

NOTES FROM THE ADYAR LIBRARY.

*Andra Saririka.**

A copy of the above work, a Telugu commentary on the Brahma Sutras of Badarayana, has been received in the Adyar Oriental Library. On carefully studying it, it appears that the subject is well treated, and the Sutras well explained according to the interpretation of Sri Sankaracharya; the material translation (Telugu) of the Sutras forming an important feature of the work. Sri Sankaracharya's interpretation of Upanishad vakyas (extracts from the Upanishads to explain the text of the Sutras) are very accurately translated. In this respect it can be said that it is superior to the English translation of the Brahma Sutras by the Rev. Dr. Bannerji. The author acknowledges having secured the assistance of a good Pandit, and the work itself shows that such was the case. The great want felt by the Theosophists and non-Theosophists in the Telugu districts, of really good Vedantic works in the Telugu language, is, in a great measure, supplied by the one under Review.

ORIENTAL LIBRARY, }
ADYAR, 17th July 1889. }

PANDIT N. BHASHYA CHARYA.

SIDDANTHA-SARA.

It is very much to be desired that Babu Manilal Nabhubhai Drivedi would translate into English and publish his new work entitled "Siddantha Sâra."†

The work, which is written in Guzerati, is "an outline of the history of thought in India, terminating with an attempt to point out the basis of universal religion."

The book treats of the Vedic period, the Brâhmanas, Aranyakas and Upanishads; Sutras and Smritis; the Darsanas, the Puranas, Tantras, and Idol-worship; the Sampradayas and Panthas; Karma, etc., and ends with chapters on Western science and thought.

A synopsis in English precedes the text, and the English preface explains the scope of the work. In it we read: "Ancient India is generally acknowledged, on all hands, to be the cradle of civilization and religion. The religion of ancient India has, however, nothing so peculiar in it as to render it special property. Moreover science and religion, so far as the ancient teaching is concerned, are convertible terms. The religion of ancient India is, therefore, the common property of mankind. The conclusions of modern science checked by the wisdom of antiquity appear untenable, and most disastrous in their ethical results. The stir of the present century, while it is the knell of all religions is, at the same time, the travail preceding a magnificent birth. The age of "idol"—atry is at an end. The Great Iconoclast is up with his hammer: It is time for the theologian to break open the shells of their belief; it is time for antiquarians to step over the boundary of myths, words and forms; it is time for scientists to break the charmed circle "this much and no more." A universal religion of truth, if it can be demonstrated, is the most craving necessity of the day.

We recommend the work to the attention of those who can read Guzerati.

*ANDHRA SARIRAKA: written in accordance with the Brahma Sutras of Badarayana, the commentary of Sri Sankaracharya and that of Ramananda. By RAI BAHADUR V. JAGANNATHA ROW PANTULU, assisted by BRAHMASRI MAHABHASHYAM VENKATRAMANA SASTRI GARU. Empress of India Press, Madras, 1889. Part I containing the 1st para. of the 1st Adhyaya.

† SIDDANTHA SARA, by MANILAL NABHUBHAI DIVEDI, Nirnaya-Sagara Press, Bombay, 1889.

ॐ

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. X. No. 120.—SEPTEMBER 1889.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

CENTRES OF THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT.

MY old friend and colleague and a co-Founder of the Society, Mr. William Q. Judge, has sent me a long article taking exception to certain ideas embodied in two articles which appeared in the June *Theosophist*. They are respectively entitled "Applied Theosophy," and "The Situation." The criticism of Mr. Judge is marked by his usual force and directness, but at the same time contains passages of a far too personal character for me to admit them. To do so would be to depart from the policy of editorial dignity, which I have promised myself to follow out so long as I am the responsible Editor of this Magazine. I have taken no part, nor shall I, in the various unseemly quarrels, public and private, which the friction of 'strong personalities' among us has and probably always will engender. They are mostly unimportant, involving no great principle or vital issue, and therefore beneath the interest of those who have the high purposes and aims of the Society at heart. The "great healer"—Time—always sets things right. For none of my colleagues have I a stronger regard and friendship than for Mr. Judge, for no one of them has worked by my side during these past fourteen years with more singleness of purpose or loyalty to our ideal. Officially, I have ever supported him when he was in the right, and in the present instance prove my personal regard by omitting parts of his article which are irrelevant to the issue and injurious to his reputation for calmness and impartiality.

He quotes approvingly from the first of the two articles under notice the following passage:

"But it is only as a united whole that the Theosophical Society can ever be a power in the world for good, or a vehicle for the altruistic efforts of its

Fellows;" and although this is not a new idea, it is the one which has been insisted on from the beginning by the Founders, expressed in the fundamental object of Universal Brotherhood, and again and again revived in various letters received from those beings who have had our Society in charge. The next sentence following that just quoted is: "The action of the Theosophical Society is on the plane of ideas";

Of which he remarks that:

"This is undoubtedly true, but is not a proper premise on which to build the remainder of the article."

Mr. Judge thinks he has found in another passage the hidden motive of the writer, viz., that

"*Adyar* is not a place only, it is a principle. It is a name which ought to carry with it a power far greater than that conveyed by the name 'Rome.' Adyar is the centre of the Theosophical movement—not '7 Duke St. Adelphi,' nor 'Post Office Box 2659, New York.' Every loyal fellow has in his heart a little 'Adyar.'* The writer wishes to make a second 'Rome' upon the material plane, a dogma in bricks and mortar, as he cannot have a dogma in words and declarations, such is the whole drift of the article, and the last one of the same issue entitled '*The Situation*' is intended to support and enforce the first."

Misconceiving the perfectly plain meaning of his author, Mr. Judge reads into this innocent passage the idea that the very name of Adyar—i. e., the T. S. Head-quarters—should have an even greater dogmatic theocratic value to all members of our Society, than has the name of Rome to the devout Roman Catholic who accepts the infallibility of the Pope! Reading the article now for the first time, what I see is that the writer meant to imply that our movement should have an ideal as well as an executive centre; and that, since there must be a crystallizing centre of our hidden spiritual force, the natural and only theoretical point would be the Society's Head-quarters. And our hidden Founders being real powers, not mere talk like the infallibility of the Pope, that central nucleus of ours should carry with it an idea of a greater force than the name of the Eternal City. I know the writer in question to be a man as loyal to the core as Mr. Judge or myself to the Theosophical cause, its projectors, and their agents. He is as far from holding to such a pitiful notion as his critic would fasten upon him, as Mr. Judge is from that of training for the Papacy. No one, surely, would dream of imputing to myself such nonsense as the assumption of personal infallibility or autocracy, in face of my persistent refusal to allow myself to be taken as guide, guru, teacher or leader, and my passionate insistence upon everybody's depending solely upon himself, and rejecting all orders, writings, dogmas, ceremonies and traditions, offered authoritatively and without granting full opportunity for free thought and private judgment. Whatever wrong may ever be charged against me hereafter, that sin against manhood and truth never will. And I venture to say that the author of "Applied Theosophy" is equally blameless in the present instance. So, let that pass.

* In the article quoted from there is no full stop here. After a comma the sentence proceeds; "for he has in him a spark of the spiritual fire which the name typifies."

Having rebelled against his mayavic delusion that Adyar is to be our Rome pontifical, Mr. Judge asks:

"But was Adyar ever the centre of this movement? Is it now? And where is the centre? In what place should it be? These are questions to be answered."

"The centre of the movement was once in New York City, and was found in the person of H. P. Blavatsky; she moved to Bombay, taking the centre with her, and for a short time she remained in Adyar, where then there was a centre, for where she is burns the flame that draws its force from 'the plane of ideas' upon which works 'the action of the Theosophical Society,' as the writer of the articles mentioned so justly says. The mere location of the President in Adyar, and the existence of a library there, do not make that spot our 'Rome.' It was in obedience to the orders of those Beings behind the Society that Col. Olcott moved the Head-quarters to India, and by reading our Rules we find that they always provided for an ambulatory head-quarters until the last Convention, when the author of these articles made them permanent. What would become of this new Rome—Adyar—if an order were received for Col. Olcott and H. P. Blavatsky to betake themselves to America once more and there set up the Theosophical Society Head-quarters? Such a thing might happen. It happened before, and the channel for the order was H. P. Blavatsky. Does any one suppose that either Col. Olcott or H. P. Blavatsky would be obstructed in their actions by the 'Revised Rules'?"

Here are many questions, and some conundrums. If my eminent, though irascible, colleague has time to consult history, he will find it stated in the Society's 'Rules' of 1879—the year of our arrival in India—that the Head-quarters of the Society "are for the time being where the President-Founder may be."

The "Revised Rules" of 1880 repeat this statement *verbatim*.

These Rules held good for two years. But in the Convention of December 1882 the following resolution was passed: "That the Head-quarters of the Society be fixed at Madras until further change is found necessary." This led to a verbal alteration of the clause in question in the Rules of 1883; the wording therein being: "whose Head-quarters are for the time being in that locality where the President-Founder may fix his official residence."

By the Convention of December 1883 the following clause was added to the foregoing (which is repeated *verbatim*): "Annually on the 27th of December and succeeding days, a Convention of the General Council meets at the permanent Indian Head-quarters, Adyar, Madras"; and the Rule is thus stated in the Rules of 1884.

In the "Revised Rules" passed by the Convention of December 1884, and known as those of 1885, considerable changes are made: the "Objects" and "Rules" which before were separate, being now amalgamated. In these Revised Rules themselves no mention occurs of the location of the Head-quarters, but appended to the "List of Branches" there is the following declaration, printed in italics:

"The permanent Head-quarters and Postal address of the Theosophical Society are at ADYAR (Madras), India, where all communications should invariably be addressed."

In the Rules of 1886 (passed by the next following Convention), the first Rule in the Section on Organization runs as follows:

"The Society shall have its Head-quarters at Adyar, Madras."

The Rules of 1887 and 1888 repeat that clause *verbatim*.

The Revised Rules of 1889 re-introduce the word "permanent," the clause being in these words:

"The Head-quarters of the Society are permanently established at Adyar, Madras, India."*

The early moveability of Head-quarters was due to the Society's living in rented houses in New York and Bombay, liable to be shifted from place to place: a condition which ceased with the purchase of the Adyar property. And because, moreover, the whole Executive responsibility had been centered from the first in the President, to whom, by most unequivocal action of the Council in New York (as attested by the Council Records, in Mr. Judge's own handwriting, now at Adyar) had been granted absolute and unlimited discretion as to the practical management of our affairs. No Council ever gave me as President the color of spiritual authority, nor did I ever pretend to such. It was Madame Blavatsky who taught and introduced me to my Initiators, but it was I who gave officially to her last year, a charter to form her Esoteric Section. Between her and myself there was never any dispute upon these points, she sustaining my exoteric authority as loyally as I have ever recognized her superior connection with the "Founders": by whom I do *not* mean the poor pigmies known by the world under that title.

Col. Olcott did *not* move the Head-quarters to India by any one's orders: his "orders" came from the depths of his own heart, where lay a magnetisable core that was irresistibly drawn by the magnet of the Himalayas. Life had become bitter to him and unbearable, away from the Holy Land of the Teachers. What he did get was the time to start; and when he arrived, instead of being permitted to go into the seclusion he coveted, he was bidden to seek those he yearned for "through the Theosophical Society, learning the first great lesson of unselfishness." If in the course of the Society's development the transfer of Head-quarters should ever be advisable—which neither I nor Mr. Judge can now forecast—doubtless I shall receive direct notice with ample time to make all the necessary arrangements in a business-like and constitutional manner.

Nor was Madame Blavatsky any more than myself the "Founder" of the Society: neither of us was anything more than a willing agent. Misinformed enthusiasts have sung this pæan these several years past, and I have let it pass as too unimportant to trouble myself about. But when it is a question of papal infallibilities and Romes, it is just as well to say it was I who proposed the formation of the Society, who had all the early burden of guiding its infant steps, and who, after the collapse of the original legislative scheme of Rules and Bye-Laws, had—as above remarked—all the executive responsibility. The scheme of utilising such an agency as this in the general movement of the world's thought at the present Karmic crisis,

* The statement which Mr. Judge has made and published that the Convention of 1888 altered the "Objects" of the Theosophical Society is equally devoid of foundation.—*Ed.*

originated, as both my critical and criticized colleagues agree, upon the "plane of ideas," and among personages the latchets of whose shoes neither Madame Blavatsky nor I, nor any one of our associates, is worthy to unloose. Yet she was the intermediary between them and me, thus earning my lifelong gratitude, as she long ago did by brotherly love and loyalty. Assuredly, wherever she finds herself, whether in her permanent home here, in Adyar, or temporarily, as in London or elsewhere, there burns the Theosophical "flame:"—if Mr. Judge had said "cyclone," he would still have been within the mark. And it is a flame that burns up a great deal of fellowship chaff, and melts a great deal of dross out of pretentious, emotional, over-confident members and "sympathizers!" Like the active volcano, she throws out a good deal of lava, scorix and sulphur, but like it she often uncovers gold and silver veins of arcane truth for those who are *not too blind to see it*.

Having trodden his bogey Rome under feet, Mr. Judge makes us a fair proposition; thus:—

"But let us a moment calmly examine our field of work with its possibilities. It is significant that H. P. Blavatsky started the Theosophical Society in New York and not in India. Does not this, together with subsequent events, give one a clear view of reasons, causes, and probable results. When this was done in America there was no following here; the Society from any ordinary standpoint would have been pronounced a still-birth. But the vortex, having whirled the appointed time in the first chosen spot, moves over to India, where after a time Branches began to spring up, and then like a pendulum-swing the influence once more reaches America, where in three years there have suddenly appeared an interest and a growth surpassing those of the preceding ten years in the whole area of the Society's operations."

Why does my friend calmly ignore Ceylon, where the result of our movement has been the revival of Buddhism, where I have just formed five new Branches, and where it was never so strong and active as now; and is not the pendulum swinging over Japan, where the nation has just been stirred to its depths by the message of international Brotherhood? Mr. Judge should prick a pin-hole in the map of the United States which he is holding before his eyes, and look across the Pacific. He thinks the American revival not due to the—

"Existence of either the Bombay or the Adyar Head-quarters, but mainly to the unflinching and constant work of H. P. Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott."

For my part, I think it due to the rush of a certain spiritual wave around the globe, upon the crest of which all spiritual reformers are swimming. It was our good Karma to have been born and brought together at the right time to take part in the splendid work. Pity we Theosophists have not been able to do more; greater pity that we should not be able to avoid misunderstandings which cripple our efforts.

Passing over paragraphs about the past and present condition of the Indian and British Branches, which embody mistakes I should have to correct, and which are not vitally important, I come to the following items of interest:

"In America are 26 actual working Branches, and a state of things with a quality of material and a potentiality for the future not equalled anywhere, and still less understood in either India or England. Let readers

examine the article entitled "A Few Words from California" in the June *Theosophist* in connection with this one.

