

Reviews.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

A LECTURE ON THE CHRISTIAN AND HINDU DOCTRINES OF CREATION, by CH. VENKATACHALAM PANTULU GARU, Masulipatam, 1889.—This is an attempt to prove that the world was made out of nothing by a personal God, and that this theory is a much more reasonable supposition than those on which Hindu philosophy is founded. The author proclaims himself on the cover a Christian convert.

WAS SWEDENBORG A THEOSOPHIST, by J. L. WILLIAMS, published by JAMES SPEERS, London, 1889.—This little fifty four-page, 12mo. is an attempt to disprove the thesis that Swedenborg was a Theosophist. It is clearly and forcibly written, and the writer is evidently very well up in his Swedenborg. He does not seem to be as well informed about Theosophy, however, and so long as he remains so fanatical an adherent as he evidently is of Swedenborg as interpreted by himself it is probable he will be mentally unable to do justice to any other system, however much he may desire to be impartial.

A HAND-BOOK OF TEMPERANCE. Edited and published by a Member of the Calcutta Band of Hope: Calcutta, 1889.—As its name implies, this little book gives a mass of information about the temperance movement and the evils of drink. It is written in Bengali, and will no doubt do much good among those who are ignorant of the English language.

THE ASTRAL LIGHT, by Nizida Theosophical Pub. Co. Lim. London, 1889, half 8vo, p. 181.—Nizida is a well known contributor to Theosophical and Spiritualistic periodicals, and being clairvoyante, is entitled to speak with some authority on the subject of the astral world. In this little treatise Nizida does not give us a description of that world, but goes in for philosophizing, as the subtitle of the work indicates: "An Attempted Exposition of Certain Occult Principles in Nature with some Remarks upon Modern Spiritism."

ADDRESSES DELIVERED BEFORE THE LONDON SPIRITUALIST ALLIANCE during the years 1884 to 1888. Published by the authority of the Council. Demi 8vo, London, 1889.—These addresses are reprinted from *Light* and form a valuable contribution to the *Light* literature of Spiritualism,—there being always a suspicion of after-dinner speechiness in addresses of this kind,—a flavour of self-congratulation and mutual admiration which, however serious the subject and able the speakers, seems somehow to warrant the application of the name "light literature" to them. We cordially recommend this little book to those who wish to know the leading ideas of some of the leading minds in modern Spiritualism.

CAN IT BE LOVE? by WM. C. ELTON SERJEANT; London. Theos. Pub. Co. Lim. 1689, pp. 79.—This is not a novel, but a little treatise on a big subject, as its subtitle indicates: "A Suggestive Enquiry into the Nature of Something, which the World admits yet cannot recognize; being a Legacy from the Living to the Dying." The author writes vigorously always, and, as a rule, gives the reader more paradoxes to the page than any other writer we know of, which is a great point in his favour for those who delight in getting into a state of spirituo-intellectual obfuscation. LOVE, of course, is the "Something" which underlies the whole creation, and accounts for all the pain, misery, callousness and carnage we everywhere behold.

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. XI. No. 125.—FEBRUARY 1890.

सत्यात् नस्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

TEARING OFF THE "SHEEP'S CLOTHING."*

A WESLEYAN publication, entitled *The Ceylon Friend*, published in Colombo, contains an article in its issue for November 1889, entitled "What is the object of the Theosophical Society?" in which are some misconceptions, more mis-statements, and a general amount of unfairness, that show

"The rarity
Of Christian Charity,"

when the missionary thinks he can stab an opponent in the back.

The writer says that, as one of the objects for which the Theosophical Society was founded, is to form a nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color, "the founder of this Society must be either remarkably ignorant of the world's history or remarkably audacious." Again, he says:—"The ideas of the unity of the human race and the equality of all men spring up in the train of Christianity; and grow stronger as the teaching of Christ is more widely known and more fully obeyed." And again, that the founder of the Theosophical Society "must be aware that the ground is occupied," here speaking of forming a society for the purpose of securing a fuller feeling of brotherhood.

* This powerful defence of our position was sent to the Editor in the shape of a letter, headed: "The Theosophical Society and the *Ceylon Friend*." We have taken the liberty of altering the title to a more general one, and inserting the communication as an article. Were the Rev. Triggs and the *Ceylon Friend* considered in any other light than as pegs upon which to hang an argument, they would appear to have an importance which they by no means possess. Dealt with in a "Letter to the Editor," they would assume that importance; whereas, their names occurring in an article, as samples of their class, leaves their obvious insignificance undisturbed. Moreover the intrinsic merit of the article fully warrants its promotion from the "Correspondence" to the "Text."—Ed.

Let us examine Christianity in some of its fraternal workings, and for this purpose take, not the statements of its enemies, but the testimony of its friends. The *New York Sun* is a Christian paper, owned and edited by a Christian, and it thus holds forth:—"And yet one Church Society is erecting a cathedral to cost seven millions of dollars. The Rev. Doctor Dix, pastor of Trinity Church, receives dollars 20,000 per year for preaching the gospel. His Church Society owns several millions of dollars worth of brick blocks and other business property. A few years ago when this Lewes organized his Female Temperance Crusade, it was found that forty saloons and gambling dens were renting Trinity Church property, and this property was all exempt from taxation. Forty thousand women at the point of starvation must embrace vice, apply for charity or starve! What are such 'Christians' as Rev. Dix doing to help those girls? Not much we fear."

Elizabeth Stuart Phelps (a Christian) writes in the *Forum* of May 1889 (a Christian periodical) as follows:—"Bigotry may be called the ecclesiastical vice, as worldliness in the personal one of the Christian cultus. Shelley and Leigh Hunt, talking together in their light, literary way, made this memorable concession to Christianity: 'What might not this religion do, if it relied on charity, not on creed?' The worst of it is that the progress of time which, after all, does something for most of us in most respects, does not seem to have advanced us radically in this..... There is no doubt that young men of the finer education and most original disposition of thought are warned out of our pulpits to-day by the theological torture chamber through which a virile conscience must pass before the authority of his Church is laid upon the longing soul, yearning to preach the gospel of love to men. Robert Ingersoll is the direct descendant of the Westminster Catechism. 'Brethren,' cried Cromwell to the framers of that moral rack, 'I beseech you in the bowels of the Lord, believe it possible you may be mistaken.' Sexton Williams has let fly a fiery winged truth; and the girl reporter who found herself welcomed by only five New York Churches, although employed in the service of the newspapers rather than the Lord, has put her shabbily gloved finger upon the spot where the tuberculosis of our religious system sets in."

A short time since, a Mr. Wishard, an emissary of the Young Men's Christian Association of America, visited Ceylon and was gushed and slabbered over in the most fraternal Christian manner. Did he tell his hearers and admirers that in that same Young Men's Association in America a negro Christian was not admitted to membership? Not he! Yet such is the fact. Did he tell his brothers in the Lord that if a negro, no matter what his position, his intellectual or moral status, went into any white Christian Church in America, he would be relegated to an obscure or back seat, amongst the charity crowd, if admitted at all? Not he. Yet, again, I am stating a fact well known to every church-goer in that country.

During the year 1889 the Diocesan Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of South Carolina met in Charleston, S. C.

There was present one regularly ordained negro clergyman, present by virtue of his position. The white clergyman and lay delegates absolutely refused to sit in the convention with him and left the Church in a body.

In Nashville, Tennessee, a Baptist minister named Graves published a book in which he proved from the Bible that the negro was a soulless animal. It was on the Christian Bible that the curse of human slavery was founded, and for years upheld in that country until wiped out with a nation's blood. It is also a fact to which I challenge truthful contradiction, that in no Christian Church in a former slave state in America will a negro be permitted to partake of the sacramental wine from the same cup with white Christians, nor will any white Christian go to a negro Church and partake with its members.

Says the Rev. De Witt Talmage, an orthodox Christian minister:—"Unless the Church of Jesus-Christ rises up, proves the friend of the people as well as the friend of God, and in sympathy with the great masses, who with their families at their backs are fighting this battle for bread, the Church as at present organized will become a defunct institution."

So far we have not as yet found any very conclusive evidence of fraternal affection that would be considered overwhelming; but perhaps we will fare better in Christian England.

From a private letter quoted in a late number of *Lucifer*, the following extract is taken:—"A lady brought me yesterday a big hamper of wild flowers. I thought some of my East End family had a better right to it than I, and so I took it down to a very poor school in Whitechapel this morning. You should have seen the pallid little faces brighten! Thence I went to pay for some dinners at a little cookshop for some children. It was in a back street, narrow, full of jostling people; stench indescribable, from fish, meat and other comestibles, all reeking in a sun that, in Whitechapel, festers instead of purifying. Indescribable meat pies at 1d., loathsome lumps of 'food,' and swarms of flies; a very altar of Beelzebub! All about, babies on the prowl for scraps; one, with the face of an angel, gathering up cherry-stones as a light and nutritious form of diet."

Is it unfair to suggest that but little Christian brotherhood exists where a "Whitechapel" can hold its sway?

From the *Women's Union Journal* we take the following list of prices paid for women's work in London:—

Making paper bags—4½d. to 5½d. a thousand; earn from 5s. to 9s. a week.

Making knapsacks—3½d. each; average 10s. a week.

Buttonholes (various deponents)—¼d. for seven; 6d. for twenty-four; 3½d. a dozen; 3½d. for three dozen in shirts; makes 8s. a week.

Shirts—2d. each and find own cotton; can get six a day done from 6 A. M. to 11 P. M.

Button-maker (girl of 16)—2s. for 100 gross, lathe-work with chest.

Book-folding—2½d. per gross.

Sack sewing—6*d.* for 25 ; 8*d.* to 1*s.* 6*d.* per 100 ; 6*d.* per dozen (smaller size) ; makes 1*s.* to 1*s.* 6*d.* per day, 7*s.* per week.

Carpet bag making—8*s.* a week.

Pill box making—1*s.* for 36 gross, can make 1*s.* 3*d.* per day.

Cork branding—6*s.* a week.

Tobacco spinner—7*s.* a week.

Shirt finishing—3*d.* to 4*d.* a dozen.

Whip making—1*s.* a dozen ; can do 1 doz. a day.*

If this is a sample of the brotherhood of man which permeates a Christian country, the less of it the better. A protest we see is now being made in the Australian papers that the brothels of other countries are being recruited there ;—perhaps it is this particular phase of Christian brotherhood that Mr. Triggs refers to in his diatribe.

"It's not the rents I look to," said the undertaker landlord of a wretched tenement block in London to Octavia Hill, "it's the deaths I get out of the houses."

In the last October number of the *Edinburgh Review* is an article on Africa. Full justice is done therein to the horrible situation of affairs, the slave-trade being rendered possible by the guns and ammunition supplied to the Arabs by Christian governments and agents ; and it is but a few weeks since that a Bishop of the Church of England said in a public discourse that all that was known of Christianity in that benighted country was that it was indissolubly connected with whiskey.

In "England's War," p. 491, by J. A. Froude, we read :—"There was a time when drunkenness was as rare in England as it is now in France or Spain. A hundred millions a year are now spent among us upon wine and spirits and malt liquor, five-sixths of it perhaps by the working-men upon stuff called beer and gin. The artizan or the journeyman, exhausted by the gas-poisoned air with which his lungs are loaded, and shrinking, when his day's work is over, from the stifling chamber which is all that society can afford as lodging for him and his family, turns aside as he goes home to the pot-house or the gin-palace. His watered beer is raised to double strength again by nux-vomica and *Cocculus Indicus*, and salted to make his thirst insatiable. His gin is yet some viler mixture—a minimum of pure spirit seasoned with white vitriol and oil of cinnamon and cayenne. Drunk, and with empty pockets, he staggers home at last to his wife, who must feed and clothe herself and him and his miserable family with the few shillings which she can reserve out of his weekly wages. She too often enough grows desperate and takes to drinking also. The result is that half the children born in England die before they are five years old. It is found that the milk supplied to the London Workhouse for the pauper children is shamefully watered. An honorable member speaks of it in the House of Commons as an 'exposure' and calls for an enquiry. Mr. Stansfield, speaking for the Ministry, complains of 'exposure' as too hard a word, and denies that watered milk

* Our Indian readers must remember that owing to the great expense of the poorest kind of living in England, these sums represent, perhaps, one-third of their exchange value in Rupees,—spent for the necessaries of a worker's life here.—*Ed.*

is adulterated, because water is not a deleterious substance. It is true that pure milk is to children a necessary of life, and those who are not supplied with it die. Such a death, however, is of course *natural*, and the parish is relieved of the expense."

As a specimen of the brotherly love that always follows the spread of Christianity, the foregoing extracts are recommended to Mr. Triggs. Or perhaps the following, being more in his professional line, will prove acceptable in a greater degree.

"The Trinitarian denounces the Unitarian and the Unitarian the Trinitarian : and both unite in condemning the Roman Catholic.

"The Armenians donounce the Calvinist's views as a system consisting of human creatures without liberty, doctrine without sense, faith without reason, and a God without mercy. (*Archdeacon Jortin*).

"The Calvinists, on the other hand, represent Armenianism as 'delusive, dangerous, and ruinous to immortal souls,' (*Close's Sermons*) and the Unitarians declare them both 'to be a mischievous compound of impiety and idolatry.' (*Discourse on Priestly*).

"Again Archbishop Magee denounces the Unitarian system as embracing the most daring impieties that ever disgraced the name of Christianity ; and declares, that 'if Unitarianism be well-founded, Christianity must be an imposture.'

"All sects join in denouncing the Wesleyans, 'as misled fanatics, alienated from all knowledge of the true God.' (*Divine Truth*).

"The Church of England denounces the whole body of dissenters 'as accursed, devoted to the devil, and separated from Christ,' (*Canon V., vii*) and the Bishop of London (*Letters on Dissent*) 'declared the dissenters to be actuated by the devil, with the curse of God resting heavily on them all.'

"The dissenters are not slow in retaliating on the Church of England, declaring it to be 'an obstacle to the progress of truth, and that its end is most devoutly to be wished for by every lover of God and man !' (*Christian Observer*).

"The Roman Catholics declare their Church to be 'the only true one,' and all other sects join in denouncing her to be 'the scarlet whore of Babylon,' and a 'combination of idolatry, blasphemy and devilism.' (*Cun's 'Apostacy'*). Whilst the Roman Catholics retort on the whole body of Protestants of every sect and description, consign them to eternal damnation as heretics and schismatics, and their clergy, designated as 'thieves and ministers of the devil.' (*Rheims, Test.*)"

Mr. Triggs certainly believes in the inspiration of the Bible. Will he tell us what he thinks of the 109th Psalm as a specimen of fraternal love ? Looking carefully and impartially at the foregoing *facts*, we will certainly not be deemed captious if we decline to have anything to do with such specimens of fraternal affection, or the source from which they sprang. If this is all the Christian Church can show as the result of over eighteen centuries of work in this field, it is neither "audacious" to try and supplement it, nor do we think it unfraternal to condemn it as a most lamentable failure. But no matter whether a failure or a success, the writer's assertion that the field is occupied and that no one

outside the Christian pale has any right to organize in favour of, or practise, brotherly love, is certainly most extraordinary and may well cause us serious thought.

Mr. Triggs tells us that on opening a copy of the *Theosophist* he saw some "Information to strangers" which he read; and then goes on to say "we read it 'is necessary to keep the idea of the Brotherhood of Man mentally indistinct. It is as a diffused sentiment only that the idea of Brotherhood can by any possibility penetrate the dark and distant places the world of to-day.'" Now it is but a fair inference that the above quotation is taken from the "Information to strangers," which Mr. Triggs declares he was seeking, but on an examination of the Journal in question, I find it taken from an article in the body of the Magazine. In the "information" we do read:—"The *Theosophist* is private property, but under the Revised Rules it is the organ of the Society for the publication of official news. *For anything else the Society is not responsible.*" (The italics are mine.—C. F. P.).

Instead of stating this, Mr. Triggs, with a disingenuousness unworthy of one who is speaking in the name of fraternal love, leaves his readers to infer that his quotation is an official utterance.

So far as the writer of this article is concerned, he believes that the idea of the Brotherhood of Man should be kept mentally distinct; as for its sentiment being diffused,—he believes that the more and farther it is diffused the better for mankind. Every member of the T. S. is bound by virtue of his membership to assist in its diffusion as far as lies in his power or ability to do so; if he fails to do so, he fails in just so much of doing his duty.

As a good sample of special pleading we offer the following morceau:—"Give up the central belief in a Creator and we become nothing more than mere mechanical results of the out-working of blind natural forces—chance products. Where then is the ground for brotherhood?"

The writer does not believe in Mr. Triggs' "Creation" nor in "special providences," nor yet in "blind natural forces." It is possible to be godly though godless. Disbelief in a personal god does not necessitate belief in "blind nature forces."

The Deity the writer believes in "is neither in a paradise nor in a particular tree, building nor mountain: it is everywhere, in every atom of the visible as of the invisible Cosmos, in, over, and around every invisible atom and divisible molecule; for IT is the mysterious power of evolution and involution, the omnipresent, omnipotent and even omniscient creative potentiality." (See "Key to Theosophy," pp. 61, *et seq.*). Believing then that the "Universe and all therein are one with the absolute Unity, the unknowable deific essence," from which all that is has emanated, and with which all is therefore indissolubly united, he thinks in all humility that his belief offers a more legitimate and far safer foundation on which to rear an organization for the diffusion of brotherly love than what Mr. Triggs offers. Nay, it is the only one.

The history of the Christian Church has been one long sickening record of rapine and bloodshed,—for the love of God (!); and if the sentiments recently expressed in the *Ceylon Friend* are those

held by Mr. Triggs and his confrères, surely the Wesleyan Missionaries in Ceylon must regret their inability to inaugurate the reign of steel and faggot there to-day.

No! the field is *not* occupied by Christianity now, or by any other creed; nor will Mr. Triggs' claim to a special patent on "brotherhood" be conceded by any one—least of all by the Theosophical Society. There can never be too many organizations for the diffusion of that sentiment, "audacious" though it may seem, nor can its diffusion be confined to any close corporation.

Such a brotherhood would *not* be a true one, nor universal; those qualities alone being found in an organization, whether the Theosophist Society or any other—that embraces all mankind without any distinction whatever of race, nation, creed, sex or color. With such an aim and keeping *mentally distinct* the motto of our Society, THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH, we can go on serenely conscious that the machinations and mis-representations of all the world, especially of the genus Triggs, can never prevail against it.

As for the founders of the Theosophical Society, any defence on my part would be an impertinence; but for their representatives, Col. Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, I would say to this missionary that the record of their connection with the Theosophical Society has been an unbroken one of continual self-sacrifice for others, of a self-abnegation and self-forgetfulness for the weal of their brother men, that might have deterred anyone not totally oblivious of moral heroism from trying to slander and belittle them. "Truth is mighty and shall prevail." If the clergy were possessed of that spirit of divine charity which they would have us believe the special property of their creed, and of which they should be a channel as ministers of the gospel, they could much better show it by trying to do justice to the motives of those whose every breath is drawn in the interests of others,—who believe in Altruism as the one truth, and who try humbly, earnestly, and faithfully, to make it the guide of their lives.

