

even local scarcity of the Oil-sardine shoals. Even *Noctiluca* is not free from being accidentally eaten by fish, for recently on 30-7-'42, a specimen of *Leiognathus splendens* examined here had *Noctiluca* in its stomach.

The explanation for the absence of fish-eggs in the stomach contents of the Oil-sardine and the Mackerel may be very simple after all, if one investigates the presence or absence of fish-eggs in the area. If the sea off Travancore is not a breeding-ground for fishes in general during the period when the shoals of these two fishes appear there, then it would be unreasonable to expect fish-eggs in their food. The sea opposite West Hill abounds in fish-eggs during certain months when the Oil-sardine and the Mackerel appear.

K. CHIDAMBARAM.

West Hill,
August 22, 1942.

¹ John and Menon, *Current Science*, 1942, 11, 243.

² Dr. Devanesan, *Ibid.*, 1942, 4, 142.

³ Gilchrist, *Marine Biological Reports* (Union of S. Africa), 1914, No. 2.

It is not our intention to criticise or dispute the observations made by Dr. Devanesan. From Mr. Chidambaram's note it is evident that the inhibitory influence of *Trichodesmium* on fishes is a phenomenon which has been observed in the West Hill Biological Station also. Citing Gilchrist he says that this phenomenon is due more to its (*Trichodesmium*) occasional profusion than to its unpalatable qualities. In our previous note it was pointed out that large patches of *Trichodesmium* appear in the in-shore waters of this coast at irregular intervals during December to April. When it occurs it does so in great numbers. During other months it is absent from the plankton. It is therefore natural that *Trichodesmium* occurs very rarely in the gut contents of the fishes of this coast. Mr. Chidambaram does not give any information regarding the seasonal distribution of the

alga in the Calicut waters. A comparison of its seasonal variations in the two regions might explain the far too great frequency of this alga in the gut contents of the mackerels and other fishes of the Calicut coast.

Mr. Chidambaram observes that the absence of fish-eggs in the dietary of the Oil-sardine and mackerel can be explained "if one investigates the presence or absence of fish-eggs in the area". Our investigations have shown that fish-eggs are a common feature of the plankton of this coast during the mackerel and sardine seasons. So Mr. Chidambaram's hypothesis does not explain the absence of fish-eggs in the dietary of the Oil-sardines and mackerels of this coast.

C. C. JOHN.

M. A. S. MENON.

Marine Biological Laboratory,
Shankummughom, Trivandrum,
September 15, 1942.

STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY

I THANK the reviewer for the generally appreciative tone of his review of my book "Studies in Philosophy", appearing in the July 1942 issue of *Current Science*. But it is my duty to offer a few words to correct certain misapprehensions that may be caused by some of his critical remarks.

1. Dr. Sarma objects to my characterisation of Dvaita as a species of Concrete Idealism.... I would only say that in my considered opinion that phrase 'Concrete Idealism' is less misleading than Dr. Sarma's Radical Realism. Ontological idealism is quite consistent with epistemological realism. Idealism is protean in its forms. Parmenides, Plotinus, Kant and others belong to one type. But Hegel, Lotze, Pringle, Pattison, Sir Henry Jones and others belong to another. Dvaita resembles the latter in essential respects. Further, Dr. Sarma's critical note on terminology is rather misleading regarding the point and scope of my

chapter on the Notion of Difference. My treatment is devoted entirely to an exposition of the realist answer of Dvaita to the idealist denial of the existential status of difference by Advaita. I expect my readers to estimate the value of the Dvaita answer to the Advaita critique of difference. My characterising phrase of Dvaita as concrete idealism may be dropped without affecting the value of the discussion.

2. Dr. Sarma considers the analogy that I have drawn between Bradley's doctrine of "My Station and Its Duties" and the Gita account of "Swadharmā" a case of doubtful parallelism. Perfect parallels are impossible, but vital resemblance is possible and is really exemplified here. There is nothing in the Gita to preclude the possibility of "Peons and Prime Ministers" with salaries from converting their daily humdrum occupation into a medium of self-realisation, provided they go about it in the spirit of self-dedication. There is no gulf between special religious ritual and secular vocation as media of attainment.

I must add that these comparative studies of mine have no motive other than the pursuit of truth. They may or may not contribute to the rapprochement of East and West. People with identical views may entertain feelings of mortal enmity with each other.

However, it is gratifying that my humble efforts should remind Dr. Sarma of Hegel's philosophic equanimity in time of war and of India's eternal quest in cultural endeavour.

M. A. VENKATA RAO.

Bangalore,
August 18, 1942.

..... I made it perfectly clear in my review that while Dvaita is not at all idealism, its description as "concrete idealism" must be a distortion. My stand has always been, whatever is connoted by Sankara's idealism, that is refuted by Madhva's realism. Thus, Sankara's being radical idealism or absolute idealism, Madhva's must be absolute or radical realism. Madhva's is all-round realism—ontological, psychological, epistemological, *et hoc*.

..... From Bradley to Sankara it is indeed a far, far cry. Having decried all activity, Sankara offers a constructive substitute in knowledge. Bradley does nothing like that. The gulf between the two in this respect is unbridgeable. The Gita ideal of Swadharmā is strictly based on realisation of instrumentality in the hands of Divine Agency. Bradley makes no such theistic appeal. Viewed from whatever standpoint, parallelisms between Bradley and Sankara must be far-fetched and strained and doubtful.

Indian philosophy must stand on its own merits quite apart from the fact of its acceptance by the West. Thus comparative studies should always be based on real, and rational parallelisms. They have an end in view. That may be correct interpretation of Eastern thought to the West. I have always held that doubtful or superficial parallelisms defeat their own purpose.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA.

Madras,

September 6, 1942.

[Owing to the necessity to economize space, we have had to omit some passages from both the letters. But no passage, material to the subject has been omitted.—ED., C.S.]