"Remembering the words of the writer of the *Secret Doctrine*, we must regard America as a theosophical field of vast possibilities. According to her, it is here that the next race is to be evolved, and that opinion is shared by many physicians, acute observers on the spot, who say they see already the indisputable evidence of that fusion of bloods and differentiation of race which indicate a great change of some sort in the people who shall one day be the American nation. All over this country, now that the inevitable roar of laughter has subsided, theosophical ideas are taking root and the doctrines brought forward by the members of the Society are receiving earnest attention. By taking up a Theosophical map of the United States, we find the Branches scattered all across its four thousand miles of territory. Every month will add more of these, and in the course of three years it may happen that there will be in this field more groups of Theosophists and members-at-large than there are in the whole of Europe and Asia. All that has come about up to the present time in the movement here, has been the result of the earnest craving of the people for our thoughts and formulations of doctrine. But if preachers of Theosophy, earnest, well-read members, should travel about the United States, there would be in two years 100 new Branches, besides the numerous members unattached. As our body is governed by votes, it might then happen that the Americans would remove the Head-quarters to the centre of this country. That centre—leaving out of view the projection of Alaska in the north—is somewhere in Nebraska, and there is a very old tradition among the aborigines that in Nebraska once lived a powerful king ruling a nation of magicians. History often repeats itself."

As for the evolution of the Sixth Race, we may leave that to our grandchildren of the twentieth generation to discuss. Before they come upon the scene Adyar and New York may have been engulfed in the ocean, and new Head-quarters be established on the topmost layer of soil that hides the archaic remains of our present quarrelsome race.

I am not quite converted to the project of shifting our Library and archives to Nebraska, because a legendary king of magicians is said to have once lived there. In truth it rather surprises me that Mr. Judge, who has been in India, should have cited the fact as of any weight in the argument. India, as he knows, was the home of the Rishis and is that of their successors, which would seem to give it far more the character of a Holy Land than Nebraska derives from the alleged circumstance of her prehistoric Magus. If it comes to a question of votes apart from "orders," and our American Section should be able to outvote all the others in the General Council, nobody would have a word to say as to its legality or constitutionality. It would then only be required that I should make up my mind whether I would resign my office and identify myself wholly with the work in the Orient, or turn over the Adyar property to some new-created Vice-President or other person, and go to the Nebraskan "centre" where the vortex whirl was spinning.

Defining his view that "Applied Theosophy" is neither the fixing of our Society centre in one or the other locality, nor the creation of a sectarian solidarity, nor the adoption of a set of Rules, nor something else, Mr. Judge asks what it is, and thus answers himself and concludes—

"It is a sincere following out in our lives of every Theosophical doctrine and precept; a determined, constant promulgation of those doctrines of Reincarnation, Karma, and the Spiritual Identity of all men, that our Founders

directed us to bring forward; a constant endeavour to realize the Universal Brotherhood within ourselves, in order that we may be fit units in the nucleus of that Brotherhood which the Society was formed to bring about; it is the endeavour to carry out in all things the behests of the divine will, which can only be done by that one who is truly devoted.

"Let those seeds of jealousy die therefore, and no more be revived by talking about any one place, being the Rome of our Theosophical Society.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE."

One point has not been discussed which should not be passed over, viz., is there any necessity for the existence of a centre of the whole Theosophical movement? I can hardly see room for two opinions about it, and would not advert to were it not virtually raised in Mr. Judge's article. This movement covers almost the whole world already in its geographical distribution, and would seem likely to do so fully in the near future. How could it get on without an organizing centre? In America, when there were but a few branches, the machinery of an administrative Committee, or Board of Control, had to be devised: when nine had come into existence, there had to be a much more perfect organization and our American Section was the result. The work could not go on without it now, and if it were abolished tomorrow there would soon follow a collapse of the movement as an entity, and the 26 Branches would fall into the state of small moribund clubs. To carry on the business of the Section requires a central office, clerks, supervisors, books of record and account, a bank book, a depository for papers and other archives. They have also found it expedient to print a magazine, books and pamphlets, organize a library, and have a reception room for visitors. And to pay for all this, funds are drawn from a scale of fees and dues. If the necessity for a Sectional centre be conceded, how much more necessary is a general centre, or Head-quarters, for the entire movement, whose official business is with all the Sections, isolated Branches, and unattached Fellows in extra-Sectional countries, the world over; whose archives comprise the documentary history of the Society from the beginning; whose literary field far overlaps the boundaries of any Section; whose administrative purview takes in the theosophical activities in every quarter of the earth; whose duty it is to enter new fields, awaken interest in previously unsolicited nations, organize new Branches, and form the nuclei of new Sections; whose Executive is the acknowledged Court of Appeal in all controversies between Sections, Branches, and individual Fellows, the official Trustee of Society property, the administrative representative of the constitutional authority of the Council, and the special custodian of those two certain pieces of movable property, to be nameless here, but which Fellows know about, which are *the palladium of the Society*. What the heart is to the body, the Head-quarters is to the Society, the working centre of its vital action. Its existence is what makes Theosophy a "going concern," as contrasted with Spiritualism, which suffers for lack of a practical working centre,—a fact which the most sensible Spiritualists have been affirming for many years past. Non-sectarian, impartial as to the various religious attachments of our members, it represents—alone can represent—the idea of Univer-

sal Brotherhood upon whose broad base our edifice rests. While the French and Germans mutually resent interference by each other in their official concerns and both would rebel against interference with them by the British or American Sections, and *vice versa*, all unhesitatingly submit their unsettled disputes to the Executive for decision. And again, when there was trouble between personal factions in English Branches and between the American Theosophical leaders, it was to me and to no one else that the disputants looked for equitable composition of their troubles. These are facts beyond dispute, facts going to prove the indispensability of a general centre which shall be the official residence of the central arbitrator and judge, officially placed above the plane of partisanship and of local interests and influences.

H. S. OLCOTT.

SOUND SPEECH AND THE LOGOS.

THE LOGOS, the WORD, the SABBABRAHMA, are all synonyms denoting the same self-conscious universe, the fourth or the sixth principle of the universe from below. It is the macrocosmic counterpart of the human soul. The object in view of this article is to trace the meaning of these terms. Why is the entity otherwise known as Iswara or Brahma or God, given the very singular name of THE WORD?

One of the five constituents of the universe on all the planes of life, is, as the learned reader no doubt knows, the *ākāsa tatwa*, (sonoriferous ether). Sound is the characteristic of this *tatwa*.

The existence of the *ākāsa tatwa* as a separate *tatwa*, the substratum of sound, is beyond all doubt. The so-called electric current which transmits sound along the wire, or along the solar rays of Prana, is nothing more nor less than the ancient *ākāsa tatwa* on the plane of Prana. It would be extremely unphilosophical to hold that light, the ether with its peculiar luminiferous vibrations, can appeal to any other sense than the eye. In that case light would become synonymous with sound. We must hold that solar Prana is a composition of five ethers, each of which appeals to one sense. We have now to do with the all-pervading *ākāsa* whose vibrations cause on the physical plane what we call sound.

In the plane of Prana *ākāsa* appears in various degrees of conjunction with other *tatwas*. The *vayu* imparts to it a certain amount of motive force, the *tejas* gives it colour and heat, the *apas* smoothness, the *prithivi* steadiness, and so on. The fact is that the least little quality of each and every *tatwa* has its representative in sound. All nature is pervaded with sound. Every change of material state that we are familiar with, has its own peculiar sound. Growth in vegetables, minerals and animals, crystallization, chemical action, all have a certain distinctive sound. There is no process on the physical plane, from the birth of living atoms to the appearance by graduated development of the highest organism, which is possible without a sound. In short, as the Indian philoso-

pher concisely remarks, the *ākāsa* being the first element in the order of evolution, the remaining four *tatwas* have all of them the quality of sound. Wherever you find the vibrations in any form of any one or more of the all comprehensive *tatwas* of Prana, you are sure to have sound there. It is from this very easy to understand that the prototypes of all physical forms, with their inherent powers of appearance, duration and disappearance, are all a set of sonorous phases. It is sound that leaves the impression on physical matter of the various living organisms of the world. It is sound that creates, preserves and destroys.

Might it not be said on the same line of argument that the colour, the touch, the taste, and the smell are each of them as many creators, preservers and destroyers? No! Take the *tatwas* in their original non-composite state. There is no smell in the *apas*, no taste in the *tejas*, no colour in the *vayu*, and no touch in the *ākāsa*.*

The touch is an effect of motion. Wherever there is motion, there is touch. You can thus feel by touch the *vayu*, the *tejas*, the *apas*, and the *prithivi* *tatwas*, which are but various modes of motion of the eternal breath of Parabrahma. But is not *ākāsa* too a mode of motion of the same great Breath? And if yes, why then should not it be held that the quality of the *vayu* *tatwa*, motion, is present everywhere, and not sound, which is only an effect of motion?

Now it cannot be denied that *ākāsa* is a mode of motion and that sound is only an effect of motion. It is on this account that *ākāsa*, the substratum of sound, and *vayu*, the substratum of motion, have been dispensed with as *tatwas* by some philosophers. The sage Pippalāda speaks in the *Chhembdagya* only of three *tatwas*, the *agni*, the *apas* and the *prithivi*, as having evolved out of the *sat*. The threefold division however is imperfect as shown by the other Upanishads, and it is quite possible that in the dialogue between father and son in which the above occurs, the sage father might only have spoken of the three *tatwas* as an elementary lesson. The fact is that with the *vayu* *tatwa* begin the relative motions of a plane of existence. While *ākāsa* is no doubt a mode of motion, it is not a mode of *that* motion which, coming after it and out of it, gives birth to the four remaining *tatwas* of the lower plane. It is one of the properties of the *ākāsa* *tatwa* that it always intervenes between two planes of existence, or even between two different modes of motion—the *tatwas*. It is, as has been said in the science of breath, *that* state which is pregnant with all the *tatwic* modes of motion, and their various phases and combinations. Thus, so far as Prana is concerned, the *ākāsa* of Prana has no mode of motion with which the Prana is familiar. The motions of Prana begin with the *vayu* *tatwa* of Prana, which comes after *ākāsa*. *ākāsa*, so to speak, is the vehicle of all these modes of motion—the *tatwas* and *tatwic* formations. Sound is

* The reader, I believe, is familiar with phenomenon of Panchikaram, the five-fold composition. Thus a minimum of *ākāsa* is before *panchikarama* simply *ākāsa*. After that $\text{Akāsa} = \frac{\text{Akāsa}}{2} + \frac{\text{Vayu}}{8} + \frac{\text{Agni}}{8} + \frac{\text{Apas}}{8} + \frac{\text{Prithivi}}{8}$.

present in all the tatwas which come from *ákása*, and could only have come from the common source. The *vayu* must thus be kept a separate *tatwa*. It is the first of the *tatwas* of *Prana*. With it begin all the relative motions of that plane of existence. Hence is every other *tatwic* motion also capable of touch, and thus it is that in every sense there must be touch before there can be perception.

It is evident from this why some of the ancient philosophers recognize only four elements, the *vayu* (air), the *agni* (fire), the *ápas* (water), the *prithivi* (earth). But this is again an imperfect theory. The existence of *ákása* is a necessity. It is an all-pervading element. Every change of state is preceded and followed by *ákása*; and the permanency of any state is only the passing of any substance from one state of *ákása* to another. It is only the change of one sound into another. The change of one physical force into another is simply impossible without the intervention of *ákása*. You apply a certain amount of actual heat to ice. The ice becomes water, but not until about 78° of your heat becomes latent. Where has all this heat gone? It has passed into the *ákásic* state, which now serves as the basis of fluidic motion. As long as this *ákása* is there, we see water. But destroy this particular *ákásic* consistency—this state of the latency of 78° of heat—and the nature of the substance is changed. It becomes either ice or steam. This shows that in every state of the existence of physical matter, the *tatwas* which appeal to our senses have *ákása* as the substratum of their action.

When the *tatwas* of any individual substance disappear in its *ákása*, that thing passes into what the secret doctrine calls the *laya* state; and it is from this *ákásic* state that the thing may either reappear, or pass into another state.

When the *tatwas* of *Prana* disappear in *ákása*, the motions of life become latent. *Ákása* is a mysterious state which, while deriving its immediate constitution from the higher principle of *manas*, foreshadows or rather carries in itself all the constituent vibrations of the next principle, the *Prana* that is to come. No other *tatwa* shows this peculiar quality. Hence is the sound alone the relative first cause of the manifestations of life. It is the substratum of all the other *tatwic* manifestations. The same holds good upon all the other planes of existence. We see as regards physical sound that it is the prime source of all formation, preservation and destruction on the physical plane. We also see that this sound derives its immediate existence from a higher principle, which is therefore its necessary antecedent.

These truths receive remarkable confirmation from certain observations on the origin of speech, which is the most important modification of sound. The origin of speech is one of the most difficult chapters in the history of man. Various hypotheses have been put forward by men of note at various times. The *Bow-vow*, the *Pooh-pooh*, and the *Ding-dong* theories have all had their palmy days, and may still count many an illustrious name among their devotees. None of these is, however, adequate. Neither imitations, nor interjections, nor yet the impressions upon the human vocal organs, are the immediate cause of speech. It is in

the mind that we must look for such a cause. There can be no speech without a pre-existing thought. What is the meaning of a word? A certain impression which by long association has come to be inseparably connected with a certain sound. Examine carefully the roots of the human languages—Sanskrit notably, which has preserved and classified the largest number of roots. What do you find there? The meanings of the roots are nothing more nor less in a majority of cases than the sights invariably connected with the sounds. It is always a certain motion which produces a certain sound, and the motion as it affects the eye is the meaning of that sound. This happens in the majority of cases, because sight is of all the senses in the commonest use with mankind. Other senses too contribute their share to the meaning of these sounds. The motion as it affects the touch, the hearing, the taste and the smell, and even the mind, is in many cases denoted by the sound. Take for example a few roots:—

1. The root *srip*, L. *serpo*. English *creep*.

This the root from which is derived the word *serpent*, the Sanskrit *sarpa*, and the root evidently means the way motion of a serpent in grass, which gives birth to the sound *srip srip srip*.

2. *as*, *ah*, *at*:—

This is the sound produced by the constant motion of the breath. The first root means to be, inasmuch as it is to breathe that is to be. The second means to pervade from the breath of life pervading every atom. The third means constant motion from the breath of life knowing no cessation.

3. *Bhi*, to fear. The primary meaning of this root is to produce void, the sound most evidently being produced by any hard substance being thrust into mud, and thus producing a void. The emotion of fear is the complement of the physiological action of the blood receding back into the heart.

A thorough examination of all the roots will show conclusively that all the elements of human speech are represented in nature, and that the meaning of the various radical sounds is the concomitant impression produced together with the sonorous impression on any other sense or the mind itself.

This connection between the sound and the meaning must have a substratum. It is impossible without a comparative faculty. Thus from the very necessity of the case we pass beyond the kingdom of *Prana*.