CHARLES FRANCIS POWELL, F. T. S.

SARVASARO-UPANISHAD¹ OF KRISHNA-YAJUR-VEDA.

Translated by the Kumbakonam T. S.

(N. B.—In the original all the questions are given together first and then all the answers. But the following arrangement is adopted to facilitate reference.)

(1) Q. **W**HAT is the nature of Bhandā (bondage)?

A. The Atma falsely perceiving the body and others which are not Atma to be itself and identifying itself with them—this identification forms the bondage of Atma.

(2) Q. What is Moksha (emancipation)?

A. The freedom from it (bondage) is Moksha.

(3) Q. What is Avidya (ne-science)?

A. That which causes this identification is Avidya.

(4) Q. What is Vidya (knowledge)?

(1.) This Upanishad will form a glossary of some of the Vedantic terms.

A. That which removes this identification is Vidya.

(5) Q. What are (meant by) the states of Jāgrata (waking), Swapna (dreaming), and Sushupti (dreamless sleep)?

A. Jāgrata is that (state) during which (the Atma) enjoys the gross objects of sense, as sound, &c., through the 14 organs,¹ manas, &c., (mind) which have sun, &c., as their devatas (presiding deities)² and which are without defect.

Swapna is that (state) during which (the Atma) experiences through the 14 organs—which carry with them the (Jāgrata) waking affinities—the perceptions of sound, &c., which arise at that moment from their former affinities, though the objects of sense, such as sound, &c., do not then exist.

The Atma experiences Sushupti when it does not experience sound and other objects of sense from the cessation of the functions of the 14 organs—and from the absence of these there being no special enjoying consciousness.

Thurya is that state during which the Atma is a witness to the existence or non-existence of the above-mentioned three states, though it is in itself without these three states, and during which it is one uninterrupted Chaitanya (consciousness). And that Chaitanya (consciousness) is that (state) which is connected with the three states, which can be inferred from the three states, which is without the three states, and which is pure.

(6) Q. What are Annamaya, Pranamaya, Manomaya, Vignanamaya and Anandamaya sheaths?

A. Annamaya sheath is the aggregate of the materials formed by food.

When the ten vayus (vital airs), Prana and others, flow through the Annamaya sheath, then (it) is called the Pranamaya sheath.

When the Atma connected with the above two sheaths performs the (involuntary) functions of hearing, &c., and the (voluntary) ones of thought, &c., through the 14 organs of Manas (mind) and others, then it is called Manomaya sheath.

When in the Antakarnah (the internal organ, mind, and the other three) connected with the above sheaths, there arise acts of meditation, contemplation, &c., about the peculiarities of the sheaths, then it is called Vignanamaya sheath.

When Gyana (wisdom), which is the cause of Agnyana (non-wisdom), which in its turn is the cause of the four sheaths—lies latent in the bliss of its own form like the banyan tree in its seed, then it is called Anandamaya sheath.

The Atma, which is associated with the Upadhi (vehicle) of these sheaths, is spoken of by a figure of speech as sheath (kosa).

(7) Q. What is meant by Kartha (doer), Jiva, Panahavarga (the five groups), Kshetrayagna (the lord of body or Universe), Sākshi (witness), Kutastha and Anthuyami (the hidden)?

A. The Kartha (doer) is one who, having acquired the idea of pleasure and pain, possesses the body and Antakarnahs (internal

(1.) The 14 organs are the five organs of sense, the five organs of action and four Antahkaranas (the internal organs), viz., Manas, Buddhi, Chitta and Abankara.

(2.) All these organs are each animated by an intellectual principle called the Devatas, which know how to perform their own function only.

organs) to gratify the desires proceeding therefrom. The idea of pleasure is that modification of the mind known as desire. The idea of pain is that modification of the mind known as dislike. The causes of feeling pleasure and pain are sound, touch, form, taste and odour.

The Jiva is that Adhiasi (viz., one who thinks this body to be Atma or self) who thinks this (his) body which is obtained through the effects of good and bad karmas as one not obtained by him through such means.

The five groups are Manas (mind), &c., (viz., Manas, Buddhi, Chitta and Ahankara, which create respectively uncertainty, certainty, fitting thought and egoism); Prana, &c., (viz., the five vital airs, Prana, Apana, Vyana, Udana and Samana); Satwa, &c. (viz., Satwa, Rajas and Thamo qualities); the (five) Elements (viz., earth, water, fire, air and akas); and the virtue and its opposite. That which is endowed with the properties of these five groups, which does not perish without Atmagyana (Atmic wisdom), which appears eternal through the presence (or influence) of Atma, and which is the vehicle (for the manifestation) of Atma, is called the original Avidya (nonbeing) and is the seed of the Linga (subtle) body. This only is called Hridaya-ghranthi (lit: heart-knot). The Chaitanya (consciousness) which is reflected and shines in it is Kshetra-Yagna.

Sakshi (witness) is that conscious one who knows the appearance and disappearance (of the three states) of the knower, the knowledge and the knowable, who is himself without (or not affected by) this appearance or disappearance and who is self-radiant.

Kūtastha is he who is found animating without exception the mind of all creatures from Brahma down to the ants, who is the Atma, which is the seat of the Sakshi (witness) of all (creatures') mind, and who is shining.

Anthiryami is the Atma that shines, as the ordainer, being within in all bodies like threads strung successively in rows of beads and serving the purpose of knowing the cause of the several differences in Kūtastha and others who live with him.

8. Who is Pratyagatma (the individual Atma)?

A. It is of the nature of truth, wisdom, eternity and bliss. It has no vehicles of body. It is abstract wisdom itself; like a mass of pure gold which is devoid of the changes of bracelet, crown, &c. It is of the nature of Chit (consciousness). It is that which shines as Chaitaniya (atmic-consciousness) and Brahm. This Pratyagatma is subject to the Upadhi (vehicle) of Avidya¹, is the meaning of the word Thwam (thus in "Thatwamasi" or That art thou).

9. Who is Paramatma (the higher one)?

A. It is that which has the attributes of truth, wisdom, eternity, bliss, omniscience, &c., which is subject to the vehicle of Maya² and which is the meaning of Thath (that in Thatwamasi).

10. What is Brahm?

A. That which free from all kinds of vehicles, which is the Absolute Consciousness itself, which is Sat (beingness), which is without a second, which is bliss and which is maya-less is Brahm. It is

(1 and 2.) Both terms mean the highest matter; but Avidya forms the particles of man, whereas Maya those of the universe.

different from what is meant by the word Thwam, which is subject to Upadhis. It is also different from what is meant by the word Thath, which is subject to varieties of Upadhis. It is (of itself) differenceless and appears as the source of every thing. It is the pure, the true and the indestructible. And what is (this) truth? It is the Sat (be-ness) which is the aim (or goal) pointed out by the Vedas. It is that which cannot be said to be Asath (non-be-ness). It is that which is not affected by the three periods of time. It is that which continues to exist during the three periods of time. It is that which is. It is that which is one without a second. It is that which has none similar or dis-similar to it. It is that which is the seat (or source) of all creation. It is that which does not perish, even though space, time, matter and cause perish.

And what is Gyana (wisdom)? It is self-light or illumination. It is that which illuminates everything. It is that Absolute Consciousness which is without any concealment. It is that Consciousness which has no beginning or end, which is perpetual, which is without modifications, and which is a witness to all modifications.

And what is Ananta (the eternal)? It is that which is without origin or destruction. It is that which is not subject to the six modifications (viz., birth, growth, manhood, decay, old-age and death.) It is free from all Upadhis. It is that Consciousness which, being all full and without destruction, permeates Avyakta and other evolved universe, like the earth in the modifications of clay, the gold in the modifications of gold, and thread in the modifications of thread.

And what is (Ananda) bliss? It is that which is the receptacle to all happy sentient beings like the ocean to the waters (of rivers), which is eternal, pure, without parts and non-dual and which is the sole-essence of Chidananda (bliss belonging to consciousness).

11. Of how many kinds are substances?

There are three kinds, Sat (Be-ness), Asat (Non-be-ness) and Mythia (Illusory).

What is Sat? It is Brahm.

What is Asat? It is that which is not.

What is Mythia? It is the illusory ascription to Brahm of the universe that does not exist really.

What is fit to be known? It is Brahm the Atma.

What is Brahma Gyana (Brahmic wisdom)? It is the rooting out of all—bodies and such like—that are non-Atma and the absorption in Brahm which is Sat.

What is non-Atma? It is the universe which includes Jiva, Akas and others.

12. What is Maya?

A. The root of this non-Atma is Maya. She appears in Brahm as clouds, &c., do in the sky. She has no beginning, but she has end. She is common to evidence and non-evidence. She is neither Sat nor Asat; nor is she a combination of both (Sat—Asat). She is indescribable. She does not exist in Brahm, which is the seat of the varieties of differences as extolled by the wise. It is she that does not truly exist. Her nature is non-wisdom (Agyana). She

appears as Mulaprakriti,¹ Gunasamyā (a state when the three Gunas are found in equilibrium), Avidya (Ne-science) and other forms. She has transformed herself into the form of the universe. A Brahm-knower knows her thus and enjoys her.

With reference to this subject there are the following slokas.

“I am not body. I am not the Indryas (organs). I am not Buddhi. I am not Manas. I am not Esa (Lord). Nor am I Ahankara (Egoism). I am not one that has Prana (breath) or Manas, I am full of light. I am always witness to Buddhi and others. I am indestructible at all times. I am (Chith) consciousness alone. I am always beneficent. I am not the doer nor the enjoyer. I am in the form of witness to Prakriti (matter). On account of my presence alone, do the bodies and others perform their function as if they were not inanimate. I am the firm, the eternal, the ever-blissful, the pure, of the nature of wisdom and stainless. I am the Atma of all bhutas (elements or beings). I pervade everywhere. I am the witness. There is no doubt (about this). I alone am the Brahm that is to be known through all the Vedantas. I am not the form—that can be known,—of Akas, Vayu, &c. I am not form. I am not name. I am not Karma. I am the Brahm that is of the nature of Sachithananda (Be-ness, consciousness and bliss). I have no body; and whence (then) are birth and death to me. I am not Ahankara (Egoism); whence then are hunger and thirst to me. I am not Manas, and whence then are grief and delusion to me. I am not the doer; and whence then are bondage and salvation to me.” Thus did the invisible voice speak the truth to the sages. Yea, thus did the invisible voice speak the truth to the sages.—Such is the Upanishad.

“INFIDEL BOB.”

(Concluded from page 193.)

IN presenting this last instalment from Colonel Ingersoll's Lectures of the quotations which tend to prove that he is deeply tinged with the Theosophic spirit, it may be well to say that no purposed attempt has been made to give a reader, unacquainted with his writings, the least idea of his inimitable wit or powerful logic. Those passages only that bear upon the theme in hand were chosen, and of these but samples have been given. It may be said that many passages of an opposite character might be culled from Colonel Ingersoll's Lectures; and, to a certain extent, that is true. But, anyone conversant with his writings, has no difficulty in separating his real ideas, spoken from his heart, from the arguments put forward in the heat of controversy; and it is to the latter category that almost all his “untheosophical” utterances belong. Like most controversialists Colonel Ingersoll frequently uses the best weapon available at the moment for the purpose of disabling his

(1.) This refers to that slumbering state of the universe—called also Maha-Sushupti—between the cessation of and the reawakening into activity of the universe. In this state all the Jivas are absorbed with their Karmic affinities into Mulaprakriti. On the reawakening into activity, it (Mulaprakriti) is called Maya, Avidya and Thamasi, which also differ in themselves.

adversary, and yields to the temptation to "answer a fool according to his folly." When, therefore, we find him speaking of Spirit and of God in a manner that may seem to us, who are dwelling in the quiet of a philosophic mind, to be somewhat undignified or even flippant, we must remember that it is not *our* idea of these things, or even his own idea, that he is characterizing, but the distorted and insignificant notions concerning them which are put forward by his opponents. Colonel Ingersoll calls himself an Agnostic; and an Agnostic in the meaning in which he uses the term is simply one who says, "I do not know,"—and does not mean, as some writers have represented, one who declares "I will never know," or "Man can never know." In the former sense Theosophists are necessarily Agnostics,—like everyone else who is not so grossly and conceitedly ignorant as to imagine he has fathomed the unfathomable. But even when doing his best to pose before us as an Agnostic (? *Anglice*, Ignoramus?) Ingersoll cannot help being Theosophical. Could anything be more so than what he says of modern controversy in his recent article in the *North American Review*, entitled: "Why I am an Agnostic"? He says:—

"In the discussion of theological or religious questions we have almost passed the personal phase, and are now weighing arguments instead of exchanging epithets and curses. They who really seek for truth must be the best of friends. Each knows that his desire can never take the place of fact, and that next to finding truth, the greatest honor must be won in honest search."

Again, in the same article, he confesses that, Agnostic as he is, he is "forced to the conclusion"—several conclusions—which, if they be not purely *gnostic* and Theosophical, no conclusions ever were. Hear him:—

"My mind is so that it is forced to the conclusion that substance is eternal; that the universe was without beginning and will be without end; that it is one eternal existence; that relations are transient and evanescent; that organisms are produced and vanish; that forms change—but that the substance of things is from eternity to eternity. It may be that planets are born and die, that constellations will fade from the infinite space, that countless suns will be quenched—but the substance will remain."

Were Colonel Ingersoll to pursue his own ideas, as here stated, a little farther, he would find himself *volens volens* a Theosophist. What is that "substance" which remains when worlds and suns vanish from space, but Mulaprakriti? What is the "one eternal existence" but Parabrahm? He has only to remember his own dictum that *everything lives*—that, in fact, the "one eternal existence" is life itself,—to see that if material nature is dissolved and disappears, while "substance" still remains, the material universe does not fade *from* space but *into* Space; and there we have a Manwantera and its succeeding Pralaya. His is not the mind to limit eternity to one day and one night, however long, or to deny that universes, like "organisms," must necessarily be "produced, and vanish," in endless series.

It is when the question is asked: How, and by what means, all things, great and small, are produced? that Colonel Ingersoll is

truly agnostic; and who indeed is not so, in presence of that tremendous mystery? Some may trace cause and effect a little further back than others do, and follow them up on other "planes" of being, or fancy that they do so; but all must quickly come to the limits of their mental powers, beyond which the mind staggers, and all is darkness and mystery; to give a name to which unknown and unthinkable "something which is not anything" in no way helps us to comprehend it or its modes of action. We Theosophists see the Great Mystery not only *beyond* but *within* everything; "each grain of sand, each leaf, each blade of grass" has for us an unfathomable depth, a meaning which, eluding us, escapes into infinity. So these have also for Colonel Ingersoll; and few Theosophists will refuse to say "Amen" to the concluding paragraphs of his article:—

"Let us be honest with ourselves. In the presence of countless mysteries; standing beneath the boundless heaven, sown thick with constellations; knowing that each grain of sand, each leaf, each blade of grass, asks of every mind the answerless question; knowing that the simplest thing defies solution; feeling that we deal with the superficial and the relative, and that we are forever eluded by the real and absolute,—let us admit the limitations of our minds, and let us have the courage and the candour to say: We do not know."

He agrees with Epicurus that Virtue is the means and happiness the End:—

To me Epicurus seems far greater than Aristotle. He had clearer vision. His cheek was closer to the breast of Nature, and he planted his philosophy nearer to the bed-rock of fact. He was practical enough to know that virtue is the means and happiness the end: that the highest philosophy is the art of living. He was wise enough to say that nothing is of the slightest value to man that does not increase or preserve his well-being, and he was great enough to know and courageous enough to declare that all the gods and ghosts were monstrous phantoms born of ignorance and fear.¹⁰

Each religion is fitted for the time it is born:—

Man has produced every religion in the world. And why? Because each religion bodes forth the knowledge and the belief of the people at the time it was made, and in no book is there any knowledge found, except that of the people who wrote it. In no book is there found any knowledge except that of the time in which it was written.¹¹

He states the true nature of unbelief:—

The truth is, that what you call unbelief is only a higher and holier faith.¹⁰

The world's religious ideas are improving:—

We are making religions to-day. That is to say, we are changing them, and the religion of to-day is not the religion of one

year ago. What changed it? Science has done it; education and the growing heart of man has done it. And just to the extent that we become civilised ourselves, will we improve the religion of our fathers. If the religion of one hundred years ago, compared with the religion of to-day, is so low, what will it be in one thousand years?¹¹

Our ideals become nobler as our minds expand :—

As man advances—as his intellect enlarges, as his knowledge increases, as his ideals become nobler, the Bibles and creeds will lose their authority—the miraculous will be classed with the impossible, and the idea of special providence will be discarded. Thousands of religions have perished, innumerable gods have died, and why should the religion of our time be exempt from the common fate?¹⁰

Devotion to a religion is not man's true object :—

We deny that religion is the end or object of this life.

When it is so considered it becomes destructive of happiness—the real end of life. It becomes a hydra-headed monster, reaching in terrible coils from the heavens, and thrusting its thousand fangs into the bleeding, quivering hearts of men. It devours their substance, builds palaces for God (who dwells not in temples made with hands), and allows his children to die in huts and hovels. It fills the earth with mourning, heaven with hatred, the present with fear, and all the future with despair.³⁰

In reality Religion is the highest science :—

What is religion? Religion simply embraces the duty of man to man. Religion is simply the science of human duty and the duty of man to man—that is what it is. It is the highest science of all. And all other sciences are as nothing, except as they contribute to the happiness of man. The science of religion is the highest of all, embracing all others.¹⁷

He tells us what he thinks the religion of the future will be :—

We are laying the foundations of a grand temple of the future—not the temple of the gods, but of all the people—wherein, with appropriate rites, will be celebrated the religion of Humanity. We are doing what little we can to hasten the coming of the day when society shall cease producing millionaires and mendicants—gorged indolence and famished industry—truth in rags, and superstition robed and crowned.²⁹

In another place he says :—

That which is founded upon slavery, and fear, and ignorance, cannot endure. In the religion of the future there will be men and women and children, all the aspirations of the soul, and all the tender humanities of the heart.⁴

Sympathy is the true basis of Morality :—

After all, sympathy is genius. A man who really sympathises with another understands him. A man who sympathises with a religion instantly sees the good that is in it, and the man who

sympathises with the right, sees the evil that a creed contains.

Sympathy is the mother of Conscience :—

The idea of right and wrong is born of man's capacity to enjoy and suffer. If man could not suffer, if he could not inflict injury upon his fellow, if he could neither feel nor inflict pain, the idea of right and wrong never could have entered his brain. But for this, the word conscience never would have passed the lips of man.

