara's works. He cannot be called a particularly original philosopher,<sup>34</sup> but it has to be remembered that in India it is not originality but fidelity to tradition which is the great virtue. He was an excellent exegete, with an approach to truth which was psychological and religious rather than philosophical.<sup>35</sup> He was really not so much a philosopher as a pre-eminent religious leader and a most successful religious teacher. His works show him to have been not only versed in the orthodox Brahmanical traditions but also well acquainted with Mahāyāna Buddhism, so much so that he was often criticized as a "crypto-Buddhist" (*pracchannabauddha*) by his opponents because of the similarity between his doctrine and Buddhism. Against this criticism, it

should be noted that he made full use of his knowledge of Buddhism to attack Buddhist doctrines vigorously, or to assimilate them into his own Vedāntic nondualism, and he made great exertions to “revedanticize” the Vedānta philosophy, which had been made extremely Buddhistic by his predecessors. The basic structure of his philosophy is nearer to Sāṃkhya, a philosophic system of nontheistic dualism, and to the Yoga school, than to Buddhism.

It is said that Śaṅkara died at Kedārnātha in the Himalayas. The Advaita Vedānta school he founded has always been pre-eminent in the learned circles of India. His doctrine has been the source from which the main currents of modern Indian thought are derived.

### Notes to Introduction, I

<sup>1</sup> For example, (1) Anantānandagiri, *Guruvijaya*; (2) Ānandagiri, *Śaṅkaravijaya* [ed. by Jayanārāyaṇa Tarkapañcāna. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1868; ed. by Pandit Jibananda Vidyasagara. Calcutta: Sarasudhanidhi Press, 1881]; (3) Govindanātha, *Śaṅkarācāryacarita* [Trichur: The Kerala Publishing House, 1926]; (4) Cit-sukhācārya, *Bṛhatśaṅkaravijaya*; (5) Cidvilāsa, *Śaṅkaravijayavilāsa*; (6) Parameśvara, *Ācāryavijayacampū*; (7) Rājacūḍāmaṇidikṣita, *Śaṅkarābhūdya*; (8) Vallisahāya, *Śaṅkaravijaya*; (9) Vidyāśaṅkara, *Śaṅkaravijaya*; (10) Vidvadbālakakāśilakṣmaṇa Śāstri, *Guruvamśakāvya* [Śrīraṅgam: Śrī Vāṇi Vilās Press, n.d.]; (11) Vyāsācala, *Śaṅkaravijaya*; (12) Sadānanda, *Śaṅkaravijayasāra*; (13) Sadāśivabrahmendra, *Gururatnamālā*; and (14) Sarvajña Sadāśivabodha, *Punyaślokamañjarī*, and its *Parīśiṣṭa* by Ātmabodha.

<sup>2</sup> Editions: (1) Bombay: Gaṅpat Kṛṣṇājī's Press, 1864; (2) Ānadāśrama Sanskrit Series, vol. 22 (Poona), 1891; (3) Hardvār: Śrī Śravaṇanātha Jñānamandir, 1943 — this edition contains a Hindi translation by P. Baladeva Upādhyāya; and (4) Sringeri: The Sringeri Matha, 1956. The first chapter of the *Śaṅkaravijaya* was translated into German by P. Deussen in his *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*, I, 3 (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1908), pp. 181–189.

<sup>3</sup> *Indian Antiquary*, XI (1882), pp. 174–175.

<sup>4</sup> Nakamura I, pp. 63–121. In opposition to this view K. K. Raja published an article, “On the Date of Śaṅkarācārya and Allied Problems,” in the *Adyar Library Bulletin* (vol. XXIV, pts. 3–4, 1960, pp. 125–148) suggesting that the works of Śaṅkara were composed toward the close of the eighth century. P. Hacher places him before or around 700 A.D. (*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 59, 1964, p. 235–236). Cf. Giuseppe Morichini's review of Nakamura's book, *East and West*, 1960, pp. 33–39.