It is evident that the organ of speech does not act in immediate consonance with the organ of hearing, otherwise man would begin to speak involuntarily whatever would fall on his ears. The absence of such a phenomenon shows conclusively that sound and its meaning is not preserved in *Prana* (life-principle), because in that case the organ of speech must be disturbed as soon as the *Prana* is disturbed by the impression upon the hearing.

The current of sound does not pass direct from the ear to the vocal apparatus. It always stands in need of a higher principle, which might consciously direct it or not as it pleases to that organ. This higher principle is the *manas* (mind). The sonorous impression together with its meaning leaving its *tatwic* trace in the

wake of Prana, passes beyond. There is the word and its meaning preserved. But what is the state in which it is preserved?

The words become latent in the centres of the *ákása* tatwa of Prana, which forms the connecting link between the mind and the remaining *tatwas* of the lower principle. There the sound currents remain in reserve, while the sound-impressions are carried to the mind to be there preserved by memory—the *mental ákása*.

The *ákása* of Prana sends the sound current back to the vocal organs during waking. The *mental ákása* is necessary to send it back to the mind during sleep, or even in thinking without speaking. There is only a difference of plane between the thought-current, and the sound-current. They are really the same. The sound-current can only be directed towards the organ of speech by the impulse given to it through the thought-current. There can be no speech without thought. The thought which is the father of speech, was given birth to by the sounds of nature, and even now is it evoked in a young mind in the same way. The impulse to the human speech comes from the mind. It is a manifestation of the creations of human thought. Where does the impulse to the inarticulate sounds of nature come from? Is there any difference between these sounds and human speech except that of location? Both have the same constituents, and indeed human speech is only the inarticulate sounds of nature transferred to man, and nothing else.

It is evident that to produce sonorous motion, the impulse must come to the *ákása* of Prana from the principle beyond the mind. Without that there can be no sound. Hence the sound sent forth in the process of growth by a tree, and in fact every sound accompanying any process whatever of creation, preservation, and destruction in nature, must have a mind. There can be no life without a sound, and there can be no sound without a mind. Every force of nature has thus a sound, and hence a mind, and is therefore a god. The manifestation of these gods on the physical plane is their sound, and the impulse to this manifestation is their thought which is sound too in everything except the plane of action. The one is the *logos without*, the other the *logos within*.

The impulse to the *logos within* comes from Brahma, the centre of the psychic ocean, which is the self-conscious universe. The laws are the same. The forces of the universal mind, together with the impulses which give birth to Prana, all live in the *mental ákása* substratum of sound. It is from there that the *tatwic* rays of Iswara—the *vijnana*—which as before is the collection of the egos of the gods spoken of above, drive out the *ideas* of the world, along the *tatwic* 'wires of thought.' Hence thought is to Iswara, as the *logos without* is to the *logos within*. In fact seeing that every sound—every creature, destructive and preservative force that is—has its start from Iswara, that is the true *logos*, the one word (*sabda*).

Now for this one word, this *logos prophorikas* so to say, there must be one *logos endiathetas*. Its postulation is a necessity, since every active force has a period of rest which is nothing more, as experience teaches us, than a merging or becoming latent in a

something beyond. That something is the *SAT* of the Upanishads. 'This (the visible universe),' says the Chhandogya Upanishad, 'was the *SAT* in the beginning.' The last three words point to the setting in for the first time after great cessation (*Mahapralaya*) of the positive current of the great breath.

The mysterious potency of the *ákása* and sound is thus patent, and there is nothing strange in the exoteric religions making the universe come out of the word of God.

RAMA PRASAD.

"A FEW TRUTHS ABOUT THEOSOPHY."*

THE difficulties in the way of a public advocate for Theosophy are great. There is, first, the general prejudice among the worldly-minded against Theosophists, who are commonly regarded by that class as a set of sentimentalists who talk much and do little. Secondly, there is the fact that the majority of the Indian members of the Theosophical Society are of the younger generation, and a youngster addressing an audience of conservatives runs considerable risk of being thought a violator of the proprieties.

But be this as it may, and ill or well as I may perform this annual task of drawing your attention to matters theosophical, I approach it in sincerity and earnestness. And sincerity and earnestness have often been deemed excuse sufficient for bad performances on subjects far less respectable than Theosophy. Well then, gentlemen, I shall lay before you a brief account of the ordinary thinkings and doings of Theosophists, and it will be for you to judge whether they deserve encouragement or not.

They believe, in the first place, that there is much imperfection in humanity still. I conceive no one will condemn this belief; it is, at least, very wholesome for young people to entertain it, for if they took it into their heads that they were perfect, they would indeed not try to better themselves.

This imperfection they further believe to be inseparably connected with the antagonism of man and man, a want of union in humanity, a discordance of interests. Want of union they ascribe to selfishness in its innumerable forms, and selfishness they believe to be co-extensive with immorality. And want of union naturally prevents progress in knowledge; so much of our time is spent in guarding against mischief from others, so much more in doing mischief to these others, that we have very little time left to devote to the pursuit of knowledge.

Observe a prominent fact—the daily growing mass of papers wherever business-men and money are concerned. It is not difficult to realise and regret that so much time and mental energy have to be wasted in merely counteracting the equally growing evil subtlety of disingenuous persons.

* A lecture delivered by Bábú Bhagavan Das, M. A., F. T. S., at a public meeting at Benares.

Little hope can there be of progress in knowledge where such waste of mind is rendered necessary by the conditions of life, and, without knowledge, even less is the hope of comfort in life, ignorance being the one sole cause of suffering.

To remedy this state of things the Theosophical Society has proposed to itself as its first object, Universal Brotherhood, in order to counteract the selfishness whose results are so mischievous. The natural result of this object,—to the extent to which it is achieved,—is to be leisure for the study of ancient books and sciences for which the Theosophical Society is forced to entertain a special affection by the loose morals of the modern products of human thought, and the inability of these to promote the genuine interests of humanity.

The third object is a development of psychic powers which is expected to be, in turn, the result of a thorough comprehension and practice of the principles set forth in ancient works.

In the degree in which these objects are realised our life on earth would become more desirable—so think the Theosophists.

And here, gentlemen, at this stage of effort at self-improvement, Theosophists have been suspected of political meddling! The word 'improvement' some of these sage critics think can mean only political improvement. But the distinction between external advancement and internal progress is patent. The former may be the uncertain object of the science of politics, the sole subject-matter of which is a fight between the clever and selfish on the one hand, and the simple and good on the other. The latter, *i. e.*, internal progress, is the sure aim of Theosophy.

Truly they have ill understood Theosophy who can confound it with politics. Where the former exists the latter will not; a community of Theosophists is expected to be free from struggle, whereas the foundation of politics is strife. Theosophy would develop the reason of all men, so that each may be able to understand and rationally minister to his own as well as other people's higher interests which, when obtained, may easily help to secure the latter also. Politics, on the other hand, confines itself to these lower interests, the outward concerns of human life, and, never going down to the principles of human existence which regulate these outward concerns, is more likely to fail of its ends than not.

To say that Theosophy is mere Utopia at this rate, and that the more practical interests of humanity are other than those Theosophy deals with, would be very like watering the leaves of a tree and neglecting its roots, simply because they happen to be invisible. The minds that have left the greatest impress on the world, the great religious reformers, have, in their persons, practically proved that the aim of Theosophy is not an unreliable or Utopian one. Moreover, to fling the word Utopian in the face of any such scheme would be especially out of place in India, where, always, those have been actual realities which entered the best minds of other countries but as dreams. Instance the organisation of a vast community into four classes or castes, and a division of each life into four periods or Ashramas, by which the same individual passed from sovereignty to hermitage without the least hesitation. The conse-

quence of which was a finer morality than can be met with now, for the motives to guilt were far weaker; what excites greed now was passed by, then, in indifference. And it is the result of their Utopian theory of life, so consistently worked out, that the Indians out of all races can show the longest period of civilised existence.

Observe, on the other hand, the ephemeral civilisations of the Greeks and Romans; their duration can be counted by poor centuries. The civilised life of the present so-called great European nations dates within ten centuries back, and it is very questionable whether it will count as many centuries more. The Occidentals live fast, being eager to make as much as they can out of this physical life, which is all in all to them and can therefore show much material activity—and a glitter which is very likely to impose upon the unwary beholder; but such fast and glittering life cannot last as long as the steady and more genuinely comfortable one of the staid Oriental.

The truth is that in these modern times the means always takes the place of the end and thereby causes much mischief.

Are the Theosophists wrong, gentlemen, if they endeavour to do away with this unhealthy condition of affairs, to give a meaning to life, and to restore its proper importance to the end?

No one indeed can imagine that all men can be made to think alike on all subjects, but this cannot be any reason for not trying to make a few men think alike on a few subjects. Whatever amount of unanimity can be established is so much pure gain, and to abandon even an apparently Utopian scheme, simply because it cannot be realised in its entirety, can be but bad policy.

But, setting aside all other considerations, Theosophy could, I think, be sufficiently defended on this one ground. That is, that although the majority of the population of the world are content enough to pass their lives in widespread poverty, vulgarities, meanness and wranglings, yet when a few unfortunates happen to conceive a sudden dislike to this sort of life, the only thing that can console them is Theosophy. With its doctrines of Reincarnation and Karma, which most if not all the Fellows of the Theosophical Society believe in, Theosophy alone can restore the lost balance of mind, the peace which is indispensable to the steady performance of the duties of life. That its doctrines are false or true will not matter so long as it is conceded that they are a cure as real as the disease they remedy. For this reason, gentlemen, if for no other, Theosophy merits the consideration and encouragement of all. Every one could thus at least recommend to a faint-hearted friend the proper cure for his weakness, even though he did not require any medicine himself.

BHAGAVAN DAS.

APHORISMS FROM THE SANSKRIT.

DO in the first stage of life what shall make thee happy in old age ; and do as long as thou livest what shall make thee happy in the next world.

2. Misery is not everlasting ; nor is happiness. The body is the habitation of both.

3. Be it happiness or misery, be it something pleasant or unpleasant, meet with an unconquered spirit what will befall thee.

4. Over the accomplishment of cherished object and over the acquisition of beloved things do not get jubilant. Nor do thou get morose over unhappy occurrences. Nor do thou give way to the troubles caused by the want of riches and give up religion.

5. By grief we lose grace, strength and sense, and bring diseases on ourselves.

6. A religious man shall not give expression to the benefits done by him, to his own glory and praise, nor shall he divulge the secrets.

7. One, whose vow is truth, whose kindness is to the needy, and who has conquered passion, has got mastery over the three *lokas*.*

8. One, who turns his face from the wives of other men, wishes not for what belongs to others, and is devoid of pride and vanity, has got mastery over the three *lokas*.

9. Speak the truth, speak agreeable things ; but do not speak unpleasant things and lie : this is everlasting religion.

10. Water cleanses the body ; truth purifies the mind ; learning and devotion purify the soul ; wisdom purifies the intellect.

11. There is no religion equal to truth ; there is nothing superior to truth ; in this world there is nothing so harsh as falsehood.

12. Some are loved for their gifts, while others for their kind words ; but the speaker and hearer of displeasing but good words are scarcely to be met with.

13. Do that which conduces to your own good. Do no vicious deeds to vicious persons ; be always honest.

14. By forbearance conquer wrath ; by honesty conquer dishonesty ; by doing good conquer the evil doers ; and by truth conquer untruth.

15. The donor shall receive what he has given away, be it small or large, little or great, according to his own free will and might and to the fitness of the donee.

16. Preserve thy sense of duty and the treasure acquired by honest means. He, who lives upon unfair means, is shunned by Religion.

17. A gift of land is high ; but the gift of learning is higher still.

18. A charitably disposed person, who shows charitable feelings to others but not to his own poor wife and children and relations, has but the shadow and not the substance. Presently it will taste sweet, but prove poisonous in the end.

* The nether world, this world, and heaven or the next world.

19. Give up vain-gloriousness, in order to be loved ; do away with anger, in order not to be penitent ; give up a desire for lucre, in order to be rich ; and be not covetous, in order to be happy.

20. Anger is an enemy not to be easily conquered, covetousness is an incurable, lingering malady. One, who is benevolent to all created beings, is really pious ; one, who is unkind, is impious.

21. Patience, forbearance, control over the mind, subjugation of the senses, knowledge of the *shastras*, knowledge of God, speaking the truth, dispassionateness, absence of dishonest motives, and purity of mind and body, these are the ten essentials of Religion.

22. On the attainment of objects desired there is no cessation of the desire ; on the contrary it increases like fire on the libation of *ghee* (clarified butter).

23. Religion is our only friend, who accompanies us to the life after death, while the secular things perish with the perishable physical frame.

NAKUR CHANDRA BISVAS.

LE PHARE DE L'INCONNU.

(Continued from page 647.)

V.

“THE disciples (Lanous) of the law of the Heart of Diamant (magic) will help each other in their lessons. The grammarian will be at the service of him who looks for the soul of the metals (chemist)” etc.—(Catechism of the *Gupta-Vidya*).

The ignorant would laugh if they were told that in the Occult sciences, the alchemist can be useful to the philologist and *vice versa*. They would understand the matter better, perhaps, if they were told that by this substantive (grammarian or philologist), we mean to designate one who makes a study of the universal language of corresponding symbols, although only the members of the Esoteric Section of the Theosophical Society can understand clearly what the term “philologist” means in that sense. All things in nature have correspondences and are mutually interdependent. In its abstract sense, Theosophy is the white ray, from which arise the seven colours of the solar spectrum, each human being assimilating one of these rays to a greater degree than the other six. It follows that seven persons, each imbued with his special ray, can help each other mutually. Having at their service the septenary bundle of rays, they have the seven forces of nature at their command. But it follows also that, to reach that end, the choosing of the seven persons who are to form a group, should be left to an expert,—to an initiate in the science of occult rays.

But we are here upon dangerous ground, where the Sphinx of esotericism runs the risk of being accused of mystification. Still, orthodox science furnishes a proof of the truth of what we say, and we find a corroboration in physical and materialistic astronomy. The sun is one, and its light shines for every one ; it warms the ignorant as well as the astronomers. As to the hypo-

theses about our luminary, its constitution and nature,—their name is *legion*. Not one of these hypotheses contains the whole truth, or even an approximation to it. Frequently they are only fictions soon to be replaced by others. For it is to scientific theories more than to anything else in this world below that the lines of Malherbe are applicable :

...Et rose, elle a vècu ce que vivent les roses,

L'espace d'un matin.

Nevertheless, whether they adorn or not the altar of Science, each of these theories may contain a fragment of truth. Selected, compared, analysed, pieced together, all these hypotheses may one day supply an astronomical axiom, a fact in nature, instead of a chimera in the scientific brain.

This is far from meaning that we accept as an increment of truth every axiom accepted as true by the Academies. For instance, in the evolution and phantasmagorical transformations of the sun spots,—Nasmyth's theory at the present moment,—Sir John Herschell began by seeing in them the inhabitants of the sun, beautiful and gigantic angels. William Herschell, maintaining a prudent silence about these celestial salamanders, shared the opinion of the elder Herschell, that the solar globe was nothing but a beautiful metaphor, a *maya*—thus announcing an occult axiom. The sun spots have found a Darwin in the person of every astronomer of any eminence. They were taken successively for planetary spirits, solar mortals, columns of volcanic smoke (engendered, one must think, in brains academical), opaque clouds, and finally for shadows in the shape of the leaves of the willow tree, ("willow leaf theory"). At the present day the sun is degraded. According to men of science it is nothing but a gigantic coal, still aglow, but prepared to go out in the grate of our solar system.