He declares what are the real good and the real evil :—

There is one good—happiness. There is but one sin—selfishness. All law should be for the preservation of the one and the destruction of the other.⁴

We can be happy only by making others happy :—

Now, then, as I say, if you want to be happy yourself, if you are truly civilised, you want others to be happy. Every man ought, to the extent of his ability, to increase the happiness of mankind, for the reason that that will increase his own. No one can be really prosperous unless those with whom he lives share the sunshine and the joy.³

Were men unselfish this world would be a paradise :—

Ah! What a beautiful religion humanitarianism and charity might become! To do so sweet a thing as to love our neighbours as we love ourselves; to strive to attain to as perfect a spirit as a Golden Rule would bring us into; to make virtue lovely by living it, grandly and nobly and patiently, the outgrowth of a brotherhood not possible in this world where men are living away from themselves, and trampling justice and mercy and forgiveness under their feet!²

He tells us what is true success :—

Let us teach our children that the happy man is the successful man, and he who is a happy man is the one who always tries to make someone else happy.¹⁷

In what true worship consists :—

The only God that man can know is the aggregate of all beings capable of suffering and of joy within the reach of his influence. To increase the happiness of such beings is to worship the only God that man can know.³¹

The Brahmin's prayer :—

There is a prayer which every Brahmin prays, in which he declares that he will never enter into a final state of bliss alone, but that everywhere he will strive for universal redemption; that never will he leave the world of sin and sorrow, but remain suffering and striving and sorrowing after universal salvation.¹¹

Religion is not a theory—it is life :—

There is no religion but goodness, but justice, but charity. Religion is not theory—it is life. It is not intellectual conviction—it is divine humanity, and nothing else. There is another tale from the Hindu of a man who refused to enter Paradise without a faithful dog, urging that ingratitude was the blackest of all sins. "And

the god," he said, "admitted him, dog and all." Compare that religion with the orthodox tenets of the city of New York.¹¹

Doing—not believing—is the important thing :—

Virtue is a subordination of the passions to the intellect. It is to act in accordance with your highest convictions. It does not consist in believing, but in doing.³⁰

The religion of Christ has been smothered by dogmas :—

As the philosophy of the ancients was rendered almost worthless by the credulity of the common people, so the proverbs of Christ, his religion of forgiveness, his creed of kindness, were lost in the mist of miracle and the darkness of superstition.²¹

Dogmatic Christianity has killed the religion of Jesus :—

The morality in Christianity has never opposed the freedom of thought. It has never put, nor tended to put, a chain on a human mind, nor a manacle on a human limb; but the doctrines distinctively Christian—the necessity of believing a certain thing; the idea that eternal punishment awaited him who failed to believe; the idea that the innocent can suffer for the guilty—these things have opposed, and for a thousand years substantially destroyed, the freedom of the human mind. All religions have, with ceremony, magic, and mystery, deformed, darkened, and corrupted the soul. Around the sturdy oaks of morality have grown and clung the parasitic, poisonous vines of the miraculous and monstrous.²²

True Religion is the child of Freethought :—

True religion must be free; without liberty the brain is a dungeon and the mind the convict. True religion is the perfume of the free and grateful air. True religion is the subordination of the passions to the intellect.⁴

Civilization consists in the subordination of passion :—

What is passion? There are certain desires, swift thrilling, that quicken the action of the heart—desires that fill the brain with blood, with fire and flame—desires that bear the same relation to judgment that storms and waves bear to the compass on a ship. Is passion necessarily produced? Is there an adequate cause for every effect? Can you by any possibility think of an effect without a cause, and can you by any possibility think of an effect that is not a cause, or can you think of a cause that is not an effect? Is not the history of real civilisation the slow and gradual emancipation of the intellect, of the judgment, from the mastery of passion? Is not that man civilised whose reason sits the crowned monarch of his brain—whose passions are his servants?²³

He describes the inner or astral world :—

The dark continent of motive and desire has never been explored. In the brain, that wondrous world with one inhabitant, there are recesses dim and dark, treacherous sands, and dangerous shores, where seeming sirens tempt and fade; streams that rise in unknown lands from hidden springs, strange seas with ebb and flow of tides, resistless billows urged by storms of flame, profound and awful

depths hidden by mist of dreams, obscure and phantom realms where vague and fearful things are half revealed, jungles where passion's tigers crouch, and skies of cloud and blue where fancies fly with painted wings that dazzle and mislead; and the poor sovereign of this pictured world is led by old desires and ancient hates, and stained by crimes of many vanished years, and pushed by hands that long ago were dust, until he feels like some bewildered slave that Mockery has throned and crowned.¹⁰

Actions must be judged by their consequences :—

We know that acts are good and bad only as they affect the actors, and others. We know that from every good act good consequences flow, and that from every bad act there are only evil results. Every virtuous deed is a star in the moral firmament.²⁴

As we would reap, so must we sow :—

If a man injures his neighbour, it is not enough for him to get the forgiveness of God, but he must have the forgiveness of his neighbour. If a man puts his hand in the fire and God forgives him, his hand will smart exactly the same. You must, after all, reap what you sow. No God can give you wheat when you sow tares, and no devil can give you tares when you sow wheat.³²

Of the progeny of a crime :—

After forgiveness the crime remains, and its children, called consequences, still live.⁸

"Forgiveness" is a delusion and a snare :—

If I, by slander cover some poor girl with the leprosy of some imputed crime, and she withers away like a blighted flower, and afterward I get the forgiveness of God, how does that help her? If there is another world, we have got to settle with the people we have wronged in this. For every crime you commit you must answer to yourself, and to the one you injure. And if you have ever clothed another with woe, as with a garment of pain, you will never be quite as happy as though you had not done that thing. No forgiveness by the Gods. Eternal, inexorable, everlasting justice so far as Nature is concerned. You must reap the result of your acts. Even when forgiven by the one you have injured, it is not as though the injury had not been done.¹⁵

Nature never pardons :—

There is no law in Nature, no fact in Nature, by which the innocent can be justly punished to the end that the guilty may go free. Let it be understood once for all: Nature cannot pardon.²⁷

No God can remit the consequences of our acts :—

I insist that no God can step between an act and its natural effects. If God exists, he has nothing to do with punishment, nothing to do with reward. From certain acts flow certain consequences; these consequences increase or decrease the happiness of man; and the consequences must be borne.²⁷

Those to whom man is responsible :—

Liberty says to the man: You injure or benefit yourself; you increase or decrease your own well-being. It is a question of intelligence. You need not bow to a supposed tyrant, or to infinite goodness. You are responsible to yourself and to those you injure, and to none other.⁷

He who injures another really hurts himself :—

In a little while a man will find that he cannot steal without robbing himself. He will find that he cannot murder without assassinating his own joy. He will find that every crime is a mistake. He will find that only that man carries the cross who does wrong, and that upon the man who does right the cross turns to wings that will bear him upward for ever.¹⁵

Karma—by another name :—

There is one splendid thing in nature, and that is that men and nations must reap the consequences of their acts—reap them in this world, if they live, and in another if there be one. That man who leaves this world a bad man, a malicious man, will probably be the same man when he reaches another realm, and the man who leaves this shore good, charitable and honest, will be good, charitable and honest, no matter on what star he lives again. The world is growing sensible upon these subjects, and as we grow sensible, we grow charitable.⁵

Karma—still further explained :—

There is in the moral world, as in the physical, the absolute and perfect relation of cause and effect. For this reason, the atonement becomes an impossibility. Others may suffer by your crime, but their suffering cannot discharge you; it simply increases your guilt and adds to your burden. For this reason happiness is not a reward—it is a consequence. Suffering is not a punishment—it is a result.²¹

Falsehood is self-destructive :—

Every wrong in some way tends to abolish itself. It is hard to make a lie stand always. A lie will not fit a fact. It will only fit another lie made for the purpose. The life of a lie is simply a question of time. Nothing but truth is immortal.¹

The doctrine of endless punishment is blasphemous absurdity :—

Nothing but the most cruel ignorance, the most heartless superstition, the most ignorant theology, ever imagined that the few days of human life spent here, surrounded by mists and clouds of darkness, blown over life's sea by storms and tempests of passion, fixed for all eternity the condition of the human race. If this doctrine be true, this life is but a net, in which Jehovah catches souls for hell.²¹

What happens when Belief is considered necessary for salvation :—

The idea that a certain belief is necessary to salvation unsheathed the swords and lighted the faggots of persecution. As long as

heaven is the reward of creed instead of deed, just so long will every orthodox church be a bastille, every member a prisoner, and every priest a turnkey.²¹

Crime and error are but incidents in man's development :—

Is there not room for a better, for a higher philosophy? After all, is it not possible that we may find that everything has been necessarily produced, that all religions and superstitions, all mistakes and all crimes were simply necessities? Is it not possible that out of this perception may come not only love and pity for others, but absolute justification for the individual? May we not find that every soul has, like Mazeppa, been lashed to the wild horse of passion, or like Prometheus, to the rocks of fate?⁷

Mankind is more to be pitied than to be blamed :—

I want you to remember that everybody is as he *must* be. I want you to get out of your minds the old nonsense of "free moral agency;" then you will have charity for the whole human race. When you know that they are not responsible for their dispositions, any more than for their height; not responsible for their acts, any more than they are for their dreams; when you finally understand the philosophy that everything exists as an efficient cause, and that the lightest fancy that ever fluttered its painted wings in the horizon of hope was as necessarily produced as the planet that in its orbit wheels about the sun—when you get to understand this, I believe you will have charity for all mankind.³

We are brothers in weakness, as in strength :—

The truth is, we are both good and bad. The worst are capable of some good deeds, and the best are capable of bad. The lowest can rise, and the highest may fall.²

"Let us be friends :—

I propose good fellowship—good friends all round. No matter what we believe, shake hands, and say, "Let it go; that is your opinion; this is mine: let us be friends." Science makes friends; religion, superstition, makes enemies. They say, belief is important; I say, no; actions are important; judge by deeds, not by creeds. Good fellowship.^{15*}

* The numbers attached to the quotations refer to the following Lectures, some of which are now out of print. 2. Breaking the Fetters. 3. Social Salvation. 4. Ghosts. 5. Defence of Freethought. 8. God and Man. 10. Answer to Gladstone. 11. Divine Vivisection. 15. What must we do to be saved? 17. Skulls. 21. Is all the Bible inspired? 29. Gods. 30. Apotheosis of Thomas Paine. 32. The Christian Religion.

THE GODDESS OF WEALTH.

THE world has ever been trying to read the riddle of the inequality of human life. Inquiring man has always attempted, and does even now attempt, to formulate an answer to the interesting problem, *Why are some men richer than others?* One points to chance. Another raises his ignorant finger towards an unintelligible God. A third finds fault with idleness, want of perseverance, and so forth. A fourth reminds us with all pomp of wisdom, of the universal laws of 'the struggle for existence,' and 'the survival of the fittest.'

Now, chance is a synonym for ignorance pure and simple. God is an excuse for ignorance. The plea of idleness and want of perseverance is an indication of ignorance and want of observation. The laws of the struggle for existence, and survival of the fittest, appear to be little more than learned hypotheses, without any clear indications of the mode in which they work out the inequality of human life in the department under discussion.

There are men and women who work to their utmost and yet cannot secure a decent competence. There are others who, with the best will, and with a very respectable power to work, find absolutely no work to do. To bring against all and every one of them the sweeping charge of idleness and wickedness would be extremely unphilosophical. It would be more. It would be an indication of the most wretched cruelty, or, at least, of gross and culpable ignorance. The majority of those men and women, who, with the best will to work, find absolutely no work, or who, with a very respectable amount of work, cannot secure a decent competence, are from virtue's point of view the very best of human beings.

There appears to be no reason why many a bright, pure and healthy man and woman should die out in the brutal struggle for existence, to give more room on earth to as many dark, impure and unhealthy human beings who happen to be rich. To expect that the strong and the healthy should die out because they are poor, is to ignore the multifariousness of human nature. The poor are seen to live very long lives, and poverty has not yet ceased to exist after a world-old struggle for existence with wealth.

Modern philosophy gives us no satisfactory solution of the problem. It does not even attempt to locate the causes of wealth and poverty. The ancient philosopher with his gods and goddesses, and his recognition of a functioning universe behind the phenomenal, was more keen-sighted. Let us see how he solved the problem in India.

The sun, as I tried to explain in my 'Thoughts on the Prasnop-nishat,' is not only the source of our heat and cold, but as well that of wealth and poverty. He is the centre of the macrocosmic life-principle of that portion of space over which his influence extends. Every point, every portion, large or small, of the shining disc is a complete picture of the whole. The whole is a Figure,—inasmuch as it gives form to the living organisms of earth. That figure is not, strictly speaking, that of a man or beast or any particular tree. It is the figure of a something which is common to

every terrestrial form. It is the figure of a god, who, under given circumstances of Time and Space, appears in whatever shape that suits these. But since every point is a picture of the whole, the sun is in fact nothing more than a group of innumerable life-figures, all alike in general appearance, and yet all having considerable atomic differences caused by their relative positions to each other. In other words, the one great centre of our system, is a collection of innumerable atomic centres of energy, each of these differing from the other in the phase of its action. Every department of human life has thus a centre of informing energy in the Sun. Each of these centres is a god, or a goddess, or, more properly, the life-principle of a god or goddess. One group of these life-figures—these atomic centres of energy—has received the name of Lakshmi (Fortune), the goddess of wealth. She is a goddess of the very highest possible importance in human life. As the Rishi Bhargava in his ode to the Goddess says, she is the ruling principle of human life.

There is no object of man which is not rendered easy of attainment by the goddess. It is Lakshmi that gives dignity to man. It is Lakshmi that makes man respected, courted and caressed. It is Lakshmi that makes him comfortable. It is Lakshmi that covers all his faults. It is Lakshmi that helps him in becoming useful to his fellowmen. The most superficial observer of society can never deny the mighty influence which wealth exercises in human affairs. It is impossible to live without it. What this power is has only fallen to the lot of the pantheistic tatwic philosopher to discover.

In order to better explain his conclusions, I shall follow the good old rule of Indian philosophy, *Know thyself by thyself*. This is the rule which the science of Breath has by pre-eminence adopted. It has thus discovered that man thinks of wealth, longs for wealth, or comes in the possession of wealth, when in his body works a certain phase of the tejas tatwa of Prána, and when his life-principle has a generally prevailing tinge of that tatwa. It is thus evident that the power which gives us wealth is a modification of the tejas tatwa, and that it is located in our own life-principles and nowhere else. Whence does it come into our life-principles? From the fountain head of all life, the Sun. It is thus to the Sun that we trace the wealth-producing tejas tatwa of our life-principles, and thence we call this particular modification of the tejas tatwa a goddess, and find her out to be a perfect *Figure*, an ethereal being who has the inborn power of assuming whatever figure the circumstances of time and space dictate.

The Sage Bhargava in his ode to Lakshmi speaks of her as *Tejorupa*. This means that the tejas tatwa enters principally into the composition of the life-principle of the goddess, and, as shown above, the pantheist has learned this lesson from the manifestations of breath in the human body.

It is further said of the goddess that she is present in every living thing. In the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal kingdoms, she is universally present. In fact, it is her presence that gives to anything the character of wealth.

Her chief resort among metals is in gold. It is therefore that she is spoken of as having a general tinge of gold, wearing golden clothes, playing with lotuses of gold, seated upon a lotus of gold, carrying in her hands vases full of gold. It is also on the same account that the world puts the highest value upon gold. The possession of gold is the highest indication of wealth. The use of gold coinage, is the complement of a nation's wealth.

The absence of gold coinage from India shows, without even the slightest possibility of mistake, that she has angered Lakshmi, and courted the favour of her antagonist Poverty. The more has a country to pay for gold, the greater without a shadow of doubt is her poverty.

And what then is the cause of poverty? Why is the goddess of fortune sometimes so very cruelly absent from her temple in the centres of human life-principles—individual or national?

She is represented to be the loving and devoted wife of Vishnu, the great Preserver of the Purana Triad. Everything in the phenomenal world is found subject to a threefold change—creation, preservation and destruction. The sun is the great source of these changes in the kingdom of terrestrial life. What is the function of the preserving energies of the sun? To see that every created thing has the fullest and the longest possible play of its qualities, and that, above all, it is given the best opportunities to propagate itself, so that the stream of usefulness might never receive a permanent check, and that the qualities of the thing might be for ever preserved. In fact, the production of its like is the highest and the only possible preservation. It is in this way that the 'Unconquerable Preserver' does his duty, and it is in the performance of this duty that his loving and faithful consort invariably follows him. For what is wealth? It is the use of the productions of the earth, in whatever form they appear, to the utmost of one's necessities.

Who is a man of wealth, but he who does, or can, command the use of whatever he wants to the desired extent? That a man has the power of governing things so as to utilize them to the utmost of his necessities and to the utmost of their capabilities, shows that he has in him the power which in the solar macrocosm is called Vishnu, Or, to use the terminology of the Indian pantheist, the fact indicates that Vishnu has thrown his reflection into the life-principle of the man.

Here then is the secret of wealth. If you use your wealth to the utmost of its capabilities, if you *preserve* it by using it in such a way that it goes on constantly *producing its like*, or helping in the process, you give room in your life-principle to the *Great Preserver*, who is invariably followed by Lakshmi. She cannot live without her lord. The long and short of the argument is that, if a nation or any individual human being uses every earthly object that he comes in contact with, to the utmost of its capabilities, and in such a way that it might not be wasted, but produce or help in the production of other useful objects, that nation and that individual is sure to become wealthy. In other

words, he is sure to have the power of using things to the utmost of his necessities.

Learn to *preserve* a thing, and that thing will learn to preserve its connection with you.

In order to be able to *preserve* a thing, as Vishnu does by giving the fullest scope to its productive powers, the one thing that is absolutely necessary is knowledge. Unless you know what a thing is, you can never possibly give full scope to its productive powers. It is on this account that one of the names given to the goddess of fortune is *Vidya*, knowledge. The knower is the same as the preserver, and in his track come knowledge and wealth.

It is evident from the above remarks that the true worship of Vishnu is a scientific investigation into, and an intelligent utilization of, the qualities of terrestrial objects to the utmost of their productive value. Now what man or what religion is there that will deny to mankind the right of doing this sort of practical honor to this one of the most important manifestations of divine energy? The Hindu pantheists differ from others in his belief that the divine whole has in Himself distinct centres of the various energies which are seen working in the universe, and it is to these minor centres which are, so to speak, the organs of the whole, that he gives the names of gods and goddesses. In doing this he aims at the perfection of scientific analysis, and succeeds in the attempt. Who can help it, if he gives offence to beginners in theology— young or old, priests or laymen?

We have now discovered the cause of wealth. It is the presence in the life-principle, of the focussed picture of the goddess of wealth, and this is consequent upon the presence in the centres of our life of her consort the Great Preserver.

The question of the causes of wealth and poverty is now reduced to this, 'Why is Vishnu absent from some life-principles, and present in others?'

To answer this question we have to fall back upon the universal doctrine of Karma. Every action changes the colour of Prána (life-principle). When the tatwic composition of the human life-principle is in touch with the tatwic composition of Vishnu, the energy of the god is focussed in the man. The single action which produces sympathy between the microcosmic and the macrocosmic life-principles, is to follow into the steps of the Preserver in relation to wealth. If we use and utilize whatever of wealth we possess so as to give the fullest play to its productive energies, our life-principle takes in the image of the god. If, however, we waste our wealth in useless luxuries, or do not use the necessities of life to the utmost of their capabilities, our life-principle will be blind to the universally diffused rays of the Preserver. We ourselves are responsible for the present absence or presence of Vishnu and his consort in our life-principle.