<sup>5</sup> *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. CCXLIII (1955), no. 2, pp. 249–251.

<sup>6</sup> *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 3 (1954), p. 292, n. 2.

<sup>7</sup> The Nambūdiris are the only original Brahmins of Kerala, whose origins cannot be traced back outside Kerala. Even today they form a unique community among the many kinds of Brahmins in India, preserving some of the ancient Vedic and early

post-Vedic traditions and rites which are extinct elsewhere. It is of interest to note that insofar as they adhered to any philosophical system at all, it was to the Bhāṭṭa school of Pūrva Mīmāṃsā, which Śaṅkara severely attacked in his works. It is said that Advaita was adopted by many Nambūdiris only after having become quite popular in other parts of India. See J. F. Staal, "Notes on Some Brahmin Communities of South India," *Art and Letters, India, Pakistan, Ceylon*, vol. XXXII (1958), no. 1, pp. 1-7.

<sup>8</sup> At present there is a walled enclosure overlooking the ghat in Kālaḍi which contains sites known traditionally as Śaṅkara's birthplace, the place where his house stood, and the place on which the remains of his mother were cremated. This compound also contains two shrines, the Śāradā and the Śaṅkara, and a *pāṭhaśālā* which offers instruction in *Veda* and *Vedānta* in a traditional way.

<sup>9</sup> Nakamura III, p. 244.

<sup>10</sup> Tradition has it that Govinda was the author of the commentaries on the Chānd. Up., *Devatākāṇḍa*, and BS, though they are not extant. He is also reported to have written the *Yogatārāvalī*, which is unpublished. See M. Raṅgācārya, *The Sarva-Siddhānta-Saṅgraha of Śaṅkarācārya* (Madras: Government Press, 1909), p. viii; Nakamura III, pp. 244-247.

<sup>11</sup> In his paper (*Adyar Library Bulletin*, vol. XXIV, pts. 3-4, pp. 125-148) K. K. Raja assigns Gauḍapāda to the fifth century A.D. and denies the tradition that makes him a *paramaguru* of Śaṅkara, interpreting the Sanskrit term as "supreme preceptor" instead of the more usual "teacher's teacher." See T.M.P. Mahadevan, *Gauḍapāda: A Study in Early Advaita* (Madras: University of Madras, 1960), pp. 15-16. Nakamura, on the other hand, regards him as an editor of the *Kārikā* rather than its author and accepts the tradition that he was Śaṅkara's teacher's teacher. See Nakamura III, pp. 589-602.

<sup>12</sup> See Introduction, II, p. 13. The *Gauḍapādiyakārikā* is also called *Māṇḍūkyakārikā*, *Māṇḍūkyopaniṣatkārikā*, and *Āgamaśāstra* (cf. Nakamura III, pp. 520-523).

<sup>13</sup> See Nakamura III, p. 531; P. Hacker, "Relations of Early Advaitins to Vaiṣṇavism," WZKSO, vol. IX (1965), pp. 147-154. This may be related to the fact that Śaṅkara pays the highest regard to the BhG among the non-Vedic texts (see S. Mayeda, "The Authenticity of the Upadeśasāhasri Ascribed to Śaṅkara," *JASOS*, vol. 85, No. 2, 1965, pp. 187-188; Mayeda Upad, p. 44). It should be noted here that a large percentage of the present Nambūdiris (see note 7) have Nārāyaṇa for their individual name, that the name Nārāyaṇa is very sacred to them, and that the most famous temple of Kerala is the Guruvāyur temple where Kṛṣṇa is worshipped and whose priests are drawn only from particular Nambūdiri families. Cf. J. F. Staal, *Art and Letters, India, Pakistan*, vol. XXXII (1958), no. 1, p. 5.

<sup>14</sup> See note 32, below, and Introduction, III, B, note 63, pp. 64-65.