Even so with the speculations published by Fellows of the Theosophical Society, when the authors of these, although they belong to the Theosophical fraternity, have never studied the true esoteric doctrines. These speculations can never be other than hypotheses, no more than coloured with a ray of truth, enveloped in a chaos of fancy and sometimes of unreason. By selecting them from the heap and placing them side by side, one succeeds, nevertheless, in extracting a philosophic truth from these ideas. For, let it be well understood, theosophy has this in common with ordinary science, that it examines the reverse side of every apparent truth. It tests and analyses every fact put forward by physical science, looking only for the essence and the ultimate and occult constitution in every cosmical or physical manifestation, whether in the domain of ethics, intellect, or matter. In a word, Theosophy begins its researches where materialists finish theirs.

"It is then metaphysics that you offer us!" it may be objected, "Why not say so at once?"

No, it is not metaphysics, as that term is generally understood, although it plays that part sometimes. The speculations of Kant, of Leibnitz, and of Schopenhauer belong to the domain of metaphysics, as also those of Herbert Spencer. Still, when one

studies the latter, one cannot help dreaming of Dame Metaphysics figuring at a *bal masqué* of the Academical Sciences, adorned with a false nose. The metaphysics of Kant and of Leibnitz—as proved by his monods—is above the metaphysics of our days, as a balloon in the clouds is above a pumpkin in the field below. Nevertheless this balloon, however much better it may be than the pumpkin, is too artificial to serve as a vehicle for the truth of the occult sciences. The latter is, perhaps, a goddess too freely uncovered to suit the taste of our savants, so modest. The metaphysics of Kant taught its author, without the help of the present methods or perfected instruments, the identity of the constitution and essence of the sun and the planets; and Kant *affirmed*, when the best astronomers, even during the first half of this century, still *denied*. But this same metaphysics did not succeed in proving to him the true nature of that essence, any more than it has helped modern physics, notwithstanding its noisy hypotheses to discover that true nature.

Theosophy, therefore, or rather the occult sciences it studies, is something more than simple metaphysics. It is, if I may be allowed to use the double terms, *meta-metaphysics*, *meta-geometry*, etc., etc., or a universal transcendentalism. Theosophy rejects the testimony of the physical senses entirely, if the latter be not based upon that afforded by the psychic and spiritual perceptions. Even in the case of the most highly developed clairvoyance and clairaudience, the *final* testimony of both must be rejected, unless by those terms is signified the *φωτός* of Iamblicus, or the ecstatic illumination, the *ἀγωγή μαυρεία* of Plotinus and of Porphyry. The same holds good for the physical sciences; the evidence of the reason upon the terrestrial plane, like that of our five senses, should receive the imprimatur of the sixth and seventh senses of the divine ego, before a fact can be accepted by the true occultist.

Official science hears what we say and—laughs. We read its "reports," we behold the apotheoses of its self-styled progress, of its great discoveries,—more than one of which, while enriching the more a small number of those already wealthy, have plunged millions of the poor into still more terrible misery—and we leave it to its own devices. But, finding that physical science has not made a step towards the knowledge of the real nature and constitution of matter since the days of Anaximenes and the Ionian school, we laugh in our turn.

In that direction, the best work has been done and the most valuable scientific discoveries of this century have, without contradiction, been made by the great chemist Mr. William Crookes.* In his particular case, a remarkable intuition of occult truth has been of more service to him than all his great knowledge of physical science. It is certain that neither scientific methods, nor official routine, have helped him much in his discovery of radiant matter, or in his researches into *protyle*, or primordial matter.†

* Member of the Executive Council of the London Lodge of the Theosophical Society, and President of the Chemical Society of Great Britain.

† The homogeneous, non-differentiated element which he calls *meta-element*.

VI.

That which the Theosophists who hold to orthodox and official science try to accomplish in their own domain, the Occultists or the Theosophists of the "inner group" study according to the method of the esoteric school. If up to the present this method has demonstrated its superiority only to its students, that is to say, to those who have pledged themselves by oath not to reveal it, that circumstance proves nothing against it. Not only have the terms *magic* and *theurgy* been never even approximately understood, but even the name *Theosophy* has been disfigured. The definitions thereof which are given in dictionaries and encyclopædias are as absurd as they are grotesque. Webster, for instance, in explanation of the word *Theosophy* assures his readers that it is "a direct connection or communication with God and superior spirits;" and, further on, that it is "the attainment of *superhuman* and *supernatural* knowledge and powers by *physical processes* (!?) as by the theurgic operations of some ancient Platonists, or by the chemical processes of the German fire philosophers." This is nonsensical verbiage. It is precisely as if we were to say that it is possible to transform a crazy brain into one of the calibre of Newton's, and to develop in it a genius for mathematics by riding five miles every day upon a wooden horse.

Theosophy is synonymous with *Gnanâ-Vidya*, and with the *Brahmâ-Vidya** of the Hindus, and again with the *Dzyan* of the trans-Himalayan adepts, the science of the true Raj-Yogas, who are much more accessible than one thinks. This science has many schools in the East. But its offshoots are still more numerous, each one having ended by separating itself from the parent stem,—the true Archaic Wisdom,—and varying in its form.

But, while these forms varied, departing further with each generation from the light of truth, the basis of initiatory truths remained always the same. The symbols used to express the same idea may differ, but in their hidden sense they always do express the same idea. Ragon, the most erudite mason of all the "Widow's sons," has said the same. There exists a sacerdotal language, the "mystery language," and unless one knows it well, he cannot go far in the occult sciences. According to Ragon "to build or found a town" meant the same thing as to "found a religion;" therefore, that phrase when it occurs in Homer is equivalent to the expression in the Brahmins, to distribute the "Soma juice." It means, "to found an esoteric school," not "a religion" as Ragon pretends. Was he mistaken? We do not think so. But as a Theosophist belonging to the esoteric section dare not tell to an ordinary member of the Theosophical Society the things about which he has promised to keep silent, so Ragon found himself obliged to divulge merely relative truths to his pupils. Still, it is certain that he had made at least an elementary study of "THE MYSTERY LANGUAGE."

* The meaning of word *Vidya* can only be rendered by the Greek term *Gnosis*, the knowledge of hidden and spiritual things; or again, the knowledge of Brahman, that is to say, of the God that contains all the gods.

"How can one learn this language?" we may be asked. We reply: study all religions and compare them with one another. To learn thoroughly requires a teacher, a *guru*; to succeed by oneself needs more than genius: it demands inspiration like that of Ammonius Saccas. Encouraged in the Church by Clement of Alexandria and by Athenagoras, protected by the learned men of the synagogue and of the academy, and adored by the Gentiles, "he learned the *language of the mysteries* by teaching the common origin of all religions, and a common religion." To do this, he had only to teach according to the ancient canons of Hermes which Plato and Pythagoras had studied so well, and from which they drew their respective philosophies. Can we be surprised if, finding in the first verses of the gospel according to St. John the same doctrines that are contained in the three systems of philosophy above mentioned, he concluded with every show of reason that the intention of the great Nazarene was to restore the sublime science of ancient wisdom in all its primitive integrity? We think as did Ammonius. The biblical narrations and the histories of the gods have only two possible explanations: either they are great and profound allegories, illustrating universal truths, or else they are fables of no use but to put the ignorant to sleep.

Therefore the allegories,—Jewish as well as Pagan,—contain all the truths that can only be understood by him who knows the mystical language of antiquity. Let us see what is said on this subject by one of our most distinguished Theosophists, a fervent Platonist and a Hebraist, who knows his Greek and Latin like his mother tongue, Professor Alexander Wilder,* of New York:

"The root idea of the Neo-Platonists was the existence of one only and supreme Essence. This was the *Diu*, or 'Lord of the Heavens' of the Aryan nations, identical with the *Iaw* (*Iao*) of the Chaldeans and Hebrews, the *Iabe* of the Samaritans, the *Tiu* or *Tuiseo* of the Norwegians, the *Duw* of the ancient tribes of Britain, the *Zeus* of those of Thrace, and the *Jupiter* of the Romans. It was the *Being*—(non-Being), the *Facit*, one and supreme. It is from it that all other beings proceeded by *emanation*. The moderns have, it seems, substituted for this their theory of *evolution*. Perchance some day a wiser man than they will combine these systems in a single one. The names of these different divinities seem often to have been invented with little or no regard to their etymological meaning, but chiefly on account of some particular mystical signification attached to the numerical value of the letters employed in their orthography."

This *numerical* signification is one of the branches of the *mystery language*, or the ancient sacerdotal language. This was taught in the "Lesser Mysteries," but the language itself was reserved for the high initiates alone. The candidate must have come victorious out of the terrible trials of the Greater Mysteries before receiving instruction in it. That is why Ammonias Saccas, like Pythagoras, obliged his disciples to take an oath never to divulge the higher doctrines to any one to whom the preliminary ones had not already

* The first Vice-President of the Theosophical Society when it was founded.

been imparted, and who, therefore, was not ready for initiation. Another sage, who preceded him by three centuries, did the same by his disciples, in saying to them that he spoke "in similes" (or parables) "because to you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given... because in seeing they see not, and in hearing they hear not, neither do they understand."

Therefore the "similes" employed by Jesus were part of the "language of the mysteries," the sacerdotal tongue of the initiates. Rome has lost the key to it: by rejecting theosophy and pronouncing her anathema against the occult sciences,—she loses it for ever.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

[Translated from *La Revue Theosophique*.]

THE AGE OF PATANJALI.

IT is well known that Patanjali was the author of the Mahābhāshya, the great commentary on Pānini's grammar; and the author of the Yōga Sūtrās is also called by that name. Some scholars are in doubt as to the identity of these two authors, and several Orientalists¹ fix the date of the Mahābhāshya, each from his own standpoint, and varying from B. C. 250 to 60 after Christ. The object of this paper is therefore to enquire into:—(a) the probable date of Patanjali, the author of the Mahābhāshya, and (b) the supposed identity of the author of the Mahābhāshya with that of the Yōga Sūtrās.

The name Patanjali is of frequent occurrence in Sanskrit literature. In Brihadāranyakōpanishad² a Patanjala of Kapigōtra is mentioned: in Pānini's Ganapāta³ the names Patanjali and Patanjala occur: and the same name (Patanjali) is also found in Siddhānta Koumudi⁴ under the Vārtika of Vararuchi, (also called Kātyāyana).

Patanjali, the author of the Mahābhāshya, was born at Gónarda, a tract of country in Cashmere, and his mother's name was Gónika⁵, and he refers to himself as Gónikāputra⁶ and Gónardiya⁶; which the commentator (Kiyyata) explains as referring to Patanjali. In Purushōttamā's Lexicon⁷ he is called Gónardiya, Bhāshyakāra, Chūrnīkrit and Patanjali. In Hémachandrā's Lexicon he is called Gónardiya, and Patanjali.*

1. Such as Bohtlingk, Max Müller, Weber and Goldstucker.
2. 5th Adhyāya, 3rd and 7th Brāhmanas, or p. 163 of the Madras Edition of 108 Upanishads.

3. 6th Adhyāya, under Vārtika of Sūtra I. 1. 64: also II. 4. 69. Throughout the essay quotations like I. 1. 64 refer to the Adhyāya, the Pāda and the number of the Sūtra—but never to Anvikas—of the Mahābhāshya or the Ashtādhyāyī of Pānini as the case may be.

4. P. 8, Nirṇaya Sāgara's Edition (Bombay).

5. I. 4. 51.

6. I. 1. 21.

7. Trikānda Sēsha, p. 33 (Benares).

* P. 131, Calcutta Edition.

From valuable and undisputed evidence furnished by Indian literature, we arrive at the conclusion that he also wrote the Yōga Sūtrās and that he lived about the 10th century B. C.; the dates given by the Western Orientalists,¹ on the other hand, vary from 250 B. C. to 60 A. C.; at any rate they have decided that from the internal evidence furnished by the Mahābhāshya itself, Patanjali flourished after Buddha's (Sākyamuni's) Nirvāna, which is fixed by them at 543 B. C.

The reasons assigned by them for such a conclusion are as below when expressed in the plainest language:—

(1). In the Mahābhāshya² the "Mouryas" are mentioned; they were all Buddhists according to the Buddhist records. This Mouryan dynasty and its founder Chandragupta are mentioned in the Vishnu and other Purānas; and he is identical with "Sandracottus" who is said to have been, according to Megasthenes, Strabo, &c., a contemporary of Alexander and Seleucus³. Hence he lived about the time of Chandragupta.

(2). In the Māhābhāshya,⁴ the invasions, by Yavanas, of Sāketa or Oude, and of the Mādhyamikās, a Buddhist sect, are mentioned: although he was not an eye witness, he could have seen them, as they took place at the time of the composition of the great commentary. The term Yavana applies to the Grecians, and hence the Grecian invasion is alluded to. Hence the Mahābhāshya was composed about 140 B. C., the date of Grecian (or Græco-Bactrian) invasion of Oude by Menander⁵.

Again, the Mādhyamikās were followers of Nāgārjuna. This Nāgārjuna lived according to Northern Buddhists 400 years after, and according to Southern Buddhists 500 years after, Buddha's Nirvāna, which took place in B. C. 477 according to the former, and B. C. 543 according to the latter. This would place Nāgārjuna between B. C. 77-43. The invasion of Mādhyamikās having occurred during the time of Patanjali, his date would probably be about the time.

(3). The Hall of one Chandragupta⁶, who is said to have lived about 327 B. C., and that of Pushyamitra, (who was, according to

1. Bohtlingk (quoted by Weber) 250 B. C.; Max Müller about 200 B. C.—vide his History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 244; Weber 140 B. C., to 60 A. C. (Indian Literature, p. 224); Goldstucker 140 B. C.—120 B. C. (Pānini, p. 234.)

2. V. 3, 99.

3. Max Müller's History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, pp. 297-298.

4. III. 2. 101. Here Pānini lays down that the imperfect should be used when the speaker relates a past action belonging to a time which precedes the present. Vararuchi observes that the imperfect is also used when the event related is out of sight, and at the same time famous but could be seen by the person who uses the verb. Patanjali adds to this Vārtika of Vararuchi's the following instances with remark—"Arunadyavana Ssākētham," "Arunadyavano Mādhyamikān." The "Yavanas besieged (imperfect) Sāketa," the "Yavanas besieged (imperfect) Mādhyamikās." Here the commentators explain that Patanjali who uses these expressions lived at that time, although not on the spot, when the Yavanas besieged Oude and the Mādhyamikās.