I tried to show in my essays on Prána in the ninth volume of *The Theosophist*, that the greater part of the actions we do, have their effect in the next birth. The present presence or absence of Vishnu and Lakshmi is always the result of actions done in the last life. Those men and women who are groaning under poverty,

did, in the long past, all that lay in their power to waste the productive capacities of their wealth. The force they have thus generated must have its way. No amount of hard work, no amount of virtue and intellect, or even of vice, will help you, unless and until the colour intensified in your life-principle by your wasteful habits is gone. It is not to be understood by this that present habits of useful application of wealth, and careful use of the necessities of life that fall to your lot, never have any effect in the present, and that they are always postponed for centuries. As a matter of fact these good habits always show their good result in the present life, when Vishnu and Lakshmi are already present in the life-principle. And besides they always generate the same good force, to be always laid in store for the future. Let no man therefore become idle, because he is suffering for past misdeeds which must have their way. Let him always go on creating to the utmost of his powers, the antagonistic force of good deeds. As the good colour forces its entrance into the life-principle, the other hastens its exit. It is only a question of the fight of two opposite forces. The stronger wins, and while a good store is always being laid up for the future life, the present hardship is a good deal softened down. The life of a nation being long enough for the same astral combinations of time to appear again and again, the working of this law is better studied there. Thus the Hindus were very rich of old. Those were the times when they knew the nature of their gods, when they strived by good deeds to place them in the shrines of their life-centres, and not in temples of brick and mortar. They began then to spend their monies in luxuries, useless wars, and for the sake of mere show. They forgot how to *preserve* their wealth, and Vishnu consequently fled from them, and with him Lakshmi. Their future rests with themselves. Let them worship Vishnu practically and truly, and not by burning incense on the altars of stone. They will by and by drive the demon of Poverty out of the land of their fathers, and once more leave the gods free to come back to the land they loved so much of old.

RAMA PRASAD.

ELOHISTIC TEACHINGS.

IV.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL.—THE ORIGIN OF MAN.

(Continued from page 195.)

THE origin of man, with the cause of his existence, is veiled in the obscurity which enshrouds the mystery of Being.

Had the human race a beginning?

Some have ventured to doubt this, and, taking things as they find them, assume that mankind is as persistent as the earth itself—that man is co-eval with his surroundings and will endure with them; but that the immortality accruing to him in this way belongs to the race which passes through endless generations, while the individual men and women successively perish. The alternations of barbarism with civilization have even been held to countenance this view. The general coincidence of these conditions, which must be distinguished from their contrasting secular relations, shows that the one does not prevent the other, while the want of persistency in progressive advance—with the successive relapses indicated by history, affirmed by tradition, and observable in the careers of succeeding generations of individuals, families, nationalities and races—suggest that persistency of race, with instability of type and a perishing individuality, is a reasonable way of accounting for the anomalies of life.

Others, following the geological indications, claim that the earth was at one time void of life, and that from small beginnings—how initiated they admit themselves powerless to explain—it has made a gradual if intermitting advance to the present day. These affirm that conscious life, which has culminated in man, is moving onwards and upwards on this earth, and point to the recent rapid advance of human knowledge in proof of this. But so doing, while subordinating the interests of the individual to those of the race, they overlook the persistent if irregular ebb and flow of the tide of civilization, and fail to recognize that man is now on the crest of an advancing wave, the retreat of which may be nearer at hand than it is agreeable to admit. Were some great cataclysm to overwhelm the earth as in its earlier geological eras, were its continents to subside and other lands to rise from the ocean depths, What would become of our boasted civilization? During the subsidence—with all the dread phenomena which accompanied it throughout the period (possibly involving successive generations) of its occurrence—terrified man would lose every vestige of his previous slowly and painfully acquired knowledge, and those who escaped from the subsiding to the up-heaved land would have to commence a renewed career of barbarism on a new earth. The ebb of the tide here would, from its relative suddenness, be more rapid and complete than its flow, and the consequences resulting from it more widespread and enduring.

This alternate flux and reflux—under which the gains of the advancing wave are swallowed up by and disappear in its retreating successor, so that when a balance is struck the ultimate benefit to the human race must be potential rather than actual—

is very suggestive. Hence in all ages those who have reflected on the subject have been driven to the conclusion that the natural, culminating in the human, is but a developing matrix through the advancing forms of which a Something successively passes, that it may be moulded and modelled during its passage, and prepared for that real life to which the present is a prelude.

This Something, thus being acted on by the serial lives, of which the natural matrix is constituted, has been individualized as Spirit in subordinate orders of Being and is being personalized as Soul in man.

Under such a view the origin of man must be regarded as coincident with origin of life.

But even so his possible origin is twofold, and owing to this two schools of thought have grown up together, and have even alternately succeeded each other, either having only been capable of temporarily overcoming and casting out its opponent.

Of these two schools—the one, which I shall call the human, affirms the natural origin of man on the planet whereon he dwells, and denies his previous existence in an inconceivable condition apart from the earth: whereas the other, the superhuman school, assumes the pre-existence of man in another and higher, an indefinable state, and claims his descent therefrom to, and incarnation on, his present planetary abode for some mystic purpose to be attained through his successively embodied lives.

This mystic purpose has never been declared. It is a mystery, the unveiling of which would reveal the meaning of life. Now to ascertain the meaning of life by discovering its object is the aim of both schools. But if man came down as man from on high, if he is in essence one with the Most High, and if the Most High is the sum of all perfections, from which nothing can be taken away and to which nothing can be added, then is the descent of man to an imperfect state wholly unaccountable. Had it been affirmed that he descended to this imperfect state to make it perfect, or at least more perfect, then would his descent thereunto have been intelligible. But to claim that he voluntarily entered a state from which only imperfections can be gained; that he debased that state by a disgraceful fall, and still further degrades it by the uses he makes of it; and that his one desire is or should be, to be freed from it in order to regain his original perfection, and so be enabled to return to and once more become one with the Most High, is to admit that the life of man on earth is a failure, its object purposeless, its meaning unexplained.

The writings of the Elohist embody, in a more or less tangible form, the teachings of the earlier, the human school. The reinterpreting transformations and extensions of the Jehovist and his successors give expression to the doctrines of its superhuman supplanter. I shall, therefore, for greater convenience, speak of these schools as Elohist and Jehovistic, respectively—using these designations as typical representatives of the human and superhuman ways of regarding the workings of nature, since natural and mystical interpreters first came into collision.

From whatever point of view the origin of man may be considered, the inquirer should always bear in mind that actual knowledge on the subject—a knowledge whose accuracy cannot be called in question—is wholly beyond his reach. He can but theorize on the indications before him, and the ultimate outcome of his speculations must rest upon, must be—hypothesis.

The first condition of any such hypothesis is, that it should be free from any savour of absurdity; that it should offer probable grounds for its acceptance and be reasonable in its requirements. To do and to be this, it must meet and account for all the ascertainable facts and relations with which it has to deal, and harmonize its conclusions with the requirements of these.

The hypothesis of the Jehovist, as interpreted by the Kabbalists, when reduced to its simplest proportions, is grounded on the assumption of the divine origin of man—an origin which he, nevertheless, considers not incompatible with a variously interpreted fall.

But then, to explain and reconcile these inconsistent or seemingly inconsistent relations, this hypothesis assumes the Divine, to which it attributes his genesis, to have been itself evolved from the impassible and absolute Divine which is the Supreme source and fontal essence of all things, and, therefore, though still divine from the human point of view, actually something less than Divine in virtue of this evolution: so that what in the human is the manifested man, is the last in a series of descents from that which first emanated from the impassible Divine.

The impassible Divine of the Jehovist has neither characteristics nor attributes. It neither willed, desired, nor caused that first emanation which evolved the universe. And yet it is the source from which all flows—the One from which all proceeds, and to which all will eventually return.

Is emanation possible under such conditions? Only in one way. It must have been the result of unconscious and involuntary function.

The descent through this emanation is, according to the Jehovist, from the idealized transparency and formless purity of the subjective state, through what may be termed progressive condensation, to the ideal types of form in the invisible order, from which the visible order is to be derived.

These ideal types are—in virtue of the transforming influences of the idealizing evolution through which they have passed, have become—spiritual beings seeking embodiment in the further condensation and organization of the forms they have by idealization made their own. And by gaining this embodiment these spiritual beings constitute themselves the progenitors of man.

The mystery of the Fall is intimately associated with the transformation of the heavenly into the earthly man. Some of the expositors of the primary evolution of spirit affirm that, like and with the evolution itself, the Fall passed through successive phases, the first of which was the refusal of some for a time to accept the embodiment which was the natural issue of individualized and developed Spirit. But it is more usually maintained

that the first fall was that of Spirit into matter through incarnation—though how this view is to be reconciled with the assumed conditions under which it was induced is difficult to understand: and that the second was the fall of the incarnated heavenly man into sexual generation, from which proceeded the earthly and fallen man. But, when the theory of the Fall, which was of Jehovistic origin, was imposed on the subjugated Elohist school, the surviving holders of the Elohist doctrine secretly taught their concealed disciples that the actual and only fall they recognized was that of the natural man into the power of Spirit and his acceptance of the teaching of spiritualizing guides.

According to the Jehovist each human being is an embodiment of a spirit entity derived through evolution by emanation from the impassible Divine, and, therefore, though unconscious that this is the case, is in reality an incarnate god.

Under this view man is by no means the simple being he fancies himself, but a complexly organized medium of the potencies, an individualization of the principles and a personalization of the entities constituting the several orders through which he has passed to his actual state, a something from each of these having entered into and forming that of which the self consists, and endowing that self with its own faculties and powers, to be called into activity as his further evolution proceeds.

The Jehovist finds a confirmatory basis of this view in the Elohist account of the Creation, which he reads as a statement of the evolution of the invisible order and of the heavenly man by the potencies which, in their mediatized forms are to become the progenitors of the earthly man.

Passing over this misrepresenting appropriation of the Elohist narrative, with the remark, that it can but treat of evolution in the visible order, since its object is to show how, after the creation of the heavens and the earth, the atmosphere and the land are upraised from the water by the action of fire, and are then by solar action clothed with vegetable and quickened with animal life, in advancing series, till in the human the culmination of these is gained, and man and woman—the male and the female, not the male-female, man—by their advent crown the initial work; and considering the actual narrative, as though it had been really intended to denote the successive stages of an antecedent evolution of Spirit in the invisible order, with a view to its progressive involution in a materialistic medium, the occult axiom—"as above, so below"—at once determines the relations of the visible to the invisible evolution. This must follow its invisible types in the order in which these were produced, that the invisible may become progressively visible, since otherwise the involution below would not correspond with, would not be as the evolution above. And yet so little did the Jehovist regard this axiom, that in his account of the origin of the visible order he makes the advent of man precede that of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, and even leaves it to be inferred that he is the progenitor of these, according to the assertions of subsequent interpreters.

The want of accord here is so palpable that later apologists have sought to evade the difficulty by affirming that the creation of animals recorded in the Elohist, and, as they would have it, spiritual kosmogony, is that of the Zodiacal signs and other constellations, there represented as beasts; but, setting aside the fact that the names given to these were simply distinctive designations, suggestively recording, in the way of the mystery language—that is, in its name as well as the peculiarities of the animal designated—the prevailing characteristics of the order of nature, when they were respectively in astronomical ascendancy, the creation (apparition or initiation of the special functional action) of the luminaries proper to the phase of evolution then reached is stated to have been the work of the fourth day or stage thereof, and so to have preceded animal evolution, whether of the invisible or visible order.

The Jehovist's view of the method of the antecedent creation of man harmonizes with the conception of antecedency. According to it man, at first but the diffused shadow of the incarnating Spirit, passes from the cloudlike state through successive stages of condensation, consecutively gained by various processes of reproduction, until his present organization and stature are attained. These he reaches as a bisexual being, and it is not until the division of the sexes that the Fall takes place, as a fall into the natural process of generation.

While his organization was proceeding, from being single-eyed he became three-eyed and two-eyed.

In the one-eyed man spiritual and natural vision were combined.

In the three-eyed man the third eye was the organ of spiritual vision.

With the loss of spiritual vision at the Fall the third eye was absorbed and disappeared, retreated into the centre of the brain—a rather singular conclusion, by the way, since the retreat of the third eye from the disturbing influence of physical vision ought to have facilitated spiritual insight.

It would thus appear that the marvellous blindness of the Jehovist (or his interpreters) to the facts and relations with which he had to harmonize his hypothesis, is only equalled by his wonderful ignorance of the earlier Mystery Language. Had he been familiar with even the rudiments of that language, he would have been preserved from the error of attributing to the Elohist a teaching wholly at variance with the doctrine he was handing down. Had he pondered over the phenomena of nature and the progressive character of evolution, he would have realized that vision with two eyes was more perfect than, and therefore an advance upon that obtained through one—so that, if after the development of two, the original single eye remained, or recurred as a third eye in some individuals, this phenomenon should only be regarded as a *lusus natura*, and the vision of those individuals would have been less perfect in consequence of this defect; and would have learnt that the bisexual preceded the unisexual organization, because it was an order of a lower type—that the bisexed were incapable of unaided or independent volitional generation, the double sexed

union of two of the bisexed being necessary for reproduction; that the division of the sexes was a slow process, not brought about by the dividing of one into two, but by the gradual development of one set of organs and the absorption of the other; and that this was accomplished low down in the scale of being, and was completed before the higher orders were reached, though a tendency to relapse to the lower state sometimes shows itself as a degrading process. This is occasionally demonstrated, in the rare cases of so-called human hermaphroditism. These seem to have been caused in the embryonic state by a sustained attempt of the incarnating spirit to change its sex through the organization it is building up. As a consequence of this effort it finds that all it is able to do is, cause an arrest of development in one direction and a slight redevelopment in the other, and so produce a sexless being.

The grave error of the Jehovist and other inculcators of the superhuman view of the origin of man, has been that of claiming to find their doctrine in the writings of antecedent teachers, especially in such as have been widely accepted and are highly venerated. The most ancient of these scriptures have been written in some of the various forms of the long forgotten Mystery Language. They have consequently been misunderstood and misinterpreted, and have thus become capable of having some of the characteristic marks of *any* doctrine imputed to them. Owing to this the superhumanizers assume that their views are to be found in all ancient SS., and that all ancient religions are simply the exoteric shells of an esoteric kernel. But, so doing, they forget the recoil which must follow the demonstration of the inaccuracy of such a pretension in even a single instance.

The dissociation of the Elohist from the Jehovistic doctrinal formularies is very suggestive in this regard, for it shows that evidence has been claimed and testimony relied on as bearing a witness contrary to that which, under cross-examination, is actually given. This is unfortunate, for, apart from their intrinsic value, it tends to discredit doctrines which, after all, must, in the last instance, stand or fall by their own merits, and should be a warning to all inquirers to consider the reasonableness of any teaching submitted to them, apart from the source from which it may be claimed to have been derived, or the authority attributed to it by its impartor.

The Elohist is not free from the suspicion of having appropriated and misinterpreted an earlier kosmogony. He seems to have had before him a pictorial representation of the several successive phases of Creation handed down by some earlier teacher, and in his written description of the series has fallen into sundry errors. The gravest of these is the conversion of the depicted commencement of the physical, physiological and psychological action of the luminaries on the at length duly prepared earth, and advancing embodiments of life into an account of the creation of those bodies. But these defects of his kosmogony are as nothing, when compared with its great merit of being grounded on a natural basis and formulating a truly scientific hypothesis. It claims that the energy to be incarnated in man, with the elements

by operating on which the incarnation is to be accomplished, is eliminated from Space—viewed as a form of Divine Substance—by some unknown functional action, but, owing to the conditions involved, necessarily remains therein, with the simultaneously extruded elements, in a diffused state, tending to cloud the natural transparency of space. This the Jehovist has read as the emanation of that which is to become human, from the Divine; and it is through overlooking the functional character of his emanation that he has fallen into an error, the consequences of which vitiate his whole hypothesis.

The only way he has been able to find out of the error thus initiated, is that extension of his hypothesis which makes of the visible order an illusive state.

Here again he has misread and misrendered the Elohist, whose teaching was that it was an illusion to suppose that happiness was attainable in this state, and not that the state itself was illusory. Indeed, it is obvious at a glance that if the visible is a manifestation of the invisible, in whatever order or degree, it must be as real as that of which it is the manifestation. Even viewed as a veil of the Divine, it must be an actual vesture to be able to clothe that which it so effectually conceals. To suppose that the transient is itself illusory, because its transiency can be fancifully treated as illusive, is not other than a delusion.

Having been functionally eliminated from Space, the Elohist hypothesis holds that the diffused energy and elements are gathered up from the spaces in which they are diffused, by the planetary bodies—of which they are thus made basic constituents, that the pristine transparency and purity of space may be maintained—and thus obtain a primary embodiment; and then, by a series of functional changes, they are gradually brought to a state in which they can be restored to and reabsorbed by their original source, Space.

This series of functional changes constitutes evolution—as displayed in the universe, and as brought under the observation of man in the planet on which he dwells.

By the instrumentality of this evolution the energy to be incarnated in man, and the elements with which it is associated, pass functionally from the elemental state through the inorganic, the organized and the animated kingdoms, in a progressively advancing order, to the human, which it enters as a spirit.

This spirit, when duly matured, possibly only after many incarnations, is functionally converted into a soul, which, at the close of its final embodiment, enters the soul state as the divinized, the Divine human.

It thus appears that, under the earliest traceable natural view of Creation inculcated by the human school, man was held to have originated on this earth, as a germ implanted by the Central Sun, which, under the fostering influence of the Polar, the Equatorial and the visible Sun, acting on it in succession was passed, by the agency of the inorganic, the organic and the psychic cell, through the mineral, the vegetable and the animal kingdoms, into the human state.

During its passage through these kingdoms which occupied a period commensurate with the geological epochs, the developing germ, gradually adding organ to organ and member to member, prepared its advancing bodily form and fitted its simultaneously growing faculties for the crowning step in its terrestrial evolution—entry into the human.

The six successive preliminary phases of this evolution are clearly indicated and accurately defined in the Elohist Kosmogony, rightly interpreted.

Through their instrumentality the primary germ has become a matured spirit, which passes the seventh, eighth and ninth phases of its continuing evolution in a series of human incarnations, until, fully prepared by these, it enters the tenth phase, of assured happiness—the soul state, duly fitted for the enjoyment of the life of that state.

When the Elohist and the Jehovistic hypotheses are compared and contrasted, it is found that they severally deal with different aspects of kosmical function—the one wholly natural, defined by the Elohist; the other wholly spiritual, set forth by the Jehovist.

These aspects have this much in common, that their point of departure is the invisible—Space. But they differ absolutely in their methods, the Elohist describing a natural evolution of Spirit, through functional interaction with Matter, crowned by its incarnation in man; the Jehovist, a degrading involution of Spirit in Matter, to the human, or a descent of the heavenly and his manifestation as the earthly man. But then, to meet the difficulties of his hypothesis, the Jehovist affirms that the involution is illusory, whereas the Elohist maintains the evolution to be real and actual.