<sup>15</sup> See P. Hacker, "Śaṅkara der Yogin und Śaṅkara der Advaitin," WZKSO, vol. XII-XIII (1968/1969), p. 119-148. It may, however, be necessary to reexamine his opinion. Cf. H. Nakamura, "Notes to Śaṅkara's *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa* [I]" (*Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. XXV, no. 1, 1976, p. 77).

<sup>16</sup> Mādhava, *Śaṅkaradigvijaya* VIII. Cf. T.M.P. Mahadevan, *Homage to Śaṅkara* (Jayanti Series no. 4. Madras: Ganesh and Co., 1959), pp. 18-23. Tradition says that Maṇḍanamīśra, converted to the Vedānta, was named Sureśvara by Śaṅkara. This tradition seems to be baseless, though the question may have not yet been settled. See M. Hiriyanna, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1923), pp. 259-263; (1924), pp. 96-97; M. Hiriyanna, *The Naiṣkarmya-Siddhi of Sureśvarācārya with the Candrikā of Jñānottama* (Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series no. XXXVIII. Bom-

bay, 1925), p. xxxii; S. Kuppaswami Sastri, *The Brahmasiddhi by Ācārya Maṅḍanamīśra with Commentary by Śaṅkhaṇḍī, Edited with Introduction, Appendices and Indexes* (Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Series no. 4. Madras, 1937), pp. xxiv f.; Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya, *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. VII (1931), pp. 301–308; Amarnath Roy, *ibid.*, vol. VII (1931), p. 632; J. M. Van Boetzelear, *Sureśvara's Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣyavārtikam* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), p. 1.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. S. Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. I (Cambridge, 1951), pp. 370–372.

<sup>18</sup> K. K. Raja, "On the Date of Śaṅkarācārya and Allied Problems," pp. 142–143. Cf. S. Kuppaswami Sastri, *The Brahmasiddhi*, p. lix; L. Schmithausen, *Maṅḍanamīśra's Vibhramavivekaḥ mit einer Studie zur Entwicklung der indischen Irrtumlehre* (Wien: Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1965); Tilmann Vetter, *Maṅḍanamīśra's Brahmasiddhi, Brahmakāṇḍaḥ, Übersetzung, Einleitung und Anmerkungen* (Wien: Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1969); M. Biarreau, *La philosophie de Maṅḍana Mīśra vue à partir de la Brahmasiddhi* (Publications de l'École française d'extrême-Orient vol. LXXXVI. Paris, 1969).

<sup>19</sup> H. Nakamura, "Śaṅkara Tetsugaku no Rekishiteki Shakaiteki Tachiba," *Dr. Hakuji Ui's Felicitation Volume* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1951), p. 361.

<sup>20</sup> See Upad II, 1, 2 and its notes 3 and 6.

<sup>21</sup> P. Hacker, *Unters.*

<sup>22</sup> See K. Cammann, *Das System des Advaita nach der Lehre Prakāśātman's* (Münchener Indologische Studies Bd 4. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965), pp. 4–8.

<sup>23</sup> M. Hiriyanna, *The Naiṣkarmya-Siddhi of Sureśvarācārya*, p. viii.

<sup>24</sup> P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II, Pt. II (Government Oriental Series Class-B, No. 6. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1941), p. 907; K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *A History of South India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 417.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Th. Aufrecht, *Catalogus Catalogorum*, 3 vols. Leipzig, 1891–1903.