5. Goldstucker's Pānini, &c., p. 234.

6. I. 1. 68. "Chandragupta-sabha, Pushyamitra-sabha," the Hall of Chandragupta, the Hall of Pushyamitra.

Rájatarangini, a history of Cashmere, a Buddhist prince), as well as a sacrifice by him¹ are mentioned in the Mahábháshya.

(4). Rájatarangani mentions the Mahábháshya and says that one Chandrácharya, himself a grammarian, introduced its study into Cashmere when Abhimanyu reigned in that country, which was in A. D. 40 (according to coins). Hence we are not wrong in supposing that Pánini and Kátyáyana in the beginning of the 3rd century B. C. and Patanjali in the 3rd century B. C.²

(5). Hioun Thsang says that Kátyáyana lived 300 years after the time of Buddha, that is about 240 B. C.; the Kátyáyana referred to is, therefore, Kátyáyana, author of the Vártika. If Kátyáyana lived about 240 B. C., Patanjali, who quotes him, flourished about 200 B. C.³

(6). The Yóga Sútras of Patanjali contains several Buddhistic views. Hence Patanjali flourished at any rate after Buddhism had sprung up.

(7). Bádaráyana refutes, in his Brahma Sútras (II. 2. 3), the Yóga system of philosophy. Hence Patanjali, the founder of the system of Yóga, flourished before Bádaráyana. Now as Pánini⁴ alludes to the Brahma Sútras, and their author Párásarya, it follows that Pánini flourished after the time of Párásarya or Bádaráyana; and much more therefore Patanjali the author of the Mahábháshya. Thus we have two Patanjalis, one the author of the Mahábháshya, who flourished after the time of Bádaráyana, and the other, before the time of Bádaráyana. Their identity is therefore highly improbable.

Let us examine the Mahábháshya and the Yóga Sútras themselves and find out how far these arguments are sound.

In reply to No. 1 of the arguments of the Western Orientalists,

I. The Mahábháshya says that the Mouryas⁵ were makers and worshippers of idols, such as those of Siva, Skanda and Visákha, and were begging from door to door, taking these idols with them. If, according to the Buddhist records, the Mouryas had belonged to a royal family instead of being beggars, then these

1. III. 1. 26; III. 2. 101.

2. Max Müller's History of Ancient Sanscrit Literature, p. 214: also Weber's History of Indian Literature, pp. 219-220 (Note).

3. Bohtlingk.

4. IV. 3. 110. 111.

5. V. 3. 99. In India, at the present day, there are several wandering tribes known variously by the names Dásaris (Tamil), Guduguduppándy (Tamil), Budubukalavádu (Telugu), Langáris (Hindustani).

They, just like the 'Mouryas,' take on their heads a small almirah, in which are kept wooden images of certain deities which they call Poturáju, Polérauma, &c., and unknown to the Hindu Pantheon, colored in divers ways, and varnished: some of them carry these images on their bosoms or hands. When they go a-begging, they recite certain prayers to the deities which the images represent, in a language which seems to be an admixture of Telugu, Hindustani and dialects of the Indian gypsies or Chenchus (a hill tribe belonging to Cuddapah and Kurnool Districts of the Madras Presidency). They do not belong to any of the Sudra classes, as the Velamas, Naidus, Modéliars, Vellálars, &c., and are by their habits and customs exclusively non-Aryans. These are known in India from a long time: perhaps these tribes are the remains of the Mouryas of Patanjali.

Mouryas mentioned in the Buddhist records must be quite different from those mentioned in the Mahábháshya.

If they had been Buddhists, they would not have been worshippers of idols, and much less those of Siva, Skanda and Visákha.

If the Aryans were worshippers of idols, he would have said so; on the contrary he alludes¹ all along in his work to the Aryan worship of the 33 Vedic gods. It is therefore conclusive that when he speaks of the idol worship of the Mouryas—a non-Aryan tribe is meant.

We also know that the descendants of Chandragupta, who were called Mouryas (from the fact that Chandragupta is called by the Puránas Mourya, being the illegitimate son of Nanda, by Mura, a slave girl,) were very famous Buddhists, for under their influence Buddhism spread over India and foreign countries, such as Ceylon, &c.; and the Great Council by the name of Sangha convened, monasteries built, and edifices constructed. It is therefore absurd to imagine that they begged from door to door and made such idols as Siva, Skanda, Visákha. Hence the Mouryas who were poor and who earned their livelihood by (making and) selling images, were not a tribe in any way connected with the Mouryas who were ruling princes, such as Chandragupta, Asóka, &c.

The old MSS. (of the Mahábháshya) of the South make the allusion of making and selling idols apply not to Mouryas but to Pouras, a peculiar tribe also mentioned in the Vishnu Purána²; for example MSS. Nos. 31, 33 of the Adyar Library, which are, on palæographical examination, found to be more than 3 and 4 centuries respectively, may be consulted. If "Pouras" be the right word, so much controversy about the allusion of Patanjali to the Mouryas will vanish at once.

II. Regarding argument No. 2, we must carefully examine the term Yavana. It is of frequent occurrence in Sanskrit literature; and every Western Orientalist, from the times of Sir William Jones to that of Professor Max Müller, says that it invariably implies the Greeks. This term is derived from the Sanskrit root *yu* = to mix or to be swift, implying a mixed or a swift race.

It occurs in Pánini³, and Kátyáyana says in his Vártikas, that when the "Alphabet of the Yavanas" is meant, the affix 'ánuk' should be added to the word 'Yavana,' and this becomes Yavanáni⁴. Even granting for argument's sake that Pánini lived in the 6th century B. C. according to Prof. Max Müller—and certainly he lived several centuries earlier—it is plain that neither Pánini nor Kátyáyana used the term 'Yavana' in their works to mean the Grecian alphabet, for it would not have been introduced into India before the invasion of Alexander in the 4th century B. C. Dr. Goldstucker⁵ thinks that 'Yavanáni' signifies

1. Vide also Tándya Mahábráhma, IV. 27, and, Brihadáranyaka, 5th Adhyáya, 9th Bráhma. Rig Veda, 8. 4. 28. I, &c.

2. 4th Amsa, Chap. 24 or p. 326 (Madras Edition).

3. IV. 1, 49.

4. Sidhánta Koumudi, p. 61. Bombay Edition.

5. History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature.

6. Pánini, p. 16.

the cuneiform writing and being peculiar in its character when compared with Sanskrit, it must have been known during the time of Pánini.

To show that the term is of frequent occurrence in Sanskrit literature, the following instances may be quoted :—

Manu¹ says that the Yavanas, Kámbhójas, &c., were originally Kshatriyas, but became outcastes by neglecting their Vedic duties, &c.

In Goutama Dharma Sūtra², it is stated that the Yavanas are a mixed (Pratilóma) caste of Aryas.

In the Rámáyana of Válmiki³, the term Yavana occurs indicating a tribe who fought during the war of Visvámitra. The Mahábhárata⁴, while giving out the genealogy of the ancient kings, speaks of the Yavanas as the descendants of T'urvasu, son of Yayáti.

In the Vishnu Purána⁵, it is stated, while describing the Bhárata Varsha or India, that the Yavanas live in the west, the Kirátas in the east, and the four Indian castes in the middle, of India; and it is also said that⁶ the Yavanas were driven out by Sagara, a descendant of Ikshváku, the countries lying beyond the borders of India, after having shaved their heads (under the advice of Vasishtha), although they were Kshatriyas. Further, the same Purána⁷ while giving details of the "future dynasties of Kali Yuga," says that eight Yavanas will rule over India.

Kálidása in his Raghuvamsa⁸ describes the victories of Raghu over the Párasikas: and in so doing he mentions the 'Yavanis' or Párasika women.

Most of the Smritis denounce the association of the Aryans with the Yavanas at the table as highly sinful.

In Garga Samhita the Yavanas are highly spoken of, for their special knowledge of astronomy and astrology⁹.

From Kásikávr̥tti and Vishnu Purána we learn that it was the custom among the Yavanas to get their heads wholly shaved,—a statement which the national custom of the Greeks could never sanction: for when Demosthenes got his head shaved, he sought to conceal himself in a cell in order that he might not appear in the public, and that he might not be therefore disturbed in his studies¹⁰.

With reference to Dr. Goldstucker's supposition¹¹ that the invasion of the Græco-Bactrians under Menander (about B. C. 144) is meant, when Patanjali used the expression "the Yavanas besieged Sákéta (Oude)," we should say that, according to the latest researches,

1. Ch X. v. 44. 45.
2. Sacred Books of the East, Vol. II. Part I, Ch. IV. v. 21. (p. 196.)
3. Bálakánda, Canto 55, verse 3, (p. 34, Madras Edition).
4. Adiparva, Ch. LXXXV. 34 (p. 119, Madras Edition).
5. Amsa 2, Ch. III. v. 8 (p. 137, Madras Edition).
6. Amsa 4, Ch. VI. 20. 21. (p. 287, Ibid).
7. Amsa 4, Ch. XXIV. (p. 326, Ibid).
8. Book IV, v. 61. 62.
9. P. 8 (Calcutta Edition) of the Brihat Samhita. Chapter II. v. 15.
10. Lempriere's Classical Dictionary. Art. Demosthenes.
11. Goldstucker's Pánini, p. 234.

Menander never came to Oude, but only up to Jumna: and in order that he might come to Oude he should have gone 300 miles eastward¹.

That the Indians apply the term 'Yavana' to all foreigners, not only Greeks, who were living west to the Indus, is plain from the foregoing quotations and considerations: also that the event which took place during the time of Patanjali is not identical with any of the Grecian invasions: and that the identity of the Yavanas with the Greeks is purely imaginary, and to prove it no evidence is forthcoming from records, Indian or Foreign².

Regarding the Mádhyamikás it is absurd to suppose that the Yavanas invaded and captured the individuals belonging to an idealistic philosophical sect called by that name—especially when we consider that they had no footing in the country. On the contrary, one would naturally expect the Mádhyamikás to seek friendship with the Yavanas to make common cause against the Indians.

Now the territory bounded on the north by the Himálayas, on the south by the Vindhya Mountains, on the east by Allahabad, and on the west, Vinasana, the place where the river Saraswati submerges underground, is called Madhyadésa³. 'Madhya' and 'Madhyama' being synonymous, the word 'Mádhyamika' means the people of Madhyadésa, and when Patanjali said 'the Yavanas besieged the Mádhyamikás,' the expression would naturally imply that the foreign invaders who penetrated into India through Panjab should first attack the country lying between Rajputana and Allahabad on their way to Sákéta or Oude; and this explanation of ours is greatly strengthened when we find Patanjali himself explaining⁴ the term Mádhyamiká (Mádhyamikán) to mean 'people or towns belonging to Madhyadésa.'

1. Vide Dr. Rájéndralála Mitra's Indo-Aryans; Contributions towards the elucidation of their Ancient and Mediæval History. Vol. II, p. 193.

2. As an example of the tendency of the Indians to give an indefinite name to several foreign nations and tribes, I may say that, at the present day, any European nation, the English, the French, or any other, is generally termed "Húna" by the orthodox Brahmins. It also seems that this is the case from a long time. The word Húna is generally taken to mean "white-skinned people."

The Bhágavata Purána mentions "the Húnas, Kirátas, Andhras," &c., as having followed the teachings of Krishna, and thus become pure. In the Raghuvamsa of Kálidása (Canto 4, v. 69), 'Húna women' are described. Vámanácharya mentions the Húnas in his 'Kávyálanakára Sūtravrittī' (written about the 12th century, according to Weber); and Appiah Dikshita, who lived about the 16th century, quotes in his 'Chitra-mimámsa,' a work on Rhetoric, the verses from Vámanácharya's Kávyálanakára Sūtravrittī, which mention the word 'Húnas.' Even Venkatácharya, who lived last century, mentions in his Visvaguṇádarsa (vv. 411, 414, 415 or p. 93, Madras Edition) the English and the French as living near the Vishnu temple at Triplicane (Madras); and elsewhere he uses the term (Yavana) to mean the Mussalman (v. 253, 254, p. 57, Madras Edition). From all these one is naturally led to suppose that the meaning of the word 'Húna,' like that of the word 'Yavana,' gradually changed from its original signification, and adapted itself to the times, meaning the particular nation or nations that each of these authors came in contact with.

We also come to the conclusion, that in the same way the several Sanskrit authors meant to describe—by the use of the term 'Yavana'—the various foreigners they had known. It might have been applied to the Persians when they invaded India; after them to the Greeks; then to the Bactrians; and at last—also to the Patans and the Moguls.

3. Manu, Chap. II. 21.

4. V. 3. 2 (Anhika).

III. On carefully examining several old MSS. of the Mahábháshya, written in Telugu and Grandha characters, we do not find any mention of Chandragupta's Hall in I. 1, 68; only Pushyamitra's Hall is mentioned here and his name given elsewhere¹. Dr. Kielhorn's Edition of the Mahábháshya may, in this connexion, be consulted with advantage. The Hall of Chandragupta occurs in Dr. Ballantyne's Edition (p. 758).

It is highly improbable that the Greek 'Sandracottus,' who is said to have been a contemporary of Alexander and Seleucus, was identical with a Chandragupta, for he was one of the many Chandraguptas in the Gupta literature. For example, there is one Chandragupta in the Gupta dynasty, and also one Chandrasri who lived long after the Chandragupta, son of Nanda, by Mura, and after whom foreigners, such as Yavanas and Sakas, were said to rule the country².

Regarding Pushyamitra, Rájatarangini mentions a prince of that name as having ruled over the Báhlika country, which is identified by the Orientalists with the modern Balkh, the birth-place of Zoroaster: and in the Mahábháshya³ we read that "Pushyamitra performed a sacrifice," and several Brahmins attended the sacrifice and assisted the king.

Now the boundaries of the Aryávarta during the time of Patanjali⁴, were fixed from the Aravalli Hills to the Black Forest in Behar, and the Aryans who lived in this tract were holy and superior. This Báhlika country was therefore outside the Aryavarta, and hence a Mléchha country, and no Aryan would enter it. Even the king himself could not have performed a sacrifice in a Mléchha country, such a thing being opposed to the Smrities; and the author of the Mahábháshya himself remarks that the goats of the Bhálika country are quite unfit for sacrificial purposes⁵.

Or, if we suppose, according to Western Orientalists, that he was a Buddhist prince, there is no reason to think that he ever performed a sacrifice, and still less a Vedic sacrifice. 'Pushyamitra' is the name of several Aryan kings, like Dasaratha, Dilipa, and Parikshit, as would appear from the Puránas. A Pushyamitra of Sunga family who killed his master and established a throne is mentioned in the Vishnu Purána, and other Puránas; and his son Agni-mitra is the hero of Kálidása's drama, Málavikágnimitra. This Pushyamitra performed an Asvamédha sacrifice, according to the same drama. But we should not in any way be understood as identifying the Pushyamitra of the Mahábháshya with the Pushyamitras of either Málavikágnimitra or Rájatarangini.