Following upon this the issues of the evolution and the involution are so far similar that both Elohist and Jehovist assume a return of the outcome of evolution and involution to the source from whence it proceeded. But then, according to the Elohist, the return is in the form of the divinized human, as a personal organ of the Divine, whereas the Jehovist affirms that, its personality disappearing, the spirit of man returns to, is reabsorbed by, and becomes one with its original source—so that where the Elohist sees the actual creation of personal Divine organs in which the Impersonal is personified, the Jehovist can only see a meaningless degradation of the Impersonal with a view to an ultimate return to the impersonal state.

The hypothesis of the Elohist, however, does not limit the effect of evolution to the production of the personal organs of the Impersonal. On the contrary, it affirms that this is the selected product—the human soul; and that those human spirits which fail to reach the soul state at their last incarnation, are ultimately dissolved and repass, as the regenerated elements of its substance, to the source from whence they had been originally eliminated—Space. Thus the Elohist, more far seeing than the Jehovist, includes the evolution of spirit with the evolution of man in his theory, and, by predicating the final issue of each, shows that the humanizing is higher than the spiritualizing function in the order

of nature; while the Jehovist, limiting his vision to the spiritual aspect of his subject, is blind to all that lies beyond.

Is it possible to penetrate behind the veil which conceals the conditions and relations of the soul-state? One of the fundamental principles of the secret doctrine suggest that it is, for if the occult axiom—"as above, so below"—holds good of the previous phases and states of passing life, then must the inverse reading of that axiom—"as below, so above"—hold good of this state. Hence those seeking a clue to the conditions of life in the "Above" may reasonably expect to find it by pondering on the conditions of life in the "Below" for life in the "Above," though higher in degree, can hardly differ in kind from the life of the "Below" from which by evolution it is derived.

HENRY PRATT, M. D.

THE VISIT OF APOLLONIUS TO THE MAHATMAS OF INDIA.

(Concluded from page 215.)

THE next proceeding was to install Apollonius on the Chair of King Phraotes, and then Iarchas invited him to ask any question or open any discussion he pleased. Apollonius shewed himself the sage. His first question was "Did the Mahatmas know themselves?" But Iarchas's reply was a surprise to the Greek. "We do. We know all things, simply because we first know ourselves. This is the first and elementary knowledge, without which no one can be admitted into our circle."

His next question was, "What opinion did they hold of themselves?" And was answered, "That they held themselves to be gods because they were good men." His next enquiry was about the soul. He was informed that they held the reincarnation theory of Pythagoras. This led him to ask whether like Pythagoras Iarchas could remember any previous incarnation as a Greek or Trojan warrior. Here the high priest reproved the conceit of the Greeks, in thinking the heroes of the Trojan War to be the height of perfection, to the neglect of the reverence due to better men—whether Greek, Egyptian or Indian. His last incarnation had been one Ganges, a king of the Indian people. The Æthiopians were in that day living in India and subject to him. He was ten cubits in stature and very handsome. He built many cities, repelled an invasion of the Scythians (Aryans), embanked and diverted the river Ganges so called after him. In his end he was assassinated by the subject Æthiopians, who driven by the vengeance of the Indians, as well as by the growing sterility of the earth and other causes produced by his ghost, were forced to leave their native land and wander from place to place until, satisfied with the punishment he had given them, he had allowed them to settle in the part of Africa called after them Æthiopia.*

* Is this referring to the advent of the Shepherd Kings or of the Israelites?

This discourse was interrupted by a messenger announcing that the king of the country was on his way to consult the "Prophets," and would arrive toward evening. Iarchas answered he was welcome, and that he would leave them a better man for having met their Greek guest.

He then resumed his conversation and asked Apollonius in his turn to tell something of his previous incarnation. Apollonius excused himself on the plea that it was an undistinguished one and scarcely worth recalling. "But surely," observed Iarchas, "to have been the captain of an Egyptian merchantship was not such an ignoble occupation: for I see you were that." Apollonius remarked that the profession ought to be as worthy as that of a politician or general, but sailors had degraded it by their own conduct. "Besides, my very best act in that life no one deemed worthy even of praise. In those days pirates infested the Phœnician Sea. One of their spies came to me one day when I was in harbour on the eve of starting with a rich cargo. He offered me 10,000 drachmas if I would allow them to capture my vessel. I pretended to agree, and arranged that they should remain hid on the further side of a promontory while I set sail during the night, and lay to under the promontory, so that they could fall upon me in the morning. We happened to be in a temple; so I made the pirates swear to fulfil their promises to me, and I swore to them to do as they wished. But instead of lying to, I set on all sail and so got off." And you think this a just act? remarked Iarchas. "Yes," said Apollonius, "and a humane one—I saved the life of my men and the property of my employers, and was, though a sailor, above a bribe." Iarchas smiled. "You Greeks seem to think that, if you are not actually doing wrong, you are just and virtuous. Only the other day an Egyptian was here telling about the Roman Proconsuls now-a-days; how they go out gaily to their provinces with axes and lictors and other insignia of office, but without the slightest information of the people they are going to govern, and the silly people exclaim, 'what fine governors they are: for they do not take bribes.' But your fault is due to your writers of fiction, they cry up Minos who really was a tyrant, while they decry Tantalus, who made his friends partners of immortality at his own expense. See our idea of Tantalus," and he pointed to a statue of a Thessalian holding a goblet, from which brimmed an incessant stream of refreshing wine.

Here their conversation was interrupted by the tumult in the village, occasioned by the king's arrival—"very different from the way Phraotes comes," observed Iarchas, "he comes as quiet as a 'mystery' ceremonial."

Apollonius noticed the good men were not stirring themselves at all or making any preparation to receive his Majesty. So he enquired if they intended offering the king any refreshments. "Aye, aye," was the quiet reply, "we have plenty of everything here. He is a gross feeder. But we allow no animal food—only vegetables and sweetmeats. Here he comes." The king glittering with gold and jewels approached as a suppliant with hands outstretched. The Masters enthroned on their seats, bowed their heads

as if graciously granting his request, but ignored the presence of the king's son and brother. Iarchas then rose up and asked the king if he would take refreshment. The king assented, and, lo, in rolled four tripod tables of their own accord, followed by bronze automaton cup bearers: trays of sweetmeats and bread, fruits and vegetables, all exquisitely prepared, moved up and down the guests, held by invisible hands. Two fountains of wine and two fountains of water, one hot and the other cold, flowed from the tripods, the automata mixed the water and wines in due proportions, and distributed the beverages in goblets of large size made each out of a single precious stone.

The company reclined at their meal in the fashion of the refined Greeks and Romans of the day, but no place of honour was assigned the king.

In the course of the dinner Iarchas said to the king, "Let us drink to the health of this illustrious gentleman here," indicating Apollonius. The king demurred. "I hear he is a friend of Phraotes." "Yes," replied Iarchas, "and he is still a guest of Phraotes, even here with us." "But what are his pursuits?" asked the king. "Those of Phraotes," was the answer. "I do not think much of them nor of your guest" sneered the king: "they prevent even Phraotes from being manly." Apollonius here asked Iarchas to inquire of the king if he derived any advantage from not being a philosopher. "Only this," modestly replied the king, "that I feel myself to be as good as anybody else." "You are right," replied Apollonius, "you could not still hold that opinion if you were a philosopher." "And pray, my fine philosopher," sneered the king, "tell us what you think of yourself." "That I am a good man only so long as I am a philosopher." "You are crammed full of Phraotes, I see," said the king. "That is sign that I have learnt something by my travels; and, if you could see Phraotes, you would say he was crammed full of me. He wanted to give me a letter of introduction to you, but, when I heard from him that you were a decent gentleman, I told him it would be superfluous."

This little flattery mollified the king's jealousy and suspicions, and he said "Well, sir, I wish you welcome." "The same to you," replied the Greek, "but one would fancy that you had just come in."

"I should like to know," asked the king with a self-satisfied smile, "what the Greeks think of me?" "About as much, I suppose, as you think of them," replied the Greek. "That's nothing at all," said the king. "I am sure the Greeks will be delighted to hear that fact when I tell them, and they will think you a most unique specimen of humanity," was Apollonius' retort, and then quietly turning to Iarchas, "Let us leave this idiot to himself. I suppose he has drunk too much. But why do you treat his son and brother so ignominiously and not even admit them to your table." "Because," said Iarchas, "they may one day rule, and by slighting them we teach them not to slight others."

Apollonius, then, noticing that the number of the Sophoi was only eighteen, asked how it came to be such a peculiar number. He was informed that the Indian Lodge of Magas paid no attention

to the number, but only to the qualifications of their members. When Iarchas' grandfather entered it, it consisted of eighty-seven, of which that grandfather was the youngest, and eventually in his 130th year the only surviving member. In all that time no eligible candidate having offered himself for admission, he remained four years without a colleague. The Egyptian Lodge once congratulated him on his being the sole occupier of the seat of wisdom; but the old man begged them not to reproach India with the small number of its wise men. Iarchas criticised the system of the Greek Elian Lodge, as he had heard they elected the Olympic Dikasts by lot,—thus leaving to chance what should be the reward of merit—and elected always the same number—being obliged thus sometimes to exclude good men and sometimes to include inferior ones: a much better system, he said, it was to allow the numbers to vary with circumstances, but to strictly require the same qualifications.

The king, so long left out in the cold, here rudely broke into the conversation. "I do not like your Greeks: they ran away before the Persians." Apollonius took the trouble to correct the king's knowledge of history. Then the king apologized for his false notions, on the plea that the rascally Egyptian travellers had always misrepresented the Greeks to him, making out that all their religion, laws and civilization were derived from the Egyptians, while the people themselves were the scum of the earth, cracked-brained, romancing, poor but swaggering. But henceforth," added the king politely, "I shall hold a better opinion of them."

Iarchas remarked that he had been long waiting for this day to come that was destined to undeceive the king. "But now that you have had your lesson let us drink together the loving cup of Tantalus and retire to rest." And so stooping to the cup he first quaffed it himself and then handed it to the other guests, and there was enough for all: for it bubbled up mysteriously as if from a fountain.

Then they lay down to rest, but at midnight they arose again and floating in the air sang a hymn to the mystic pillar of fire. Then they have a private audience to the king, and next morning early after the early service, the monarch had to retire to the village in virtue of a convention which forebade his remaining more than one day at the college. As he left, he pressed Apollonius to come and visit him there. The sages now sent for Damis. The poor Chela had all the previous day been left down in the village, but Apollonius gave him the above succinct account of what had occurred, and he entered it in his note book.

This day Iarchas gave his two guests an epitome of the philosophy of the Indian school. The earth was composed not only of the four elements—water, fire, air, earth—but also of a fifth, viz., "Æther" (? akasa, astral light, tatwas' magnetism.)

These were all co-related, but spiritual beings were generated out of the æther, and terrestrial mortal beings out of the air. The world is an animal and hermaphrodite or bi-sexual, and as such reproduces all creatures of itself and by itself. This world might best be likened to one of those big trading vessels which are

now used for traffic in the Indian Ocean, a sort of floating home and castle with pilots at the helm and look-out, seamen for the masts and sails, marines to guard against pirates, and a captain over and above all who rules and directs the rest. So in this world there is first a ruling deity, and then bands of sub-deities who each have their department, some above the earth and some below it. For, perhaps, there was a distinct region below the earth-level terrible and deadly.*

Poor Damis here carried away by admiration burst into extravagant praise of the Indian's elegant discourse and fluent Greek, and further conversation was interrupted by the arrival of native suppliants, a child possessed, a lame man, a blind one and other unfortunates; all of whom were cured and sent away happy.

Apollonius, but not Damis, was further initiated in astrology and divination and invocations to deities. Only "etherial" souls, such as that of Apollonius, could apprehend such subjects. But still Iarchas said to Damis pleasantly, "Do you never foresee anything,—you who are the companion of such a man?"

"Yes," said Damis, "but only in matters that concern me personally. When Damis predicts he only predicts for himself—like an old witch." And the Sophoi all laughed at his modest pleasantry.

Their stay among the Sophoi extended to four months. On their departure their hosts provided them with camels and a guide, and gave Apollonius a special present of 7 rings, one for each day, and dedicated to each planetary spirit. They accompanied their guests on the road and took an affectionate farewell of Apollonius, prophesying that even in his life-time he would attain the honours of divinity.

The itinerary of the journey back is most perplexing in some particulars.

They started with the Ganges on their *right* and the Hyphasis on their *left*, they travelled down to the sea coast, and reached it in *ten days*. Now if they were at Mt. Aboo and the Hyphasis taken as the Nerbudda, this might be taken to be correct. But if they were in Kashmir and the Hyphasis is the Jhelam, or Chenab, as the route up seemed to indicate, there must be some mistake in the name of the rivers, and also the sea must have come up much further up the Indus than at present, or the travellers must have mistaken the Indus, which is very broad in its lower course for the sea itself. But the lapse of two thousand years must doubtless have pushed the mouth of that river much lower down, judging by the present rapid rate of the delta formation. In this ten days' journey they came across wild oxen, asses, *lions*, panthers and tigers, showing they must have traversed jungles on the way and perhaps a desert also; they met with a new species of monkey, black, hairy and dog-faced, like little men. This last looks as if they must have come by way of Bengal, and therefore the position of the Ganges was rightly mentioned and only the number of days wrongly. But I still think their home

* In here speaking of the "earth," the Mahatma was probably referring not to our globe but to our present terrestrial grade of consciousness and to the "elementary" life that haunts our sub-consciousness.

route was by Scinde. For the historian says distinctly that after ten days they came to a small merchant factory and passage boats of a Tuscan build, and *that the sea was of a very dark colour*—indicating that they were mistaking the river water for the sea, because the banks were so distant. Furthermore, after dismissing the guide and camels with a letter of thanks to their masters, in which Apollonius says, "I came to you by land, with your aid I return by sea and might have returned by air,*" the travellers embarked, and sailing along came across the mouth of the Hyphasis which ran into the sea (? river) through a narrow gorge with beetling cliffs, its current being strong enough to cause danger to navigation. What river in India answers this description? The Nerbudda or Mahanuddy might if the sea came further inland in those days. Does any tributary of the Indus enter the river thus? The historian goes on to say that at the mouth of the *Indus* they found a city called Patala, built on an island formed by the river where Alexander had collected his fleet in old days—Damis in his note book gave some particulars of the Indian Ocean then called the Red Sea, which the historian mentions as interesting facts confirming the observation of other travellers, viz., that there the constellation of the Great Bear is no longer visible, and at noon there is no shadow and the stars are all in different positions. This certainly favours the view that the travellers returned by the Bay of Bengal and rounding Ceylon got into equatorial regions. But Damis may have been recording not his personal observation, but what he heard from the sailors.

For the rest they passed a town Byblus, famous for large mussels, another called Pagala of the Oritae, with rocks and sands of copper, a city Stobera, where the inhabitants the Carmani fed themselves and their cattle and clothed themselves with fish. Then they anchored off Balara, a mart for myrrh and palms. Then a pearl fishery is mentioned, and the ingenious method the inhabitants employ to make pearls grow in the oysters. This may have been in the Persian Gulf. For the next thing mentioned is that they finally reached the mouth of the Euphrates and went up to Babylon, where they again met their friend Bardanes.

Such is the interesting account of Philostratus, who was a master of Greek rhetoric at the Court of Rome. It only remains to add the interesting way these Boswellian notes of Damis fell into his hands and thus came to be published. When Damis died his journal was kept by his family as an heir loom for upwards of a century, till one of the descendants knowing the taste that the Empress Julia Domina, the wife of Severus, had for the curious, presented her with it. She found it so interesting that she gave it to Philostratus with orders to revise and edit it.

To us, perplexed students of the present day, this account is still more interesting as a corroboration of much that we have heard from other sources. I venture, in conclusion, taking as I do the history of Philostratus to be genuine and the journal of Damis

* He actually did use this method of "Projection" once when he disappeared from a tribunal at Rome at noon whilst on his trial and appeared at eve to Damis at Puteoli.

authentic, to point out some of the points we may learn from it. 1st.—That the school of the Mahatmas in India not only existed two thousand years ago, but was connected and in intercourse with similar esoteric circles in Egypt and Greece, and that there were false lodges as well—perhaps of black magicians. 2ndly,—That the powers and teachings and habits of this school correspond with those of the prophets of the Hebrews and the Persian and Median Mages. 3rdly,—Here we have an explanation of the historian's great problems, the origin of the Greek Myths and of the Shepherd kings. 4th,—Here we have a proof of the esoteric teaching of reincarnation and astrology. 5th,—The powers of clairvoyance, æthervoyance, projection of the astral body, levitation, healing, prophecy, &c., now seen commonly in spiritualistic communities, were then possessed by the few, and with the tendency of the age, as seen in art, music and science, have spread from the few to the many.

It would, as I said at the beginning, be of extra interest to us in India if we could identify the then abode of these Mahatmas. Perplexing as the itinerary is, surely the minute description of the rock of the Indian sages ought to be enough to enable us to do this. There cannot be many rocks answering that description. Can any of my readers experienced in Indian travels or geography help me?

LUCKNOW.

F. W. THURSTAN, M. A.

THE AGE OF SRÍ SANKARÁCHÁRYA.

(Concluded from page 185.)

SECTION III.—INTERNAL EVIDENCE.

BEFORE proceeding to examine the evidence furnished by his works, it may be asked what his works are. This is a pertinent question, seeing that a good many works—more than sixty—are generally ascribed to him. The works, when judged by their style, and the system of philosophy they inculcate, are not all his production. Very few of them can be *his* works. These are the Brahma Sútra Bháshya, the Upanishad Bháshya, the Gitá Bháshya, the Commentaries on Sanatsujátiya, and on Sahasranámádhya. It is doubtful whether he wrote a commentary on Nrisimhatápani Upanishad, as it contains extracts from the 'Vártikas' written after his time. One Sankaránanda wrote commentaries on several minor Upanishads, such as the Kaushitaka, and on comparison of these, in point of style, with the commentary of Nrisimhatápani, it is evident that he alone must have written it.¹ Upadésasahasri and Drigdrisyavivéka claim to be the writings of Sri Sankaráchárya. For the present it is doubtful whether they are his writings. The other works, such as Apárókshánubhúti, Átmánátmavivéka, Vivékachúdámáni and Átma-

1. Some, however, think that even the commentaries on Sanatsujátiya and Sahasranámádhya are not his own.

bódha cannot be his works, for they are in many respects in contradiction with philosophical conclusions found in his Sūtra, Upanishad, and Gitá Bháshyas. Even among the commentators on his Védánta Sūtra Bháshya, there is a difference of opinion as to the real import of several passages; compare, for example, the interpretations in Bhámáti and Vivarana; and a particular passage in Aitareyópanishad Bháshya which contains several modes of interpretation.¹ Sidhántalésasangraha, a treatise on Védánta Philosophy, by Appiah Dikshitá, enumerates many sub-divisions among his followers. It is plain, therefore, that after the time of Sri Sankarácárya his school became variously divided, and every individual belonging to a particular division wrote a work, on the basis of his own doctrines, and attributed it to the philosopher. That this was the case will be apparent to any one who has an opportunity to go through Appiah Dikshitá's examination of those systems, and compare his statements with such works as Vivékachúdámáni, &c.