<sup>26</sup> In India it has been a common practice to lend a book authenticity by attributing it to a famous author. Besides, all the heads (*Ḥagadguru*) of the Śrṅgerimaṭha have had the title Śaṅkarācārya, and any literary or philosophical work written by any of these heads could be legitimately called a work of Śaṅkarācārya. Cf. K. K. Raja, *Adyar Library Bulletin* (vol. XXIV, pts. 3–4), pp. 127–128. It is thus not easy to decide which works were really written by our Śaṅkara. P. Hacker pointed out that Śaṅkara's contemporaries had styled him Bhagavat, Bhagavatpāda, and Bhagavatpūjyapāda and that the BSBh is invariably ascribed to Śaṅkara-Bhagavat, -Bhagavatpāda, or -Bhagavatpūjyapāda in the colophons. From this fact he concluded that "we are entitled to regard provisionally as genuine those works that are described in their colophons as productions of the Bhagavat, whereas all the works that are usually attributed to Śaṅkara-Ācārya in the colophons are suspicious of being spurious" (P. Hacker, "Śaṅkarācārya and Śaṅkarabhagavatpāda," *New Indian Antiquary*, vol. IX, 1947, pp. 182–183). He applied this method and concluded that all the commentaries on the *Prasthānatrayī* are genuine. But he denied the authenticity of the *Śvetāśvataraopaniṣadbhāṣya* in its present form. Cf. P. Hacker, *WZKSO*, vol. XII-XIII (1968/1969), p. 147.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Mayeda Upad, p. 22.

<sup>28</sup> There are two commentaries on the *Kenopaniṣad* which are ascribed to one and the same author, Śaṅkara; one is entitled *Padabhāṣya* and the other *Vākyabhāṣya*. Both of them seem to be genuine. See S. Mayeda, "On Śaṅkara's Authorship of the Kenopaniṣadbhāṣya," *Indo-Iranian Journal*, vol. X (1967), no. 1, pp. 33–55.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. S. Mayeda, "On the Author of the Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad- and the Gauḍapādīya- Bhāṣya," *Professor V. Raghavan's Felicitation Volume, Adyar Library Bulletin*, vols. 31-32 (1967-68), pp. 73-94.

<sup>30</sup> See note 26, p. 9; Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series No. 9 (1918), pp. [1]-[2]; S. Mayeda, "Nārāyaṇa's Kenopaniṣaddīpikā," *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, vol. XX (1972), no. 2, p. 97.

<sup>31</sup> See note 29 and P. Hacker, WZKSO, Vol. XII-XIII (1968/1969), S. 147.

<sup>32</sup> T. Chandrasekharan (ed.), *Pātañjalayogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇam* (Madras Government Oriental Series no. XCIV. Madras, 1952). On Śaṅkara's authorship of this *Vivaraṇa*, see Introduction, III, B, note 63, pp. 64-65.

<sup>33</sup> Mayeda Upad, pp. 22-64. There are many other non-commentarial works ascribed to Śaṅkara but their authenticity is very doubtful. For example, the following works do not seem to be authentic, though they are widely accepted as Śaṅkara's works: (1) The *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*—see D. H. H. Ingalls, "The Study of Śaṅkarācārya," *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, vol. XXXIII (1952), p. 7; S. Mayeda, "Śaṅkara's Upadeśasāhasrī: Its Present Form," *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, vol. XV (1966), nos. 3-4, p. 252, footnote 3; (2) The *Saundaryalaharī*—see W. Norman Brown, *The Saundaryalaharī, or Flood of Beauty traditionally ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya* (Harvard Oriental Series 43. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 25-30; (3) The *Sarvasiddhāntasaṅgraha*—see P. Hacker, *New Indian Antiquary*, vol. IX (1947), pp. 184-185; (4) *Vākyavṛtti* and *Laghuvākyavṛtti*—see S. Mayeda, "On the Vākyavṛtti," *Professor H. Nakamura's Felicitation Volume* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1973), pp. 57-69.

<sup>34</sup> Nakamura IV, pp. 420-437. Taking up ideas which have generally been regarded as characteristic of Śaṅkara's teachings, Nakamura has shown that each of those had already been expressed by some of his predecessors and that Śaṅkara himself was not the originator.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Eigen, p. 256; D. H. H. Ingalls, "Śaṅkara on the Question: Whose Is Avidyā?" *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 3 (1953), no. 4, p. 72.