Patanjali mentions in the Mahábháshya the Hall of Chandragupta, as well as that of Pushyamitra. If, on this basis, Chandragupta be considered as the contemporary of Alexander and Seleucus, why should not Pushyamitra too be considered his (Alexander's) contemporary? Or, if one is mentioned by the

1. III. 1. 26.
2. Vishnu Purána Amsa, 4. Ch. XXIV.
3. III. 1. 26; III. 2. 101.
4. II. 4. 1; VI. 3. 109. The northern and southern boundaries were the Himalayás and the Páriyáthra Mountains (Vindhya).
5. I. 1. 15 (p. 377—Dr. Ballantyne's Edition).

Grecians, why not the other? Now it will be easy to think that the only solution of the difficulty, possible, with our present knowledge of the subject, is that, as it is quite common, among grammarians, while giving illustrations to the rules to use such names as Dévadatta, Yagnadatta, and Vishnumitra¹, and these being well known as Brahminical names, and such common names of kings should be added to the expressions like 'The Hall of——' and '——sacrifices,' such names as Chandragupta and Pushyamitra were chosen at random.

IV. Rájataranjini is a work written by Kalhana Pandit in the 12th century after Christ, and is a compilation made by him from vague traditions current in his time.² No reliance should therefore be placed in such work as this, and much less should it be consulted for the solution of a historical problem. The fact of Chandrácharya's having introduced the study of the Mahábháshya into Cashmere in the 1st century A. C., does not necessarily lead us to the conclusion that Patanjali lived only three centuries before that time. One may as well argue that by the introduction in the 19th century of the study of the Vedas into German and English Universities, it may be supposed that the Vedas were written or compiled only two or three centuries ago!

V. From Stanislaus Julian's translation of Hioun Tshang's travels,³ it is clear (a) that the Kátyáyana referred to by the Chinese traveller was a Buddhist, whereas the author of the Vártikas was a Brahmin, (b) that the Kátyáyana of Hioun Tshang was the author of a metaphysical work on Buddhism, which the traveller himself translated into Chinese, and (c) that except in name all the details given by Hioun Tshang differ from those of Kátyáyana, the grammarian.

Again, to one of the Sútras⁴ of Pánini, Kátyáyana adds a Vártika to explain the term 'Nirvána,' and says that it means 'to blow out.' Thereupon Patanjali explains by giving various illustrations, 'the fire is blown out by the wind,' 'the lamp is blown out by the wind,' &c.* If Kátyáyana or Patanjali lived during or after the life-time of Sakyamuni (as is supposed by some), surely they as grammarians would have noticed the Buddhistic interpretation of the word 'Nirvána' which is of the greatest importance in the Buddhistic philosophy; but as they did not, we are

1. These three names frequently occur in the illustrations of the Mahábháshya, something like 'John comes,' 'John goes,' where no reference is made to a particular John—much less King John of England or St. John the Apostle. Such names are called Yáthrichhika Sabdas.

2. Pp. 213, 214, Weber's Ind. Lit.

3. Max Müller's Hist. Anc. Santk. Lit. pp. 305-9.

4. VIII, 2. 50.

* M. Burnouf was the first to create the misconception that 'Nirvána' meant annihilation. The Paranirvána Súra does not give that meaning even. Prof. Max Müller labored, until recently, under the same misconception. On the other hand Nirvána means with them (1) Negatively, state of absolute exemption from the circle of transmigration, state of entire freedom from all forms of existence, &c. (2) Positively, Nirvána is the highest state of spiritual bliss, absolute immortality through absorption of the soul into itself, but preserving individuality [so that, e. g. Buddhas after entering Nirvána may reappear on earth]. For further particulars see Beal's Catena of Chinese Scriptures, p. 172, and Dr. E. J. Eitel's Handbook of Chinese Buddhism, being a Sanskrit-Chinese Dictionary—(Hongkong, 1888.)

at liberty to say that neither of them lived after the introduction of Buddhism by Sákyauni, which carried this peculiar interpretation.

The name Kátyáyana is also of frequent occurrence in Sanskrit literature. There is one Kátyáyana, author of Kalpa,¹ and Grihya Sūtras, and Sarvānukramani and who was a disciple of Asvaláyana; and the same name is also that of the author of several Parisishtas and a Prátisákhyā of Sukla Yajur Veda, while the author of the Vártika on Pánini is also called by that name.² The Mahābhāshya³ mentions a poem of Kátyáyana's, and from it we find that he was also called Vararuchi. It may perhaps be the case that the several persons called by the name of Kátyáyana⁴ were descendants of one and the same Rishi,⁵ and lived in different times and wrote different works: even Mahākátyáyana, a disciple of Buddha, and Kátyáyana, the author of a work on Buddhist Metaphysics (translated by Hioun T'sang) might have been lineal descendants of one and the same original Kátyáyana Rishi.

VI. It is not necessary to dwell much in reply to the 6th, as several points involved were traversed in our reply to the fifth argument, by giving important quotations from Pánini, Kátyáyana, and Patanjali, in which the word 'Nirvána' is mentioned; and there

1. Pánini alludes to several Kalpa Sūtras in IV. 3. 106. Ásvaláyana was a disciple of Sounaka, and Kátyáyana, the author of Kalpa Sūtras, and a Prátisákhyā was a disciple of Asvaláyana. All the Prátisákhyās differ in many respects from many of Pánini's rules. Hence the Kátyáyana who was the author of a Prátisákhyā, and Kalpa Sūtras, &c., was anterior to Pánini.

2. According to Kathásárit Ságara of Somadéva, Kátyáyana studied along with Pánini, and with Vyádi, the grammar of Indra under Uparvarshopádhya, in Pátaliputra; and he was born in Kousámbi, a town on the banks of the Jumna, somewhere near Agra; his father's name was Sónadatta, of Sankriti Gótra and his mother's name Sónótara. The name 'Upavarsha' is not only peculiar to Kathásárit Ságara, but also to lexicographers; vide p. 131, Hémachandra's Lexicon (Calcutta Edition) and Purushóttama Déva's Trikándasésa, p. 33 (Benares Edition). (Calcutta Edition) and Purushóttama Déva's Trikándasésa, p. 33 (Benares Edition). Upavarsha was a commentator on Jaimini's Púrva Mimámsa Sūtras, and Bádāráyana's Brahma Sūtras; his works are quoted by Sabaraswami in his commentary on Jaimini's (p. 12, Calcutta Edition, A. S. B.) and by Sri Sankarācharya in his commentary on Brahma Sūtras (pp. 291, 953, Calcutta Edition of Asiatic Society of Bengal).

3. IV. 3. 116.

4. There is one Vararuchi, author of 'Lingánusāsana' (rules of gender) who is said to have lived in the Court of one Vikramāditya, as would appear from the last verse of his work (Benares Edition).

The Jyotirvidáharana, the authorship of which is erroneously attributed to Kálidésa, mentions a Vararuchi as having lived in the Court of the said Vikramāditya. Vákyanganita, otherwise called 'Girnásrýadhivákya,' a work on Astronomical tables, (according to the system of Aryabháta), and on which the calculations of South 'Vákyapunchāngam' (calendar, according to the system of Vákyanganita) of South India are based, is said to be the work of one Vararuchi who lived in the 6th century A. C. From these one may naturally conclude that the Kátyáyana who was the author of the Vártika, cannot be identified with any other Kátyáyana or Vararuchi.

5. According to a well known rule of grammar, all the descendants of a 'Kátyáyana' may be called by that name.

6. Kátyáyana, the author of the Vártika on Pánini of the poem Vararucha, and of the Slókas called Bhárája (Mahābhāshya, 1st Anhika, pp. 23, 24, Ballantyne's Edition) is altogether different from the author of Kalpa Sūtras, Prátisákhyā, &c., and who is also called Vararuchi (Trikándasésa Slóka 85, page 33, Benares Edition); and the same person by the names of Medhājít, and Punarvasu, (p. 131 of Hémachandra's Lexicon, Calcutta Edition).

we have shown that Patanjali was not aware of the Buddhist interpretation of that word. Patanjali in his Yóga Sūtras mentions the Ísvara,¹ and speaks of the necessity of the study of the Vedas,² and uses a word Kaivalya³ different from 'Nirvána' to signify the same idea.

The theories of Karma, incarnation, &c., are quite common not only to the Buddhists, but to all the Asiatic philosophies, except, perhaps, the Jews; and hence there is no reason to suppose that these theories were only borrowed from the Buddhists and introduced into Hinduism.

It has been argued that the doctrine of Ahimsa or 'not killing,' is peculiar to the Buddhists, and against the doctrine of the Vedas, and that this is found in the Yóga Sūtras, and hence that these Sūtras were written after Buddhism had sprung up. To this, we reply, that the performance of sacrifice—and hence killing of animals for sacrificial purposes—are enjoined only on Grihasthas (married men), but not for Brahmacháries (bachelors) or Yatis (ascetics). The rules laid down in the Yóga Sūtras do not apply to Grihasthas, but only to Naishtika Brahmacharies (those bachelors who wish to remain such throughout their lives), Vánaprasthás (those that go to forest with their wives for purposes of meditation), or Yatis (ascetics)—more especially the last named order; also those Vánaprasthás who practice Yóga should not perform sacrifices.

VII. In reply to the 7th argument we should say that Patanjali was not the founder of the Yóga system of philosophy. Hiranyagarbha, a Maharishi, was the founder of this system,⁴ and it was promulgated by his successors Várshaganya, Yágnavalkya, &c., as Asuri, Panchasika and others did in the case of Sánkhyā founded by Kapila. Neither the Brahma Sūtras nor the more famous of its commentators, as Sri Sankarācharya and others mention by name any philosopher of the Yóga school.⁵ The expression in the Brahma Sūtras⁶ is 'the Yóga philosophy is condemned on the same reasons as are given in the previous Sūtra regarding Sánkhyā.' The Sánkhyā and Yóga philosophies are inadmissible for (a) the philosophies themselves are in contradiction with the doctrine of the Vedas (Upanishads); (b) the authority of the Vedas are superior to these philosophies; (c) the founders of these philosophies, viz., Kapila and Hiranyagarbha are human beings, and hence their knowledge must be finite and subject to errors, and even opposed to reason in several points; and (d) on the other hand, the Sruti (Vedas) is invariably followed by the majority of the sages. Again, Sri Sankarācharya in his commentary⁷ on the

1. I. 23, 24, 26.

2. II. 1.

3. IV. 25—33.

4. Váchaspati Misra, a commentator on Vyásadéva's Bháshya on Patanjali's Yóga Sūtras, explains the word 'Anusāsana' in the 1st aphorism (Atha Yogánusásanam) thus: "The doctrine of Yóga had been founded by Hiranyagarbha and others, Patanjali simply promulgated it, by supplementing it, and hence it is called 'anusásanam.'"

5. Sri Rámānjanācharya mentions Hiranyagarbha by name in p. 476, Madras Edition, of his Bháshya.

6. II. 2, 3.

7. Vedāuta Sūtra Bháshya, Calcutta Edition (Asiatic Society of Bengal.) Page 406.

above Sūtra quotes an aphorism, which does not belong to Patanjali's Yōga Sūtras, as will be found to be the case on an examination of that work : but it must either belong to Hiranyagarbha or Vārshaganya. The definition of 'Yōga' given in the Sūtra quoted by Sri Sankarācharya is that 'it is the means of knowledge of the realities (or truth),' whereas Patanjali defines it in his aphorisms¹ as "the suspension of the action of the mind." Two verses from Hiranyagarbha's work are quoted in the Vishnu Purāna²; and Vārshaganya is mentioned by Vāchaspati Misra in his Bhāmati,³ a commentary on Sri Sankarācharya's Vedānta Sūtra Bhāshya. Yāgnavalkya promulgated the same system on his 'Yōgayāgnavalkya-gita,' from which various quotations appear in many philosophical and other treatises.

From these considerations it will be seen that the Yōga system was not founded by Patanjali⁴ and that it (the Yōga system) existed from a long time before Patanjali, that he was simply an author of a work on that philosophical system; and that he lived after the times of Pānini and Bādarāyana.

It is argued that the systems of philosophy taught in the Yōga Sūtras and the Mahābhāshya are in opposition with each other, and that one author could not write two such different works, inculcating two antagonistic philosophical systems. Even certain contradictory passages are brought forward to prove that such is the case; to give a few of such contradictions:—(a) That the Mahābhāshya advocates sacrifices of animals, and even remarks that the goats of the Bāhlika country⁵ are not fit for sacrifice, and knows nothing of Buddhism: on the other hand the Yōga system inculcates the doctrine of 'Ahimsa' in general⁶ which is the mainstay of Buddhism, and even the killing of animals for sacrificial purposes is prohibited, although sanctioned in the Vedas: (b) Yōga describes Īswara⁷ (God), and enumerates his attributes: whereas the Mahābhāshya believes in a result produced by sacrifice, and considers that result to be the ultimate one⁸, as advocated by

1. I. 1. 2.

2. Amsa, 2. Adhyāya 13, vv. 42-45 (p. 195, Madras Edition).

3. P. 332, Benares Edition.

4. Vyāsadēva (also called Vyāsa or Vedavyāsa) author of a commentary on Patanjali's Yōga Sūtras, is generally supposed to be identical with Vedavyāsa, the author of the Mahābhārata, the Brahma Sūtras, &c; and that he, therefore, alluded to his system in his Brahma Sūtras. If it had been written by Vedavyāsa (the author of Brahma Sūtras) he would have been mentioned in Rājamārtānda by Bhōjadēva who, every one knows, lived after him; nor would Sri Sankarācharya or Sri Rāmānujācharya have neglected it without making any quotations from it. In Rājamārtānda there is no allusion to any former commentary on Patanjali's Yōga Sūtras. Vāchaspati Misra mentions one Vedavyāsa, a commentator on these Yōga Sūtras, and there can be no doubt that this 'Vedavyāsa' was quite a modern author, and is in no way connected with the author of the Brahma Sūtras. For the name is of frequent occurrence. One Vyāsācharya is the author of a gloss on Sri Rāmānujācharya's Bhāshya on Brahma Sūtras; also the name of a work called Chandrika, on the Dwaita philosophy of Sri Madhvācharya is Vyāsa or Vyāsārāya,—besides the fact that a large number of the followers of Sri Madhvācharya is called by that name.

5. I. 1. 15. (p. 81, Benares Edition).

6. II. 30, 31, 34, 35.

7. I. 1. 24—6.

8. 1st Auhika.

Jaimini, in his Pūrvamīmāmsa, and, by several other Yāgnikas. It should be observed that Patanjali in his Mahābhāshya followed the system of Pānini, Kātyāyana, and Vyādi¹ (their commentator); also one Kuni² with whom he agrees on several points. It would also seem that in his 'great commentary,' Patanjali followed the systems of several grammarians anterior to Pānini, such as Āpīsali, Bhāradwāja, and Gargya, as will be seen from his allusions to them³. Further there are several questions regarding which he does not give any opinion whatever, but simply gives those of various grammarians⁴.