Looking, then, into those works that are undoubtedly his own, viz., the three Bháshyas, we find him quoting Upavarsha,² Sabaraswami,³ Bhartriprapancha,⁴ Dramidáchárya,⁵ Vrithikára,⁶ Kumárilabháta,⁷ Prábhákara,⁸ Udyótakara,⁹ Prasastapáda,¹⁰ and Isvara Krishna.¹¹

We may now try to roughly ascertain the dates of these several authors, and find out which of them was the last in point of time.

Upavarsha. His name is rendered famous by the Kathásáritságará of Sómádéva and Kshéméndra, which is an abridgment in Sanskrit of Brihatkatha written by Gunádhyá in the Prákrit tongue, during the reign of Sátaváhana.¹² He was the author of a gloss on Jaimini's Mimámsa Sūtras and the Védánta Sūtras of Bádaráyana. He is stated to have lived during the reign of king Yógananda, and whoever he might be, there can be no doubt that he lived before the Christian Era. Sabaraswami was the author of a commentary on the Mimámsa Sūtras of Jaimini. His date may be between the 4th century B. C. and the 2nd century A. C.¹³ He quotes in his work a *vritti* on the Mimámsa Sūtras. Besides, Bhartrihari in his Vákyapadéya quotes certain solutions of Mimámsa problems. These solutions are those of Sabaraswami and of

1. Vide p. 29 of Madras Edition.

2. Pp. 291, 953 of Védánta Sūtra Bháshya (Bibliothica Indica series).

3. Pp. 58, 953 (Ibid).

4. Pp. 1, 373, 375, Brihadáranýópanishad Bháshya (Madras Edition).

5. Pp. 1, 87, 89, Chhándogýópanishad Bháshya (Madras Edition).

6. Pp. 57, 343 of Védánta Sūtra Bháshya (Bibliothica Indica series; pp. 7, 93 of his Gitá Bháshya (Babu Bhuvan Chander Bysack's, Calcutta Edition, which also contains Anandagiri's commentaries thereon, and a Hindi translation).

7. Pp. 50, 53, Védánta Sūtra Bháshya (Bibliothica Indica series).

8. P. 57 (Ibid).

9. (Ibid).

10. 2nd Adhyáya, 2nd Páda.

11. 2nd Adhyáya, 2nd Páda (Ibid).

12. As may be learnt from Kathásáritságará, Bána's Harsha Charita, Kunaláy-nanda, Chandrika, and Kavyádarsa of Dandi.

13. During this period many famous Yágnikás flourished, such as Pakshilaswamy, Hariswamy, Dévaswamy, Karavindaswamy, Dhúrtaswamy, and various others whose names ended with "Swamy." This may rightly be called the "Swamy Period."

none else. Bhartrihari's date being the first century A. C., as can be deduced from Vákyapadéya itself, Sabaraswami's date may be fixed not later than the beginning of the Christian Era, and at any rate after the third century B. C.

Bhartriprapancha is no doubt identical with Bhartrihari. He appears to have written commentaries on the Upanishads, the Védánta Sūtras, and the Bhagavadgita. From Sri Sankarácárya's commentaries and Anandagiri's gloss on the Brihadáranýakópanishad of Kánwasákha, it appears that he commented on the same Upanishad, but belonging to Mádhyandina Sákha. Bhartriprapancha must, no doubt, have been a very famous writer, as he was quoted by several Visishtadwaitic philosophers as well.¹

Dramidáchárya (Drauidáchárya) was beyond all doubt a native of Southern India, as his name implies. He was the author of commentaries on the Védánta Sūtras, and the Upanishads. He is also quoted by Sri Rámánujáchárya in his Védánta Sūtra Bháshya, and Védárthasangraha. His date cannot be fixed, with certainty but, there can be no doubt that he lived before the Christian Era, for his Bháshyas are quite unsectarian, and must have therefore lived before sectarianism got a hold on the Vedantists. His works are commented upon by one Vámanáchárya, not the author of Kárikávritti.

Vrithikára. He is of course the same as Bódháyana. It is an established rule that whenever there are Sūtras there must of necessity be a small commentary (Vritti) to enable the reader to understand those Sūtras, and thus the author of the Vritti must be either the author of the Sūtras themselves, or a pupil of his. The date of Vrittikára depends therefore on the date of the Sūtras, which is too remote to be definitely settled. Vrittikára's interpretations are accepted by Sri Rámánujáchárya in his Védánta Sūtra Bháshya, but not by Sri Sankarácárya in several places. His commentary (Vritti) consisted of 100,000 grandhas of 32 syllables each; he is followed by Dramidáchárya, Brahmanandi, Acháryakapara, and Acháryabhárucci, as may be seen from Sri Rámánujáchárya's Védárthasangraha.

Prabhákara is a follower of the school of Sabaraswamy, and as he was called guru, his followers were called Prábhákaras, and his school Gurumatha. His school is severely criticized by Kumárilabháta in his Tantravártika, Tantraratna, Vártika (in slokas), and Tuptika. The interval between these two authors may be supposed to be about a century.

As Kalidasa is mentioned in Kumarilá's Tantravártika, he lived after the time of the poet. Unfortunately there is a good deal of difference among Orientalists and Sanskritists as to the date of Kálidása. Without going deeply into this broad question, we may say that as he is mentioned in one of Palakósi II's inscriptions (637 A.C.)² and in Bána's Harsha Charita, (550 A.C.), there is nothing

1. He is quoted by Sri Yámunáchárya, the Paramaguru of Sri Rámánujáchárya in his two Védántic works, Sidhitraya and Ágamaprámánya.

2. These are the dates of Western writers, and only tentatively adopted. These are given as the latest dates that can be assigned to them.

extraordinary in thinking that Kálidása must have lived at least three centuries before the time of Pulakési II. The date of Kálidása can at all events be before the 4th and after the middle of the 2nd century. From Méghadúta (1st canto) we learn that Dignága was a contemporary of Kálidása—Dignága condemned the Nyáya philosophy, and in reply to those condemnations Udyótakaráchárya wrote his Nyáya Vártika. This information is from Váchaspatimisra's Nyáyatátparyatiká. Udyótakaráchárya's date, may be placed in the 4th century A. C. and therefore Kálidása's in the 3rd century (roughly), and Kumarila in the beginning of the 4th century.

Ísvara Krishna was the author of Sánkhyakáriká, otherwise called Tatvasangraha. Sri Sankaráchárya does not directly give his name or quote from his work, but he gives the substance of what Sánkhyakárika says in reference to certain philosophical questions. There can be no doubt that Ísvara Krishna lived before the time of the Advaita philosopher, for his Paramaguru Goudapádáchárya wrote a commentary thereon, which is said to have been translated into Chinese during the reign of the Chang Dynasty, 557—583 A. C. It is quite probable that Goudapáda lived a century before the date of its translation, and it is possible that he was a contemporary of Udyótakara, in the beginning of the 4th century, granting that this is the earliest date that can be assigned to him, the latest date being a few years before the translation, say about 550 A. C. This would give the earliest date for our philosopher (Sri Sankaráchárya) as 350 A. C.

Kanáda Sútras are quoted in the Védánta Sútrabháshya, and so also Prasastapádáchárya's gloss thereon; but Prasastapádáchárya and Udyótakaráchárya were, it is generally known, contemporaries. If the latter lived about the beginning of the 4th century, the former too must have lived about that time.

We also find certain passages in his works which tell us when he lived. They are as below:—

(i). Nahidévadatta Srughnésannidhiyamánahtadaharéva Pátaliputré sannidhiyaté, yugapathá nékathra vrittáv ánekathraprasangáth dévadatta yagnadatta Yóriava Srughnapátaliputranivasinóh.¹ Dévadatta who is (present) at Srughna* (at a given day) cannot be present at Pátaliputra† on one and the same day; if (however) a man is present in different (and distant) places, he must possess different personalities, as in the case of Dévadatta and Yagnadatta, who live at one and the same time at Srughna and Pátaliputra.

(ii). Yópih Srughnánmathurángatvá Mathuráyáh Pátaliputram vrájati. Sópi Srughnáthpátaliputram yátili sakyaté varithum.² He

1. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XII (new series).

2. Védánta Sútra Bháshya, p. 463 (Bibliothica Indica Series).

* Near Mathura in Northern India.

† Now in ruins near the modern Patna.

3. Ibid, p. 1093.

who goes from Srughna to Mathura, and thence to Pátaliputra may be considered as going from Srughna to Pátaliputra.

(iii). Yathápúrnavarmanassévá bhakta paridhána mátraphalá, rájyavarmanassévá rajya thulya phaléthi.¹ Just as the service of Púrnavarma will give food and clothing, (so) Rájyavarma's service will be productive of kingly bliss.

(iv). Satórivádvayósambandhassambhavati Nasadasató rasatórivá abhávasyacha nirupákhyatvát pádutpaththériti maryathákarana manupapannam Satamhi lóké kshétra grihádénam maryátháthrishta nabhávasya nahivandhyaputró rájábabhúva prákpúrnavarmanó abhishékathi thyévam Játiyakena maryáthákaranéna nirupakhyóvandhyaputró rájá babhúva bhavatibhavishyoti itivá visishyaté.²

Between two entities a relation does exist; but not between an entity and a non-entity; nor between two non-entities—for how can non-entity be described? To draw out a boundary between the genesis (of an entity) and (its) prenatal condition is utterly impossible. This boundary is visible in the case of entities, but not in the case of non-entities. If it is said that an indescribable son of a barren woman was king before Púrnavarma's accession to the throne, would it necessarily lead (us) to the conclusion that the son of a barren woman was, is, or will ever be a king?

From the 1st and 2nd quotations it will be plain that in his time Srughna and Pátaliputra were in existence.

From history we learn that:—

(a). Pátaliputra, once the capital of India, and mentioned by Patanjali, the Grecian and Chinese writers, &c., was washed away about the year 750 A. C. by excessive floods in the Sone and the Ganges, at the junction of which it stood.³

(b). That the modern city of Patna dates only from the time of Shir Shah (1541 A. C.) Popular tradition is said to confirm this account, and that at the present day a masjid of plain massive construction is pointed out as the masjid built by Shir Shah, and it has an inscription of Shir Shah's.⁴ Srughna also a very ancient city near Thaneshwar on the Jumna, is identified with the modern Sugh.⁵ The modern Sugh is said to contain about 200 houses,⁶ and it is not possible to find out when it came to the degraded condition it is now found in. We are, however, told that "the discovery of coins of the Tomar and Chohan Rajas of Delhi shows that the place

1. Chándógyópanishad Bháshya, 2nd Prapataka, 23 Khanda, or p. 71, Madras Edition.

2. Védánta Sútra Bháshya, p. 465 (Bibliothica Indica series) on the Brahma Sútras II. 1, 18.

3. Archæological Survey Reports, Vol. VIII, Notes. Pp. xii and xiii. This is based on the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1836, and Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. VI.

4. Archæological Survey Reports, Vol. VIII, p. 28. It is here said that with the exception of a few wrecks which are used as steps, a few fragments, near a temple and numerous boulders of stone lying scattered on the banks and built into the river revetments showing that on this side probably was the old city, with its store edifices:—no other traces of old Pátaliputra exist in modern Patna. It is quite improbable that the Pátaliputra of Sri Sankaráchárya's time would be of this description.

5. Archæological Survey Reports, Vol. II, p. 229.

6. Ibid, p. 223.

7. Ibid, p. 230.

must have been occupied down to the time of the Muhammadan conquest in A. D. 1193." General Cunningham also thinks that there are evidences at least of its partial occupation as late as the reign of Feroz Toglak (1320 A. C.) Hiounthsang says that the greater part was in ruins, but the foundations still remained. "It possessed five monasteries containing 1,000 monks who discussed clearly and ably the most profound and abstract questions; it also possessed 100 temples of Brahmins, whose followers were extremely numerous."

From Sri Sankarácárya's mention of the names of these two cities it is evident that the fame of the city must have been so great and in a flourishing condition to enable him to mention them more than once in his works. We have now found out that Pátaliputrá was in a flourishing condition before A. D. 750, and Srughna before Hiounthsang's visit of the place in about 635 A. C. Thus in all probability Sri Sankarácárya lived before the 7th century A. C.

The credit of first bringing those passages that relate to Purnavarma to the notice of Oriental scholars, and of basing a historical argument thereon, is due to Mr. K. T. Telang of Bombay. His paper is to be found in Volume XIII of the Indian Antiquary, p. 95, *et seq.* His arguments with regard to the date of Purnavarma found in passages Nos. 3 and 4 are briefly as follows:—

(a). Sri Sankarácárya must have lived at the time of one Purnavarma as he mentions his coronation. Purnavarma could not have been a fictitious personage, for we are told by the philosopher that his coronation actually took place.

(b). If we search for the name Purnavarma in the various lists of kings of India, such as the Kadambas, Pallavas, Chándels, Maukharis, Utpalas, &c., only two Purnavarmas occur, one of whom is mentioned in the Javanese Inscriptions.² It may be most unlikely that the philosopher ever alluded to the Javanese Purnavarma. The other Purnavarma must therefore be the man alluded to. He is mentioned by Hiounthsang in his travels, and is found

1. Hiounthsang quoted in *Ibid*, p. 227.

2. There is a good deal of doubt attached to the Javanese Purnavarma. He too appears to have been an Indian Prince, although the evidence in favor of such a conclusion is very insufficient.

The inscription in Java is in Sanskrit, and the name of the country or town of which he was the ruler is not legible. The character of the inscription is a development of that in use during the reign of the early Pallavas. The Pallavas were the foremost of kings in Central and Southern India, and they ruled over the largest of the contemporary Buddhist kingdoms of India (Mr. Foulkes on the Pallavas in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, New Series, Vol. XVII). Mr. Foulkes thinks, and so also does Dr. Burnell (*South Indian Paleography*, p. 131) that he must be a Pallava prince who conquered Java, in about 450, A. C. that being the date assigned to the inscription by Prof. Kern (*Vide The Indian Antiquary*, Vol. IV, p. 356, *et seq.*)—and from the fact that Varma is the general surname of Pallava Kings. This supposition receives considerable strength from the fact that there were also connections between South Indian and Javanese kings, and a king of Java sent in about 921 A. C. his four sons and a daughter to Southern India for education, (*Vide p. 204* of Mr. Foulkes' article on the Pallavas, in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, New Series, Vol. XVII, p. 204, and *Madras Journal of Literature and Science*, Vol. XVI, p. 133.)

to have reigned about 590 A. C.' Sankarácárya must therefore have lived about that time.

The great objection to this conclusion is that, according to Sri Sankarácárya's fourth passage, one Rájavarma must have been a contemporary of Purnavarma. In other words, Sri Sankarácárya was a contemporary of one Purnavarmaraja, who was contemporary with another king called Rájavarma. But no king of the name of Rájavarma seems to have been a contemporary of Purnavarma of Western Maghada.

Mr. Pandit throws out a suggestion that Sasánka, king of Kanuj, might be identical with Rájavarma. And Mr. Telang thinks that "this is not very probable, *if* Sasánka's other name was Naréndraguptá as we are told by General Cunningham (*Archæological Survey Reports*, Vol. I)"; nor does he himself try to find out with whom Rájavarma can be identified. There can be no doubt, that Mr. Telang's date, viz., the end of the 6th century A. C., is the most acceptable one under the present circumstances, but it would also be better if the earliest date that can possibly be assigned to the philosopher be taken into consideration, and the intervening period as the *safest* one that can be fixed for him—as other con-

1. This second Purnavarma was King of Western Maghadha, and reigned about 590 A. C. According to General Cunningham (*Archæological Survey Reports*, Vol. I, pp. 5, 7, Vol. III, p. 137), Hiounthsang says of him thus "... the King of Maghadha, called Purnavarma, the last of the race of Asoka-*raja*, hearing of it (*i. e.*, the destruction by Sasánka of the sacred Bódhi tree at Gaya, sighed and said 'the sun of wisdom having set, nothing is left but the tree of Buddha; and this they now have destroyed, what source of spiritual life is there now.' He then cast his body on the ground overcome with pity, then with the milk of a thousand cows he again bathed the roots of the tree, and in a night it once more revived and grew to the height of 10 feet. Fearing lest it should again be cut down, he surrounded with a wall of stone 24 feet high." He also speaks of a pavilion of six stages "having been formerly made" by Purnavarma. In his 'Life' it is said that "Purnavarma Raja, Lord of Maghadha, had a great respect for learned men, and that he assigned the revenues of twenty large towns for the support of Jayaséna (the teacher of Hiounthsang) which Jayaséna declined to receive. The narrative then proceeds.—'After the obsequies of Purnavarma, Siladitya raja also invited him to be the master (of the country), and assigned him the revenue of eighty large towns of Orissa, which Jayaséna likewise declined to accept. From that time we are further told Jayaséna "has constantly lived on the mountain called Yashuivana, where he takes charge of disciples." We have then four different passages relating to Purnavarma in Mr. Beal's volumes, and taking them all together the following conclusions seem to be fairly deducible from them:—

First.—Purnavarma had been dead sometime before Hiounthsang's visit to India.

Second.—Purnavarma must have lived at a time sufficiently removed from the date of Hiounthsang's pilgrimage, to warrant his speaking of the work done by Purnavarma as having been done 'formerly' or 'in old days.'

Third.—The interval of time between Purnavarma, and Hiounthsang must be enough to explain the reduction of about four feet in the height of the wall built round the Bodhi tree.

Fourth.—The interval between Purnavarma and Hiounthsang must not be too large to be spanned by the life of Jayaséna who was living in Hiounthsang's time, and had acquired renown enough during Purnavarma's reign to be offered the revenues of twenty large towns by that sovereign.

These passages and the foregoing ones from Hiounthsang's work and life, are taken from Mr. Telang's paper "On the dates of Purnavarma and Sankarácárya," intended for publication in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* for this year. It is on the foregoing reasons that he places Purnavarma about 590 A. C.—the date first given by General Cunningham, but subsequently changed to 637 A. C.

siderations such as the literary ones take us back a century or two earlier.

We have previously come to the conclusion that the earliest date that can be assigned for him was the middle of the 4th the latest date being the last quarter of the 6th century (about 590 A. C.); and we may not be far from truth if we say that he lived somewhere about the 5th century A. C.

SECTION IV.—SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION: AND A BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

In the first section we have examined the various traditions current about Sri Sankarácárya, and found that none of the traditions could bear the tests that were applied. The inconsistencies between any two different traditions were too many for any of these to be seriously considered. As the majority of the traditions pointed to Kaladi in Malabar as the philosopher's birth-place, we must accept it.