One thing is certain, namely, that while he is the author of the Yōga Sūtras, he follows the system founded by Hiranyagarbha—Vārshaganya and Yāgnavalkya⁵: and while he is a commentator on a grammatical work, he cannot follow any philosophical system opposed to it; in other words, he simply works out the subject he writes upon as though he belonged to that system, and no other. This is the case with every Indian who writes treatises on different philosophies, and examples may be multiplied; for one, Vāchaspati Misra, was the author of a commentary on Yōga Sūtra Bhāshya, on Nyāya Sūtra Bhāshya of Pakshila Swami, and the Vārtika of Udyōtakarācharya, of Bhāmati on Sri Sankarācharya's Vedānta Sūtra Bhāshya. He never adopted in his works one uniform system of philosophy, and no one could generally do so. This practice continues to the present day, when we find the late Professor Tārānātha Tarkavāchaspati as the author of 'Notes on the Yōga Sūtra Bhāshya of Vyāsa, and the commentary thereon by Vāchaspati Misra,' 'Notes on Vāchaspati Misra's commentary on Sānkhyakārika,' and of Sidhāntabindu sāra, a work on Vedānta. If we judge him from his work on Yōga he will appear as a follower of that system; if we judge him only from his work on Sānkhya, he will appear a Sānkhya, and from his Sidhāntabindusāra he will appear as a Vedānti. Hence from the fact that two different systems of philosophy are taught, one in the Mahābhāshya, and the other in the Yōga Sūtras, it is not right to say that the authors of these two works are not identical.

So far as the Indian Pandits are concerned, they would not for a moment believe that there were two different persons known by the name of Patanjali, one of whom wrote the Mahābhāshya, and the other the Yōga Sūtras; for if the tradition handed down from generation to generation in the line of teachers, and which is current among the Pandits, is to be believed, no one will hesitate

1. P. 43. Ballantyne's Edition: Vyādi was the author of Sangraha, the commentary, which contains 100,000 grandhas of 32 syllables each.

2. Kiyata on I. 1. 75. (pp. 87, 88, Ballantyne's Edition).

3. III. 1. 81, 71. Vide III. 2. 15. regarding the meaning of Parōksha (past time or behind the sight); III. 1. 27. about Varthamānakāla (present tense).

4. IV. 3. 105. Kātyāyana in his Vārtika on this Sūtra mentions Yāgnavalkya. Patanjali also does the same in his Mahābhāshya. Hence Yāgnavalkya must be anterior to Patanjali.

5. Vignānabhikshu and Mādhvāchārya were also authors of several works on different philosophical systems, such as, the Nyāya, the Mīmāmsa, the Sānkhya, and the Vedānta.

to declare that the authors of these two works are identical. The Mahábháshya¹ cannot be read by a Brahmin without Sánti, a ceremony performed under the auspices of a proper teacher, just as in the case of the study of Vedánta Súra Bháshya and other sacred works². This principle is followed by every Brahmin throughout the length and breadth of Bháratavarsha, from Travancore to the Northern extremity of Cashmere and from Lahore to Dacca. During the performance of the Sánti of the Mahábháshya, the following verse should invariably be chanted by the student at the first opening of the book for the day, and in the presence of his teacher; and the study of the work is condemned when this Sánti is not performed.

This verse, viz., Yógena Chittasya padéna váchám, malam sarirasya cha vidyakéna, Yópákaróththam pravaram muninám, Patanjali pránjaliránathósmi, means, 'I bow with folded hands to Patanjali who purified the mind of its impurities by (writing a work on) Yóga, the voice of its impurities, by his grammar (Mahábháshya), the physical body of its impurities by his work on Medicine, and who was superior to all the sages (of his time)'.

Let us try to fix the date of Patanjali. During his time Sanskrit was the only language spoken in the Aryávarta, and this is evident from the fact that in the Mahábháshya we find a conversation between a charioteer and his master, a Brahmin,³ examples of different modes of pronunciation of some words by people living in different parts⁴ of the Aryávarta, differences in giving meanings to roots⁵ by those that live in countries beyond Indus, such as the Kámbhójas, &c., and certain provincialisms which are strictly condemned in the Mahábháshya.

During the time of Sákyamuni, on the other hand, the spoken language was Pali—the language used by him in addressing his disciples. The tradition goes to say that he first began his address in Sanskrit, but on one of his disciples reminding him of the fact that the previous Buddhas used in their addresses only the Pali language, he too addressed them in the same tongue⁷.

Religion during the time of Patanjali was almost entirely Vedic. Vedic doctrines were followed, and we had the Yágnikas and

1. Although the Mahábháshya is a grammatical work, it should be noticed that it also teaches a system of philosophy of grammar; and without the study of such a system, Páini could not be properly understood.

2. A follower of the School of Sri Sankarácarya will, on opening his Bháshya, first chant a Vedic Mantra, then a Sanscrit verse in praise of the great philosopher (and such is the case with all the Súra and Gitábháshyas), and followed by reciting verses in praise of the long line of teachers that succeeded him and ending with one on his own teacher. There is a similar custom among the Srivaishnavás at the commencement of the study of Sri Rámánujácarya's Brahma Súrabbáshya and other sacred works.

3. Bhójadéva followed the example of Patanjali, by writing like him three works on three subjects. On Yóga, we have his Rájamártánda, a commentary on Patanjali's Yóga Sútras; on Grammar, Sabdaprakásika; and on Medicine, Rájamri-gánka.

4. II. 4, 56.

5. In I. 1. 75, the modes of pronunciation by the Easterns are given; for those of the Northern see VII. 3. 46; and several other places besides.

6. Vide 1st Anhika (P. 62, Ballantyne's Edition).

7. Dr. Mason's Kachchayan's Pali Grammar. p. 13.

Brahmavádins. In the Mahábháshya, we find the Aryávarta described,¹ the purity and wisdom of the Aryans extolled, and drunkenness condemned,² sin included even wrong pronunciation of words,³ although he admits that certain words had no regular way of pronunciation, but the general usage of the Aryans should be followed; Sishtáchára⁴ (usage or custom among the elders) described, and strongly recommended to be followed: purity and condition of the Brahmins delineated⁵. If all these points be considered, it is quite clear that the authority and customs of the Brahmins were in their full sway.

When Buddhism was preached by Sákyamuni, the decline of Brahminical authority was so great, Brahminical customs, sacrifices &c., so much neglected and even ridiculed, and Vedic authority so much defied, that there were 1,350 Buddhist Bikshus in India⁶. These changes in religion, and especially in a religion professed by those that are termed 'the greatest conservatives,'—these changes (which were of so destructive a character) would at the lowest estimation require 300 years to intervene. If Goutama Buddha, and Buddha Bhikshus could be found in India about 570 B. C., there is nothing extraordinary in placing Patanjali three centuries earlier, that is 870 B. C., in other words between the 9th and 10th centuries B. C.; although the changes of language would necessitate our placing him even earlier.

Our argument is greatly strengthened if we base our reasoning on the chronology of the Chinese, who believe that the Nirvana of Sakyamuni took place in 949⁷ or 973⁸ B. C., instead of in B. C. 543, following the chronology of the Southern Buddhists, who follow the Mahávanso supposed to have been written about 459 A. C.⁹ If the Chinese chronology were again seriously considered in the light of a vast literature of the Chinese, now accessible to the Western Orientalists, the 'decisions' of the various Orientalists carefully reviewed, the dates of the Western Orientalists which are considered to be final on the subject of the Nirvana of Sákyamuni may fall to the ground. The discussion of the date of

1. The country bounded on the north by the Himálayas, on the south by the Vindhya (Páriyátra), on the west by the Aravalli Hills, and on the east by the Black Forest in Behar. VI. 3. 109.

2. 2nd A'nhika, p. 100, Ballantyne's Edition, and in various other places.

3. 1st A'nhika, pp. 12. 18 to 22 (Ballantyne's Edition).

4. 2nd A'nhika, pp. 122, 123 (Ballantyne's Edition).

5. II. 2. 6. 'These (Brahmins) are devoid of ambition, of no motives, possess knowledge and are not too rich'; also 'One who is austere, good education, of brown colour, reddish hair.' In (VI. 3) we find him describing a Brahmin of his times as one 'who lives in the Aryávarta, who lives without keeping anything for the next day, not covetous, and (practises) very good morals without any motives, and pure.' He elsewhere says (IV. 1. and II. 2. 6) that all these qualities go to make up a real Brahmin, and every one else is a Brahmin only in name. The state of morality generally was so great that he condemns every now and then the practice of drinking (Surápána.)

6. Sukhávativyúha in the Maháyána Súra. This number is only of learned Bhikshus. The work (Maháyána Súra) says that there were many more present (vide page 1. Tokio Edition).

7. Dr. E. J. Eitel's Sanscrit-Chinese Dictionary—a hand-book of Chinese Buddhism, p. 137 (Honkong, 1888).

8. Beal's Catena of Chinese Scriptures, p. 116 (Note).

9. Max Müller's History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, p. 267.

'Nirvána' cannot find a place in a brief article to a monthly magazine, on the 'age of Patanjali'; and a full treatment of the subject of the present paper with its allied questions, cannot receive any justice except in a volume.

To state our conclusions once more for the sake of clearness:

(a) Patanjali was the author of the Mahábháshya, a commentary on Panini's Ashtádhyáyi, and also of the Yóga Sútras, and (b) that he lived without any doubt between the 9th and 10th centuries B. C., that is about the 10th century B. C.

General Remarks.—The mode of treatment of Oriental questions by the Western Orientalists is so unique, and so prejudiced² that we cannot refrain from quoting the following:—

"The writings of many of these Orientalists are often characterized by an imperfect knowledge of Indian literature, philosophy and religion and of Hindu traditions, and a contemptuous disregard for the opinions of Hindu writers and pandits. Very often facts and dates are taken by these writers from the writings of their predecessors or contemporaries, on the assumption that they are correct without any further investigation by themselves. Even when a writer gives a date with an expression of doubt as to its accuracy, his follower frequently quotes the same date as if it were absolutely correct." * * *

"III. It is often assumed without reason that every passage in the Vedas containing philosophical or metaphysical ideas must be looked upon as a subsequent interpolation, and that every book treating of a philosophical subject must be considered as having been written after the time of Buddha or after the commencement of the

1. The arguments of Mr. T. Subba Row Garu relating to the age of Patanjali, which make Patanjali identical with Govindaswamy, the Guru of Sri Sankarácarya, are quite baseless, being in contradiction with the internal evidence derived from original works, such as the Mahábháshya, Sri Sankarácarya's Vedánta Sútrabháshya, &c. (Vide *The Theosophist*, Vol. IV, p. 309-12).

2. We can give brilliant illustrations. Just imagine Dr. Otto Bohtlingk, 'While incapable of understanding even the easy rules of Pánini, and much less those of Kátyáyana, and still making use of them in the understanding of classical texts. The errors in his department of dictionary are so numerous and of so peculiar a kind—yet on the whole so thoroughly in accordance with the specimens I have adduced from his commentary, that it will fill every serious Sanskritist with dismay, when he calculates the mischievous influence which they must exercise on the study of Sanskrit Philology.' (Pánini and his place in Sanskrit Literature, by Th. Goldstucker, p. 254.)

Dr. Roth writing his *Wörterbuch* (Sanskrit Dictionary), which is described by Goldstucker (Pánini, p. 261) in this way: 'I will merely here state that I know of no work which has come before the public with such unmeasured pretension of scholarship and critical ingenuity as this *Wörterbuch*, and which has, at the same time, laid itself open to such serious reproaches of the profoundest grammatical ignorance"—explains Vedic words, and 'has courage to pass sweeping condemnation on all those gigantic labors of the Hindu mind (e. g., Sáyanácarya's *Bháshya*) while ignorant of all but the merest fraction of them.'

Professor Kuhn, who is said to be 'no proficient in Sanskrit', was asked to give his own opinion of the *Wörterbuch*, and of course praised the work very highly. Prof. Weber rushes into the stage at once, and warily defends it against every one. A detailed criticism on the 'vain labors' of these 'Saturnalia of Sanskrit Philology' will be found in Goldstucker's 'Pánini, his place in Sanskrit Literature,' pp. 241-268.

Prof. Weber himself acknowledges, although not in the plainest language, that he had, while lecturing on Indian Literature, made only a superficial study of the Mahábháshya (P. 224, note),

Christian era. Civilization, philosophy and scientific investigation had their origin, in the opinion of these writers, within the six or seven centuries preceding the Christian era, and mankind slowly emerged for the first time from 'the depths of animal brutality' within the last four or five thousand years.

"IV. It is also assumed that Buddhism was brought into existence by Goutama Buddha. The previous existence of Buddhism, Jainism and Arhat philosophy is rejected as an absurd and ridiculous invention of the Buddhists and others, who attempted thereby to assign a very high antiquity to their own religion. In consequence of this erroneous impression, every Hindu book referring to the doctrines of the Buddhists is declared to have been written subsequent to the time of Goutama Buddha. For instance Mr. Weber is of opinion that Vyasa, the author of Brahma Sútras, wrote them in the fifth century after Christ. This is indeed a startling revelation to the majority of Hindus.

V. Whenever several works treating of various subjects are attributed to one and the same author, by Hindu writings or traditions, it is often assumed, and apparently without any reason whatever in the majority of cases, that the said works should be considered as the productions of different writers. By this process of reasoning they have discovered two Badarayanas (Vyasas)..... We do not mean to say that in every case identity of name is equivalent to identity of personality. But we cannot but protest against such assumptions when they are made without any evidence to support them, merely for the purpose of supporting a foregone conclusion or establishing a favorite hypothesis.

We have enumerated these defects in the writings of European Orientalists for the purpose of showing to our readers that it is not always safe to rely upon the conclusions arrived at by these writers regarding the dates of ancient Indian History."¹

Professor Bhandarkar, who was present in Vienna during the occasion of one of the International Congresses of Orientalists, and who had therefore an opportunity of becoming personally acquainted with several Western Orientalists, says in his lecture delivered in Bombay in 1887,² after his return from Europe, that the so-called 'Sanskrit Professors' of the West, possess only so much knowledge of Sanskrit as to enable them to translate into their own languages works written in Puránic but not in a more difficult style (e. g., that of Sábara's *Bháshya* on the *Mimámsa Sútras*, Sri Sankarácarya's *Bháshya* on the *Brahma Sútras*, *Tatwachintámani* of Gangósópádhya, or the works of Udayanácarya). Our own impression is that most of them (Western Orientalists) are acquainted only with the names of philosophical and other works, and if at all they have studied those works, it is only *very superficially*; and hence it is quite natural that they should commit errors and fallacies in their writings. On the other hand, the Indian Pandits study their own literature systematically under a well-trained teacher, who is one in the long line of teachers, each of whom

1. *The Theosophist*, Vol. IV, p. 304, *et seq.*

2. Vide the *Journal* of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1887.

transmits the doctrines and truths to his successor, who is below him in the list. But unfortunately they do not possess any knowledge of any of the Western languages, such as English, French, and German, in which treatises and other publications relating to Sanskrit Literature and History are written. But if once the ideas and modes of thinking of the Orientalists are made known to them, they will produce wonderful results. It is a matter of deep regret that our Indian graduates do not generally possess an enterprising spirit, and are indifferent to furthering the progress of the study of Sanskrit, especially works like the Mahābhāshya. They generally depend, owing to their ignorance of Sanskrit, for their information, on Western translations, or Western compilations, from Sanskrit works. These unfortunate circumstances attendant on the Indian people can only be remedied by our University students continuing, with the aid of good Pandits, their Sanskrit studies—more especially of the Vedas, Srouta Sūtras, &c.—even after obtaining their degrees. Our Western Orientalists would do well, before becoming Professors of Sanskrit in the Western Universities, to come to India, and systematically study the Sanskrit language, and its literature in all its branches under well known Pandits or in the Sanskrit Colleges or institutions established in India, viz., those of Benares, Calcutta or Mysore.