It is quite probable that, as has already been pointed out, an attempt towards his biography was made in later times; but they could not get the whole truth, and had therefore to simply record the traditions current in their times. The dates of the biographies being several centuries later, there is no wonder why the traditions were different from one another. In addition to this, every biographer seems to have twisted the narrative with a view to give some sanctity to the particular mutt he belonged to, or the places he had seen. We have at present no work which can be truly considered as his biography, written during or immediately after his time. The length of his life is not, however, doubted, although different traditions make it 32, and 55, while some Western writers even consider 32 years as the length of his active life, and thus make 40 years the length of his entire life: but we accept 32 as the most probable, firstly, because there is nothing very extraordinary in thinking that a person became so profound a thinker and so great a philosopher writer, within such an early age as thirty-two; and secondly, because the majority of traditions have it.

In the next section we took up external evidence, and from it we found that, by making the date of Sri Rámánjáchárya as the basis for our calculations and going upwards, the date of Sri Sankarácárya might be fixed at the last quarter of the 6th century A. C. at the latest.

In the third section (on internal evidence) we divided the subject into two parts; first, to ascertain bibliographically what can be considered as the earliest date, and we came to the conclusion that it must be about the middle of the fourth century A. C.

In the second part, certain names of persons and cities which were mentioned by the philosopher in his works, and which persons and cities, were found to have had a contemporaneous existence, were considered in the light of history, and we concluded that he must have written his works at the time when those cities and persons had an actual existence; and although we in the main adopted Mr. Telang's arguments, we pointed out that it would

perhaps be not far from truth if we should say that he lived in the middle of the earliest and the latest dates, between the middle of the 4th and the 6th, that is in the 5th century A. C.

The places and persons he mentions in his works are all of Northern India, that is India north of the Vindhya mountains. If he was a native of South India it might be said he would naturally be expected to take up for purposes of illustration persons and places of South India, such as Chidambaram, Conjeveram, &c. The only way of answering this, is by saying that he was born in South India, but went in his boyhood to North India, lived there for a long time, and there alone composed his works.

It is also a matter of doubt whether the slokas said to have been composed by him in adoration of deities in certain sacred places in South India were really his, for the language and style in which they are written are entirely different from the sweet and exquisite style of our philosopher, as we find it in his works: but it is probable that they might have been written by his successors who all bore the same name as a title.

To attempt a brief biographical sketch.

He was born in Káladi, Malabar, became a nominal sanyasi at the age of eight, and by this time studied a great deal, then went in search of a really good Guru, found him in Góvindayógi, on the banks of the Nerbudda: then became a real sanyasi, and studied the different schools of philosophy under him: for a long time he argued with several philosophers of antagonistic schools, visited several sacred places, such as Badarináth, Dwárka, &c., and composed his three Bháshyás,—and probably his commentaries on Sanatsujátiya and Sahasranámádhyaáya too,—in Northern India alone, somewhere on the banks of the Ganges. He never seems to have really persecuted the Buddhists as some of our Western writers and Sankaravijáyas have it. The extraordinary composure of mind exhibited by his writings forms a striking contrast to those of the other reformers and philosophic writers, and would induce any reader to think that he had nothing to do with Buddhist or any other persecutions as Mr. A. Barth represents when he says that the disciples of Sri Sankarácárya "Organized into military bands and constituted themselves the rabid (!) defenders of orthodoxy." With the exception perhaps of this single writer, every one else firmly believes that he was too philosophical to have a hand in those persecutions.

Lastly, towards the end of his life he came to the south, but had to leave his body and this world in Conjeveram, at the early age of thirty-two. We think Conjeveram was the most probable place of his Nirvana, for at present there is an image of him in the temple of the famous goddess Kámákshi, and judging from the style of architecture and the local traditions to the effect that his body lies buried underneath the image, which is now worshipped.

For Sri Sankarácárya and his works we have a very high reverence. The loftiness, calmness, and firmness of his mind, the impartiality with which he deals with the various questions, his clearness of expression—all of these make us revere the philosopher, more and more: but the object of this paper, written as it is by a

Visishtádwaitee is not in any way to underrate the value of his works, or the merits of their author by fixing his date in a comparatively recent period: and we assure our Adwaitee brethren that the object of this paper is simply to see what date can be fixed for him, by impartially and without any prejudice examining the different traditions and evidence we have, and to show our Western writers, that, even according to their recognized canons of examination, the date of this eminent philosopher is at least three centuries earlier than that they usually accord him.

ADYAR ORIENTAL LIBRARY, }
10th October 1889. }

N. BHASHYA CHARYA.

APHORISMS FROM SANSKRIT.

(Continued from the "Theosophist" for September, 1889.)

24. ONE who professes to be other than his own self is a self-deceiving thieving rogue, who can do all evil things.
25. Tell the truth as thou hast seen and heard it. The telling a truth tends to the purity of the soul and to the conservation of Religion.
26. The gods and goddesses look upon him as a being superior to all in this *loka*, who doubteth not that the living soul in him hath not told a lie.
27. O noble soul! Think not that thou art alone; the all-virtue and vice-seeing and all-knowing God is always present in the heart.
28. Truth and the practice of truth and noble deeds throw the light of Religion on a heart that remaineth unmoved in happiness and misery as well.
29. The society of the vicious worldlings engendereth an inordinate desire, which leadeth to impiety and vice, while the society of good men is the royal road to Religion.
30. One who, some way or other misled, does not heed the kind and useful words addressed to him, deteriorates according as he gets slow in his performance and has to repent of his past misdeeds.
31. He who takes to the ways of the wicked, disregarding the sage advices of the pious, is sorrowed over by his friends, when they find him soon encountering evils.
32. He who is peaceably disposed, skilful, grateful, intelligent and guideless, acquires fame in this world and engages not himself in any harmful pursuit.
33. There is neither fame, nor shelter, nor happiness, for the ungrateful. The ungrateful deserve no pity: they are sure to suffer.
34. He who gives a share to others of whatever he eats and drinks and is charitably disposed and apt to have a legitimate share of happiness and enjoyment, and is not envious, enjoys the highest felicity.

35. The giving away in charity is the most difficult work in this world of ours, as man hankers after riches, and riches are acquired with the greatest possible difficulty.
36. Having made a fair start with some work of charity with wealth acquired by unfair means, the giver is not freed from the great fear which is a necessary consequence of sin.
37. A sense of duty shall be well guarded with money honestly acquired. He who earns a livelihood with dishonesty, is turned out from the sacred precincts of all pious actions.
38. To the best of thy power feed others, learn to be forbearing, practise religion, and always kindly treat all.
39. Have beds for the sick, seats for the wearied, water for the thirsty, and food for the hungry.
40. An intelligent well-wisher should give away medicine, diet, food and the like things to the deserving only.
41. Remove mental suffering with knowledge and physical suffering with medicine. The wise do not give way to sorrow, being convinced of their destiny.
42. He, who has a control over his mind and senses, is not made to suffer repeatedly. A peaceful heart does not murmur at the prosperity of others.
43. There is no end of the misery of one, who is jealous of another's riches, beauty, intrepidity, lineage, children's happiness, prosperity and good works.
44. He who feels ashamed at the utterance of obscene words by others, hates sin, and prospers; a falling off from this keen sense of hatred against sin is followed by an impediment to the practise of virtue, which in its turn affects prosperity.
45. One, who is grateful and averse to ascribe faults to the otherwise spotless character of others, and practises virtue, has happiness, religion, wealth and paradisaal bliss in reserve for him.
46. An unjust punishment entails on the inflictor a corresponding loss of his good name and fame in this world and in the next that of beatitude. Therefore avoid it.
47. By forgiveness people become obedient; Forgiveness is a jewel; with the weak Forgiveness is a sterling merit; with the strong it is an ornament.
48. A well-wisher regards others as a part and parcel of his own self, for happiness and misery are to be found among all, who are near and dear to us and who are not so.

NAKUR CHANDRA BISVAS.

PERSECUTION BY THE FREE-THINKERS.

IT is a great anomaly in the law of human nature that even Free-thought should arrogate to itself infallibility for its own pet dogmas. Of all the fields of useful action for the bettering of humanity,—next to Theosophy, the fundamental basis of all religions, philosophies and sciences, that the human thought has ever evolved in the past and has yet to evolve in the future,—that of Free-thought is the most fitting arena for one who is a real truth-seeker. The Free-thinker is, like a Theosophist, a friend of humanity, a real sympathiser with mankind in ignorance, and he should endeavour, on a rational basis, to adopt means to lead his erring brethren to the light of reason and thus lessen the burden of their misery. Free-thought is not fettered with any ritualistic rules, nor is the sphere of its investigations in any way limited. Free-thought cannot dictate authoritatively to its followers like the Christian Church that they “should go so far and no further.” Like Theosophy, it “seeks for truth,” and consequently every problem that touches nature in any way, should engage a Free-thinker’s attention. So Nature, the Prakriti of the Hindus, is the only Bible of Free-thought,—and not the Pradhana, which is too subtle yet to be fully grasped by a Free-thinker who has not understood the veritable teachings of the Eastern Occultism,—and work is the only worship it recognizes, and the service of man the only goal of a Free-thinker’s existence. Free-thought should, in the name and interest of Truth, give every liberty to its followers to take up the study of any subject, any dogma or doctrine, any religion and philosophy (these being two different aspects of one and the same truth), or any theory, however futile and inconsistent it may appear at first sight with the preconceived beliefs or so-called established physical or materialistic scientific truths; and it should permit the dissection, discussion, reconstruction and verification of any and all of these subjects and their ultimate acceptance, if reason and proof warrants it, or their rejection if the evidence is against their truth. Between these two extremes of acceptance and rejection, there lies a middle course of suspending one’s own judgment when the evidence is insufficient or wanting. This “golden mean” should be adopted by every Free-thinker, when he can neither seasonably accept nor foolishly reject a theory. And it is his sacred duty to test it in every possible way till the solution of the intricate problem is attained, either directly or indirectly. When his own methods fail, he should learn other methods from persons who are in the fold of his own following, or from outsiders who profess to know and teach him. Certainly he is never asked to accept such teaching on blind faith, despite logic and common sense. He should also remember that all theories are not amenable to one uniform course of research. Physics and metaphysics have each its own method of investigation into the secrets of nature. The brain and the spinal cord can be seen and dissected, but thought can never be tested by a telescope or a microscope, nor can it be expressed in a mathematical problem that could be solved by a “protoplasmic or a molecular scientist”

by the ordinary rules of his exact science. The world has suffered for centuries together from bigotry, ill feeling and abominable persecution of the orthodox and illiberal religionists all over the world. During the *Middle Ages* the suffering had attained its climax on the European Continent when the *Inquisition* had its sway. But, alas! even to-day, in the enlightened Nineteenth century, with all our boasting of its learning, enlightenment, and liberal thought and speech, persecution still lives and flourishes in its borrowed garbs, in the mild and disguised form of abusing and obstructing the progress of humanity. It is a melancholy fact to-day that so-called Free-thought even is not unaffected by the contagion of persecution in endeavouring to stifle its own children, and prevent them from pursuing the course of action which they are convinced will best lessen human misery and enhance the happiness of all sentient beings. I was long under the mistaken impression that this spirit of oppression was confined only to the Free-thinkers of the Madras Presidency, but it has now opened my eyes when I find substantial evidence that it exists elsewhere also in the ably written pamphlet now before me, called “Why I became a Theosophist?” Mrs. Annie Besant, the well-known colleague of Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, M. P., the veteran champion of religious, social and political liberty, has been fighting for years together the battle of liberty side by side with her coadjutor on the Free-thought platform. And every Free-thinker will agree when we say that she has done more than any other Free-thinker in England, except Mr. Bradlaugh, for the cause of free-thought in that country during the past ten or fifteen years. She has sacrificed everything most dear to herself, in the worldly sense, for Truth. In the pamphlet above referred to, she complains bitterly that one especially of her brother Free-thinkers, the Editor of the *Free-thinker*, had attacked her personally “in an unjustifiable manner” for having joined the Theosophical Society. Progress is the order of Nature. Free-thinkers are not wedded to any particular sect or dogma, and every beam of light of the sun of wisdom, through whatever crevice it comes, ought to be gladly accepted. It is from the chilling religious faith that most of us have emerged into the daylight of Reason, Materialism and Modern Science, and why should we now hesitate to advance further to Theosophy, which is found to give the key that unravels the mystery of the highest problems of Life and Death,—problems for which Materialistic Science can suggest no solution. I heartily sympathise with my sister, Mrs. Annie Besant, the distinguished Vice-President of the “National Secular Society” of England, in her present persecution by a portion of the English Free-thinkers; more particularly when I think of my own state of mind brought about by the abuse which was freely showered on me by the Madras Free-thinkers when I joined the Theosophical Society in December 1882. I was a Secularist for a period of upwards of seven years, and a certificated member of the “National Secular Society,” and a member of the “Free-thought Union” of Madras. My case is almost parallel with that of my sister Mrs. Besant. I was once a staunch orthodox religionist of the Visishtadwaita sect, and through love of Truth I joined the Free-thought party in

1875, and ultimately I went over to the *Theosophical Society* after careful research and conviction of the truth of Theosophy, the Divine Wisdom;—the immediate cause of my joining the Society being a personal discussion with the sage Madame Blavatsky, and her clear exposition of the aim and scope of this universal Religion and Science for three consecutive days, the discussion occupying us for over four hours each day.

My brother Free-thinkers of Madras persecuted me most uncharitably for leaning to Theosophy, even before I formally joined the Society, and that necessitated the appearance of a declaration on my part of severance from the Free-thought party, which appeared in the then *Philosophic Inquirer* of Madras, in its issue of 13th August 1882. I wrote to Mr. Bradlaugh how I was treated by the Madras Free-thinkers, and in reply he wrote to me in his letter dated the 23rd of August 1882, as follows: "I much regret to read, not only in your letter but in many communications which have reached me, the statement of the irritation which has grown up between so many of our Hindu Free-thought friends." The Editor of the *Philosophic Inquirer* also shared the abuse with me. This irritation at Madras had provoked even my sister, Mrs. Annie Besant, who wrote, to quote from the *Philosophic Inquirer*, July 16, 1882, that "The Theosophical Society seems to be attracting within its pale in India some of those who have been forced to give up ancient superstitions, but who are not strong enough to rest upon reason alone. The published explanation of its objects and principles conveys no very definite idea of the requirements for membership, beyond a dreamy, emotional, scholarly interest in the religio-philosophic fancies of the past," &c. Need I state that I was actually forced out of "Free-thought Union" and the "National Secular Society?" I then wrote an article under the heading "Can a true Secularist be a Theosophist?" as a reply to the abovementioned strictures of members of the *Hindu Free-thought Union* of Madras, which appeared in the *Philosophic Inquirer* of July 23, 1882. In this article I fully stated the objects and principles of the Theosophical Society and those of the Secular Society, and showed how a true Secularist can be a Theosophist. I shall quote here only one passage from that article. I wrote among other things that:—

"Nature is the common ground of both; neither Secularism nor Theosophy outstrips its boundary. Nature is the whole of known and unknown phenomena, the causes and consequences, the happened and those yet to happen. Secularism admits no being outside the universe, and neither does Theosophy. The former is allied to truth, the latter is a staunch ally of truth. Truth is the body, the heart and the kernel of both. Secularism and Theosophy are twin sisters in the field of investigation. Both are modest, firm and unyielding to any force, but to the force of knowledge and wisdom. The origin of both is noble. They are mutual in the kindly office of helping each other. One is rudder to the other. It is impossible to approach the shrine of Theosophy without being led by Secularism. Secularism should first plough the ground and make it ready for Theosophy to sow the seed. Theosophy should acknow-

ledge the debt of obligation it owes to Secularism. Secularism will do without Theosophy, but the latter can scarcely stand without the prop and support of the former. The Scientists and the Theosophists are, like the Pandoos, wedded to the same mistress, Truth and Virtue. Both are speculative thinkers and both are well-wishers of the world. Both are bent upon righting the wrong, mending folly and correcting human errors. Secularism is the close friend of humanity as much as Theosophy is the brother of man. Secularism respects noble lives and Theosophy pays due homage to Mahatmas, not the jugglers or mountebanks, but the great and wise thinkers, or the Brothers, who are notsupernatural, but "are just as much tied by natural laws as anyone else; they are conditioned by all the forces of the universe," as stated by Col. H. S. Olcott, the President of the Theosophical Society. What is there in Theosophy that Secularism should hate? and what in Secularism for which Theosophy should chide Secularists? Upbraid not Theosophy, mistake not its aims; wait, wait until you are convinced of its inner truth,—or of its folly! Theosophists, extend your right hand of brotherhood ungrudgingly to Secularists, they are the true and undaunted soldiers under the illustrious banner of Truth, that hoisted the courageous flag of Freedom, Equity, and Fraternity."

I am now infinitely pleased to learn that our sister, Mrs. Annie Besant, "the brilliant atheistic orator and splendid atheistic writer," waited so long, examined so carefully and impassionately into the claims of Theosophy and at last embraced it herself,—recognizing beyond all dispute, the truth of the Wisdom-religion of the ancients. Truth is often repelling at its first sight, and only persevering and intelligent enquiry can then make it acceptable. I have to confess that I was not free from the touch of prejudice. I attacked Theosophy and the Theosophical Society more than once before I examined into it, and in my article under the heading "Is not Death the ultimate End of Life," which appeared in the *Philosophic Inquirer* of May 21, 1882, I wrote that "Matter is indestructible though ever changeable. It is known by special characteristics, such as density, visibility, &c. And in this condition as a human body, it puts forth animal activity. Soul, spirit, will, locomotion, speech and several such manifestations, are the sure indications that matter is in this peculiar condition; and when this condition is displaced, all these several functions cease for ever. But to say even after the change of condition and circumstances that soul or any principle of man does exist is beyond our cognition, and to say that the merit or demerit of a person leaves indelible impressions on the surrounding atmosphere, and these impressions live for ever, is utterly unthinkable.... We can reasonably say that a wicked man broke the glass, but can any one understand you, oh! imaginary reasoner, that the wickedness of a man broke the glass, unless you speak in a metaphorical sense.... Who ever lived again with such impressions to tell the tale of his former birth?... We do not know how far our respected friend Col. Olcott realizes it...."

It is not possible for all men to believe in the reality of the other planes above this physical one; but it is in every way possible for

them to enquire about those planes, and most people who do so, attain conviction after due deliberation and investigation. If the truth cannot be made plain at once, glimpses can be obtained and further progress from that standpoint will lead them into realms unknown before. According to the well-tried maxim, "Truth will prevail in the end," which my dear brother and first instructor, Mr. Damodar Mavalankar, has often impressed on me in his lengthy personal correspondence with me, it is certain that, Theosophy the diluted essence of knowledge and wisdom, has been often prevailing among men, notwithstanding the stupid opposition, which faces it anywhere and everywhere in this matter-of-fact world. We congratulate heartily our brave and able sister Mrs. A. Besant, who has evinced great moral courage in siding as she has done with Truth, and in abiding by her true and honest convictions. I have been all along very carefully watching the behaviour of the Free-thinkers towards Theosophy and the Theosophical Society, and I very eagerly expected that the noble champions of Free-thought will some day rally round the banner of our sages, the Rishis of the Aryavarta, the Mahatmas of the snowy Himavat.* I have realized my expectation in Mrs. A. Besant's cordially embracing Theosophy. Will it stop here? Ah! No. The future will bring us more success. The signs are significant, and Theosophy is a common topic all over the world from "China to Peru." The cyclic law is in its ascendancy, and I can safely prophesy, if it is not too much, that *Theosophy*, the true fundamental basis of all philosophies, all religions and all sciences, will be the common, the only philosophy, the only religion and the only science all over the world in the no distant future, to the utter discomfiture of its enemies.

May Theosophy prosper and the *Masters* bless us!

R. JAGANNATHIAH, F. T. S.,

Founder of the Bellary "Sanmarga Samaj."

BELLARY,
10th December 1889. }

* It would be a doubtful gain to have all these "noble champions" full fledged Theosophists. There is an immense accumulation of rubbish and ordure, left by long centuries of priests and dogmas, which must be cleared away before the house of Theosophy is built, and the horny-handed son of reason, who is not so delicately constituted as to suffer from the work, is just the man to remove this rotteness. Strong common sense, a generous and altruistic nature, and the courage of one's opinion, are enough for the work of the iconoclast or the religious scavenger. If his spiritual nature were too much developed, the job would make him sick in his stomach.—*Ed.*

Reviews.

"THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY."*

The "Key to Theosophy" will be exceedingly welcome to those who have been preaching Theosophy for some time,—whatever it may be to outsiders. In the very clearly written work before us Theosophists are for the first time taught in readily comprehensible language a good deal about what it is that they really *do* believe. This sounds satirical, but there is no other way of expressing the idea that we have at last got an authoritative exposition of Theosophy, since, were anyone to put the matter in this crude form, he would at once be told that as there is no such thing acknowledged in Theosophy as Orthodoxy, "authority" goes for very little indeed.

Although the Authoress has liberally provided a cheap edition for the Indian Market, the work is more likely to create a sensation in the West than in India, where, in one form or another, the chief doctrines of Theosophy crop up in all the current systems of philosophy and religion; and when Madame Blavatsky sharply cuts Gordian Knots which it has baffled rival systems of Philosophy for hundreds of generations to unloose, Western readers are far less liable to grumble at this summary treatment than people whose intellectual faculties have been exercised almost from childhood in debating the knotty points in question, and who, to all appearance, are as little likely to come to an agreement about them now, upon the old lines, as they were ten centuries ago.

All this disputation of the schools the "Key" leaves quite, or almost quite, unnoticed; and very wisely confines itself to presenting the system, Religio-Philosophico-Cosmico-Ethical, which the Authoress wishes the world to understand as that of those mysterious personages, the Adepts of the Himalayas,—the Mahatmas, her teachers.

There can be no doubt but that it is only upon this basis that Theosophy can be adequately presented or fairly judged. Theosophy is not Buddhism, nor Advaitism, nor Dwaitism, nor Vishistadvaitism, and does not profess to be taken from those, or any other forms of philosophy or religion; it is therefore as illogical as it is unfair to object to its teachings, because they do not agree in all points with those of the particular philosophy the objector happens to follow. The claim which Theosophy makes as to its origin must be taken into account in judging of its merits, and it claims to come fresh from the fount of Wisdom; not, indeed, from the "Throne of God," whence most religions are supposed to have descended,—through some mysterious back stairs, at whose foot there waited to receive it a divinely appointed mouth-piece of heaven,—but from the secluded dwelling of saintly men, who are the present custodians of this knowledge in its purity, and the heirs in wisdom of a long line of similar sages, of whose hidden existence the world has ever been obscurely cognizant. We are told that hitherto a great deal of the teachings which are now being given out under the name of "Theosophy" has been kept jealously from publicity, and confided only to those who had entered irrevocably into the service of truth, by enlisting

* THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY. Being a Clear Exposition, in the form of Question and Answer, of the Ethics, Science and Philosophy, for the Study of which the Theosophical Society has been founded. By H. P. BLAVATSKY. 8vo. pp. 307. Theos. Pub. Co., Lim. London: 1889.

in the ranks of the sacred brotherhood of the Wise Ones. We are further told that, according as men were prepared to receive a new or different instalment of truth, some half-initiated member of the Brotherhood was deputed to spread this imperfect presentation thereof in the world, or to bring it with him into the world;—that all the religions which have appeared upon the earth are of this nature: half truths, entrusted to some one who was still sufficiently in touch with ordinary human nature to be able to influence worldly people, to be delivered to men for their immediate use, guidance and improvement, it being well known to their divulgers that even these half truths would quickly become corrupted by human folly and selfishness,—qualities of current human nature which made it useless to attempt to introduce more than such half-truth into the world with any hope of their being comprehended or received at all.

This theory of the origin of religions accounts for their strange similarities, and equally strange differences. And it also explains how it is that Theosophy has so many resemblances with them all, and yet differs very materially from each. Every religion obtained originally some of the material of which Theosophy also is composed, and worked it into its own structure; so that in the fabric of each there are some threads of the wisdom of the Truthful Ones, and no religion is a "Lie out of the whole cloth," as some of the more uncompromising materialists assert.

One effect of the "Key" will be,—and, indeed, has already noticeably been,—to shut the mouths of the more silly of the tribe of cavillers and difficulty-mongers—as far at least as the press is concerned. It is an old saying that "a Fool can ask questions which a Philosopher cannot answer." In ordinary cases, the philosopher may without loss of reputation tell the fool to go to school and learn the elements of his subject; but in this particular instance foolish questioners appear to have a kind of presumptive right to a categorical answer, for there is no other recognized schoolmaster in Neo-Theosophy than the very learned and highly philosophical lady, the authoress of the "Key;" who, if not exactly engaged in drawing down fire from Heaven, is at all events by degrees bringing to light from hidden sources a very wonderful system of religious philosophy, or philosophical religion. The foolish ones therefore assume a *primâ facie* right to have all their questions answered and objections met by her, and if they are treated to a good many puzzles and paradoxes, it is entirely their own fault.

It is their own fault because they ought to have remembered that but a few truths are at present being divulged. It is impossible to set up a machine if some of the parts are wanting. It is a thousand times more difficult to present in the form of a universal solver of all possible conundrums a system of philosophy, confessedly fragmentary or imperfect, in which not only parts are wanting, but also the mental powers and appropriate kind of consciousness on our part to understand their working even were they present. This cry for a complete picture of that in which for us there must necessarily be wide gaps has been the curse of all religious systems, whose expositors have invariably felt themselves constrained to paint in all kinds of fanciful objects wherever a lacuna occurred, in order to satisfy the insatiate "thirst for truth" of followers not sufficiently developed mentally to be able to suspend their judgments in matters which, if they stopped for a moment to reason for themselves, they could plainly see that real knowledge was impossible; and who by incontinently demanding information when none is to be had, have simply invited deception and fraud.

Far be it from us to suggest that all this is the case with those whose questions are answered in the "Key." Almost all the questions therein asked are reasonable, and frequently extremely apposite. (The book is in the form of question and answer throughout its 307 pages). Still there are many gaps in the doctrine which is gradually unfolded as the book proceeds, and also here and there a paradox which those who have been intellectually nourished on the very plain and matter-of-fact diet furnished by modern scientific text books, might perchance qualify as a confusion or contradiction. When the reader comes to such passages as these, he should ask himself whether he is not expecting the authoress to show him how to put his puzzle together when half the pieces are wanting, and whether the confusion he feels is altogether due to the book.

On the whole, however, the value of the "Key to Theosophy" cannot easily be overestimated,—at least in its particular line. It is essentially a treatise on the philosophical and religious aspects of "Theosophy;" although it wanders slightly off the straight road occasionally, a well-known little weakness of the learned Lady, whose rushing ideas tend to overflow into side channels all the time.

The book is one which will educate the educators,—those whose function it will be to teach Theosophy to the multitude. The multitude itself cares little for philosophy, and is chiefly amenable to the simple truths of ethics which are delivered to it from heart to heart. These are its medicines for the ills of life, and it has neither time nor inclination to enter into details, either with regard to the character of the medicines or the nature of its disease. All that most of us care to know in that case are names,—what our complaint is called and with what drug we are being dosed,—and this is very true also in matters philosophical. The "Key," in fact, teaches the anatomy and physiology of Theosophy, very necessary knowledge for the practitioner, indispensable for him, indeed, if he would take care of others, but which does not necessarily make him strong and healthy himself; for health and strength do not depend upon a knowledge of our organs and their functions, but upon pure air, good food, and wholesome exercise; and experience proves that in matters spiritual, as in physiological, one may be very learned in his anatomy and physiology and still be feeble and sickly himself, with weak chest, knock knees and poisonous breath.

In a future article we hope to give the reader an idea of the contents of this very valuable book, which not only every one who pretends to the name of Theosophist should carefully study, but which should also be read by all outsiders who desire to have authentic information as to the nature of Theosophy and the aims and objects of the Theosophical Society.

ALPHA.

(To be continued.)

THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE.*

Those who have made "Light on the Path"† their "prayer book" for the last few years, will find it a little difficult at first to attune themselves to the somewhat different key in which "The Voice of the Silence" is pitched. It may be because the latter is a translation, while the

* THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE, being extracts from THE BOOK OF THE GOLDEN PRECEPTS, for the daily use of Lanoos (disciples). Translated and annotated by H. P. B. Theo: Pub. Co. Linn. London, 1889.

† By a strange oversight "Light on the Path" is omitted from the list of works recommended officially by the British Section, as also are "The Idyll of the White Lotus" and "Through the Gates of Gold."

former is an original work, that a certain transcendental roughness and jerkiness is apparent in Madame Blavatsky's invaluable addition to books of occult science and devotion; but the difference between these two works will strike some people as like that between a magnificent melody by Verdi, and a fragment of Wagner;—a simile which the admirers respectively of melody and of harmony (with a trifle of discord thrown in) will each take as a compliment to their taste. While "The Voice of the Silence" supplements "Light on the Path" it cannot be said to replace it.

The book is dedicated "To the Few," and few will probably be those found capable of appreciating it at its real value. It goes many fathoms deeper than "Light on the Path" into the region of what (following the example of the authoress) might perhaps be termed *meta-meta-physics*. An irreverent reviewer once said that, as far as he could see, all that would be left of him, were he to sublimate himself according to the instructions in "Light on the Path," would be something comparable only to the "grin" which remained after little Alice's "Cheshire Cat" had vanished from her view. If that sapient reviewer were to give an opinion as to his condition after realizing in his inward being the processes described in "The Voice of the Silence," he would probably liken himself to the ghost of that same "grin"! But Madame Blavatsky does not write for such unintuitive materialists, and "The Few" will probably make up by the intensity of their admiration for the lack of appreciation on the part of the many of the really magnificent lessons of occult wisdom which she has given to the world in the shape of the three too short "Fragments" which compose the work.

In the Preface the authoress tells us that these Fragments are derived from "The Book of the Golden Precepts," one of the works "put into the hands of mystic students in the East," and forming part of the same series as "The Book of Dzyan," on which her "Sacred Doctrine" is based.

"The Original Precepts," says the Preface, "are engraved on thin oblong squares; copies very often on discs. These discs, or plates, are generally preserved on the altars of the temples attached to centres where the so-called 'Contemplative' or Mahâyâna (Yogachârya) schools are established. They are written sometimes in Tibetan, but mostly in ideographs.....The Book of the Golden Precepts—some of which are pre-Buddhistic, while others belong to a later date—contains about ninety distinct little treatises." Of these Madame Blavatsky learned thirty-nine by heart "years ago;" and of these thirty-nine she now gives three to the world—"The Voice of the Silence," "The Two Paths," and "The Seven Portals." Of course it need not be said that this is not told in the Preface as a mere literary device to plausibly account for the publication of the book, like the well known "manuscript left by a mysterious stranger"—but as a very serious and strictly true account of the origin of the work;—so, at least, the present reviewer understands it.

"The Voice of the Silence" deals with spiritual conditions and exercises necessary for emancipation. It ends thus:—

"Behold thou art become the light, thou hast become the sound, thou art thy Master and thy God. Thou art THYSELF the object of thy search: the VOICE unbroken that resounds throughout eternities, exempt from change, from sin exempt, the seven sounds in one, the VOICE OF THE SILENCE."

"The Two Paths" have little in common with the familiar "two ways" of theology,—with the sheep trotting up the one, and the goats capering down the other, while "the Almighty" presides at the wicket, and the Devil stands by to see he is not cheated out of any of his own.

We are told:—

"When to the Permanent is sacrificed the Mutable, the prize is thine, the drop returneth whence it came. The OPEN PATH leads to the changeless change Nirvâna, the glorious state of Absoluteness, the Bliss past human thought.

"Thus the first Path is LIBERATION.

"But Path the second is—RENUNCIATION, and therefore called the Path of Woe."

The Path of Woe "leads the Arhan to mental woe unspeakable," for he gives up self, and *self*, and even SELF for the sake of SELF. He becomes "A SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD." Still it seems that the bitterness is but bitter-sweet after all, and "payment" only deferred. ("Eternal Justice" always requires what is vulgarly called "payment"), for we are told:—

"Sweet are the fruits of Rest and Liberation for the sake of *self*; but sweeter still the fruits of long and bitter duty. Aye, Renunciation for the sake of others, of suffering fellow men."

Between these two Paths the then Initiate has to take his choice:—

"Behold! the goal of bliss and the long Path of Woe are at the furthest end. Thou canst choose either, O Aspirant to Sorrow, throughout the coming cycles.....Om Vagrâpani Hum."

"The Seven Portals" are gates upon the PATH which the aspirant for Bliss, or its opposite, must pass through; and this he can do only by opening each portal with its appropriate Golden Key. These Keys are respectively: The Key of charity and immortal love; The Key of harmony in word and act; Sweet patience that nought can ruffle; Indifference to pleasure and to pain, illusion conquered, truth alone perceived; The dauntless energy that fights its way to truth; Dhyâna; and Prajna."

After these Portals are passed, the aspirant is told:—

"Till then, a task far harder still awaits thee: thou hast to feel thyself ALL-THOUGHT, and yet exile all thoughts from out thy soul."

It is at this point, or somewhat yet beyond it, that the choice between The Two Paths must be made.

The attainment of Arhatship is a matter of importance to the universe; for, "In signs of praise both heaven and earth unite" when the happy event occurs.

"Hark!...from the deep unfathomable vortex of that golden light in which the Victor bathes, ALL NATURE'S wordless voice in thousand tones ariseth to proclaim:

"JOY WITH YE, O MEN OF MYALBA.

"A PILGRIM HATH RETURNED BACK 'FROM THE OTHER SHORE.'

"A NEW ARHAN IS BORN."

It is needless to say that everyone who lays claim to any knowledge of Theosophy ought to thoroughly study this wonderful little book, and try to understand as much of it as he can.

R. H.

Correspondence.

"MY PROPHETIC SOUL, MY UNCLE!"

TO THE EDITOR.

I heard the following from a Chela; he holds a respectable post under the Government of Bengal, and is closely related to one of the leaders of Brahma Samaj. He is, however, not a Fellow of our Society, but belongs to a Secret Brotherhood, of which, by the way, there are many in India:—

"I was then a young man, one of the naughty students of Hare School, Calcutta. I and my uncle were great friends; we were of the same age, lived together and studied the same books. My uncle was then suffering from a disease which gradually developed into phthisis. The last physician who treated him was Dr. Mohendra Lal Sirkar, who advised us to remove ourselves with the patient to a house near his own, which we did. I was at last compelled to recognise the fact that my poor friend and relative had not many days to live; we then made a solemn compact that whoever of us should die first, would try his best to appear to his surviving friend and tell him, if possible, the state he found himself in after death.

A little more than a month after the above, my friend died, and we burnt his body to ashes as is our custom. About five days after the sad occurrence, I was lying alone in a room on the outer compartment of the house. The doors and windows were open, the room was well lighted by the moon. I was fast asleep on a sofa with the curtain drawn. Suddenly at about midnight I awoke and found my uncle just by the side of my bed, but outside the curtain. He appeared to me just as he looked a few hours before his death, and was naked. I thought I was dreaming; I closed my eyes, for a few seconds, looked again, then rubbed my eyes, then looked again, the figure was still there intently gazing at me with a dull, dazed stare. I then looked round, and with the help of the light of the moon which was nearly full, could well discern the articles of furniture of the room which were all in their proper places. I turned in my bed and was perfectly convinced that I was wide awake. Suddenly our solemn compact came into my mind; I felt no fear and accosted the apparition thus: 'Are you come uncle to fulfil the compact? All right; now let me hear what you have to say. Well, why do you not speak uncle?' The apparition raised the curtain a little, and by a motion which seemed to me like the leap of a monkey, sat on my bed. 'Well, my dear uncle, I am very anxious to hear from you, why do you not speak?' And I tried to catch hold of its hand, which was near mine; then by an exactly similar motion it regained its former place. 'Why do you stare, uncle, oh why can you not speak? Do speak pray.' At last I could endure it no longer; I raised myself and stretched my hands to catch hold of the apparition, when it vanished. I was filled with indescribable sorrow and began to pace the room to and fro. I have now learnt from my Master the reasons of the apparition's not being able to speak."

Yours truly,

K. P. MUKHERJI, F. T. S.

BERHAMPUR.

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. XI. No. 126.—MARCH 1890.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH;

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

THE OUTLOOK.

I SHALL never forget the inspiring effect upon my mind of a sermon I heard at New York on the Sunday after the Battle of Bull Run, in the first year of the Rebellion. Our army had been disastrously, disgracefully routed, and there was general gloom: the capture of Washington with the National archives and treasury seemed inevitable, and with it the overthrow of our Government. On the following Sunday the Rev. H. W. Bellows, one of our greatest pulpit and platform orators, preached the sermon in question to a great audience that hung upon his words. From that moment and throughout the four years of our titanic struggle I never despaired for the country. The eloquent preacher searched into the depths of the question of national life and strength and appealed to the calm judgment, faith and manhood of his hearers. A brave heart himself, he infused his courage into the heart of every sympathetic listener.

And now that I sit me down to survey the position of the Theosophical Society in the first half of its sixteenth year of activity, this old lesson comes back to me with force, and I feel the deepest regret that I lack the lofty power of Dr. Bellows to put into the hearts of all my colleagues the perfect confidence which many of us feel in the destiny of this remarkable movement. If there be faint heartedness in some quarters and doubt or despondency in others, it is merely because the movement is not considered as an entity, but only viewed in fragments. There are hosts of men who are myopic as regards broad questions, and can see only what is close to the mind's eye. Others become pessimistic when looking through smoky mental spectacles. From the very beginning I have had to listen to prophets

You are free:



to **Share** — to copy, distribute and transmit the work



to **Remix** — to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:



Attribution — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).



Noncommercial — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.



Share Alike — If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under the same or similar license to this one.

With the understanding that:

Waiver — Any of the above conditions can be **waived** if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Public Domain — Where the work or any of its elements is in the **public domain** under applicable law, that status is in no way affected by the license.

Other Rights — In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:

- Your fair dealing or **fair use** rights, or other applicable copyright exceptions and limitations;
- The author's **moral** rights;
- Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is used, such as **publicity** or privacy rights.

Notice — For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. The best way to do this is with a link to this web page.