One word more. Our European Orientalists will confer a great boon on Indian Pandits if they (Orientalists of Europe) would take the trouble of expressing in the Sanskrit language, their views regarding Indian antiquity and literature in order that the Pandits may become more easily acquainted with their views; for, it is more difficult thing for the Pandits to learn three European languages, viz., English, German and French, for knowing what the European Orientalists think about them, and the Indian literature, than for the Orientalists themselves—who are mostly Professors of Sanskrit, teaching that language to many University students—to write in Sanskrit.

PANDIT N. BHASHYA CHARYA.

ADYAR ORIENTAL LIBRARY, }
31st July 1889. }

1. Professor Max Müller feels this necessity more in the study of Pūrvamīmāṃsā than that of any other system of philosophy or subject, as may be seen by his letter to the late Mr. M. M. Kunte, dated 21st June 1877:—"But to the scholar the Pūrvamīmāṃsā is of great interest, and I have always thought that we wanted a native Indian scholar to translate and properly interpret it. It is so full of allusions to Yagnika matters which are familiar to your Srotriyas, but we in Europe have a very vague and indistinct conception." Professor Bhandarkar, too, advocated this step in his lecture in Bombay in 1837.

A DREAM, OR WHAT?

I THREW myself back in my chair and closed my eyes in order to concentrate the flickering glimmer that psychologists call the attention, upon a passage I had just read in the *Theosophist*, which Magazine now lay half closed upon my knee, with my finger for a book-marker.

"No," thought I, "those dreams and dream stories are certainly made up affairs, as the *Theosophist* very broadly hints. I never had any dreams like them. I never knew a man who had—nor a woman, at least not one whose evidence I would take. I never knew a man who knew a man who had these visions. Moreover, it is perfectly evident where they come from, supposing for the sake of argument, that the writers thereof really do dream them. The stage properties are always more or less the same; there is a great extent of mountain, sky, sea, what not; rainbow tints; some strange thing in the sky or something written across it; a majestic personage who acts like a combination of cicerone and Greek chorus, with a dash of Chitra-Gupta thrown in, and who reads a moral lesson into the vagaries of the disquiet brain of the sleeper. No; the more rational dream stories and 'visions' are simply works of fiction of a certain kind, which are purely earthly and intellectual in their origin, using that vehicle of presentation because the manuscript discovered in a 'secret drawer' has become a threadbare device. The wilder, crazier kind of dreams may be the genuine effects of an unfortunate conjunction of a heavy supper with the book of Revelation." So reflected I, and then I took up my book again and opened my eyes, in order to proceed with my reading.

They fell half listlessly upon the open page, and for a fraction of a second I felt a queer mental confusion, for instead of the article I had been reading, there, all across the open pages in huge red letters, was the word "IDIOT." Through my mind there flashed instantly a confused mass of broken ideas:—I had opened the wrong page; what an extraordinary mistake of the binder! Could this possibly be an hallucination? I was just going to turn over the pages to look for my place, when I was half stunned by a wild burst of mocking laughter, which seemed to come from all sides, and even now I cannot tell whether it did really come from the outside, as it seems to me to have been *inside* my own head as much as *outside* of it. I started up from chair, somewhat scared, and looked round. Instinctively I glanced towards the windows, both of which, as I remembered, were open, the room looking out on a porch. There were no windows there! There were no bookshelves! My eyes wandered round the room, or rather round what ought to have been my room. Tables, chairs, books, carpet, pictures, everything had vanished, and I found myself standing alone in a totally different room,—a room nicely furnished, and, evidently occupied by a person of taste and culture. I was about to take a mental inventory of the various objects in the room when my attention was directed to myself. I became distinctly aware of a sensation of personality that did not belong to me. I felt

taller and stronger than I knew I really was. I felt sure I was better looking, for I distinctly experienced a sensation of massiveness and sharpness of feature, and an absence of lines and wrinkles that seemed an immense relief. Up to this moment I had perfectly preserved the recollection of my identity. If I had closed my eyes again and found myself sitting in my chair when I opened them, with the *Theosophist*, in my hand, I should not have been in the least surprised. I half knew it was a kind of dream that I was experiencing. Now, however, I began to get confused. My personality began to get dim; my wife and children seemed to me to properly belong to some one else. I felt as if for an indefinite time I had been in some one else's place, doing his duties during his absence. Then I began to get muddled as to whose duties I had been doing. The coachman occurred to my memory, and I tried to remember whether I had been doing his duties or his master's. My former or true personality gradually came to appear to me as not myself at all, but as a third person, equally with the coachman, or my old friend the family doctor, or a tradesman who that morning had presented a bill which I had already paid,—all of whom occurred to my mind as possibly the "self" of whom I was in search. A strange thing was that when my true personality did not seem to belong to me I thought, "what a fool that man (namely, myself) is to waste his life in literary labours, whose only object is to get the applause of a little clique of conceited professors and others, whose approbation is of as much real value as the cawing of so many crows."

By degrees I lost my personal bearings altogether. It seemed to me that bits and scraps of a hundred different persons' thoughts and feelings came tumbling into my mind, and chasing each other through it. This mental "circus" ceased, and was succeeded by the most cruelly painful blank. One of the obscure diseases of which medical books tell, causes the patient to forget his own name, which is said to be accompanied by great distress of mind. Fancy, then, what it is to lose not the name only but every clue to one's identity;—time, place, age, sex, nationality, everything gone, and merely the bare consciousness left,—not even self-consciousness, for it was precisely any special "self," of which to be conscious, that was absent in my case. I have thought since that I would just then have been an admirable subject for the "electro-biologist" or hypnotizer; for if anyone had told me that I was a red Indian squaw, or the late Duke of Wellington, I should have gladly believed him; in fact I am not sure that it would not have been an immense relief from my embarrassment to have been seriously informed that I was a jack rabbit, or even a cocoanut tree. This state, however, was only temporary; it was like the confused picture that appears on the screen in "dissolving views" when "Mont Blanc" is melting into "the charge of the Light Brigade." My mind cleared, my real personality and the fragments of other people's egos passed from my memory and mind, and I found myself a calm, large being, quite contented and composed with regard to his individuality, of which he seemed to himself to be perfectly aware, although he did

not care to recall the incidents of his life to his active memory just then. As I now remember my feelings and ideas at this moment, everything distinctive had vanished from my mind, I mean that Europe, Asia, Africa, America had sunk with all their contents into the ocean of non-remembrance,—not lost to memory, but "inhibited."

I had just arrived at this happy state of mental repose when the door opened and a tall and handsome man of perhaps forty years of age entered. The moment I saw him I knew I had an appointment with him to see some of the curiosities of which he was in charge. When he greeted me, I knew at once that we were old friends, and that I had not seen him for several years. Then I knew, in the same unaccountable way, (as it seems to me now) that he was writing a book on moral philosophy, and had been making observations for that purpose, as a person who wished to write about the habits of certain animals or insects would make observations of their habits and customs. I also knew that his name was Alamor and mine Ortal.

"Are you ready?" he asked. I answered that I was. Then he touched the centre of his forehead with the middle finger of his left hand, and I did the same;—not in imitation, but because it seemed to me a perfectly familiar action, the intention and effect of which were obvious.....

I found myself standing beside my friend in an enormous circular Hall, far larger, it seemed to me, than the Coliseum at Rome; but, unlike the Coliseum, it had a great dome, which was painted blue, and decorated with a multitude of stars. The walls of the hall were hardly walls at all, but a series of very high arches which supported the dome; and beyond, through the arches, I saw a lovely landscape all around, mountains, rivers, sea, trees, flowers, with birds of brilliant plumage and bright insects flying and flitting about. The Hall was full of light and full of people. There seemed to be thousands there, but there was plenty of room for them to move about freely. And such people! Such bright, happy, beautiful young men and women! The moment they saw us a great shout of joy went ringing up to the dome, and they came crowding round us, for they all seemed to know Alamor and to love him. Presently they all returned laughing and singing to their work. It was a huge factory of artificial flowers. Some sat at tables, some on the marble floor. Great heaps of material of bright colour lay all about, and the workers took a little of it in their hands, moulded it, touched it here and there, blew gently on it this way and that, and, Lo! a lovely flower! "Do they themselves think that they are making flowers?" I asked Alamor. "Why certainly!" he replied, "if they suspected that they were in reality making beautiful thoughts they would become as conceited as so many college professors, and then good-by to peace and harmony; moreover that would spoil the colours at once. Maya, my dear Ortal, is an exceedingly beneficent goddess! Don't you think that if the coral insects knew they were building up a continent, they would stop their work, as being far too insignificant and unremunerative for such exceedingly important and intelligent animalculæ?"

Just then a man somewhat older and sterner looking than any of the others, entered by one of the arches with a list of names in his hand which he read out. Here and there in the Hall some one stood up, as he or she heard their names called; and all went with evident reluctance towards the same part of the Hall, where a staircase led down underground. At a table near us sat a lovely girl making violets; she heard herself named, and said to her companions: "What a nuisance! I hate going into that horrid, dark, beastly place. I do hope they will give me a better part than last time, for then I was a poor out-cast, and killed my child and went mad in prison. Keep my place, dears, I won't be long." And off she went with the others.

The flowers as they were finished by the girls were taken by the young men and carried to the edge of a large pit in the centre of the Hall, which had a wall, breast high, all round it, at which stood a number of these beautiful workers of both sexes, who threw the flowers into the pit as they were brought up to them, with great apparent interest. Sometimes they laughed outright at the effect produced by the flowers they threw, and sometimes they looked after them quite sadly. These flower throwers only peeped for a moment into the pit as they threw, for there came up from it a horrible, suffocating stench, which it evidently gave them great pain to endure. Alamor led the way to the brink of the pit, and, looking over, the strangest possible sight met our gaze. About a hundred feet below was the rough, uneven, floor of the pit, which extended away out of sight under the other parts of the Hall. This floor was an extraordinary burlesque of the beautiful scenery we could see through the arches of the Hall. There were lakes and hills and trees and rivers; but the rivers were muddy and lined with poisonous plants, the trees were stunted and drooping, the hills were barren and crumbling, and the lakes were stagnant and full of slimy things. The pit was crowded with the most extraordinary looking people. They were not all of one age, like a class in a college, as were the beautiful inhabitants of the Hall. There were young and old, and middle-aged, strong and feeble, ragged and finely attired. The whole place was in a turmoil. Every now and then there was a general rush to some particular spot, during which the weak and the children were trampled under foot. At other times a band of evil-looking men would quietly assemble, and all of a sudden begin beating and kicking every one in their neighbourhood. I watched the flowers as they were thrown down. The inhabitants of the pit did not seem to perceive them. They generally missed their mark and were trampled into the mud; but when they did hit the effect was curious. For instance, a creature that looked like a caricature of a man was beating another creature that looked like a caricature of a woman, when a rose struck him in the back. His uplifted bludgeon did not again descend on the wretched bleeding bundle of rags at his feet; he did not even kick the creature in the face any more; he merely swore at her,—asked her what the dash dash she thought he had married her for, if he was not to have his dinner ready when he came home from work, and told

her to take dash dash dash good care not to behave like that again.

Just then a great mob of howling, shouting creatures came along close enough to distinguish the object of their enthusiasm. It was an ugly, dirty, mean-looking man whom they carried round on a high chair. On his breast was a huge placard with the words "I AM A VERY GREAT MAN." The mob that carried him beat and robbed every one they met, and cried out that the Very Great Man told them to do so.

As I was watching him, the Very Great Man leant over to those who were carrying him, and feebly begged them not to go so fast, as the jolting hurt him. Whereupon the mob cried out: "He is *not* a Very Great Man;" and those who carried the chair upset him out of it, and he was trodden into the mud by the crowd.

Presently I saw a number of misshapen evil-looking creatures, sneaking up from various directions to a point just below where we stood. They had long, stupid, melancholy, cruel faces, and were dressed in sombre colours and carried old musty-looking books and great bundles full of old rags and bits of bone and scraps of tinsel. They formed a circle in a quiet corner and opened the books and bundles. Then they began to make a big rag doll out of the contents of their bundles, while some of them read descriptions of rag dolls out of their books and showed the others the pictures. When they had finished their doll, which looked like a monstrous exaggeration of themselves,—stupid, cruel and horrible,—they painted it in all kinds of loud, discordant and inharmonious colours, and put a big placard on its breast, on which were the words: "THIS IS GOD ALMIGHTY." Then some of them took their rag doll on their shoulders, and the other produced trumpets and bludgeons from under their cloaks, and they blew the trumpets and shouted: "This is the Creator of the Universe;" and every one who would not go down on his knees to their rag doll, and pay them some money, they beat with their bludgeons and left for dead.

"Who are these awful wretches that inhabit this pit"? I asked Alamor.

"Cannot you guess?" he replied; "they are our flower makers; the very same people you see all around you in this Hall."

"But—!" I exclaimed.

"But," he answered, "they do not know each other in the masks they wear down there. Neither do they recollect this Hall, and their happy life here, for the din and stench of the pit drives the recollection of this place out of their heads at once. Before they go, and after they return, they know that all they say and do there is wretched farce and cruel fooling, but while they are there the Goddess Maya throws her glamour over them and theirs and they take it all in earnest."

"But how cruel it is to make them go into that horrible place, and play the idiot and the maniac!" I exclaimed.

"My brother, thou hast much to learn!" said Alamor, with something between a sigh and a smile; "did they do not go down into the pit and learn for themselves by personal experience what flowers are wanted there, they would not be able to make the

beautiful violets, roses, carnations and other flowers, you see them throw down; flowers, which even when they miss their mark, purify the foul atmosphere of the pit, and in time will make it clear and clean."

"Where do they get those hideous masks?" I asked.

"In the robing room," replied Alamor, "the same masks last for many years, slightly altered to suit each new wearer. When they became worn out, and too dirty and rotten to be used any more, a new and slightly better-looking set of masks are supplied to the robing room. Let us go and see the operation for ourselves, and then we can stroll through the pit."

"First tell me," said I, "what this pit is called."

"It goes by various names," replied Alamor. "The people here generally call it the Infernal Region, or 'Hell.' The inhabitants themselves call it 'Terra Firma'; but those of them who are religiously disposed call it 'God's beautiful world.'"

A. K.

THE DHAMMAPADA.

THE *Dhammapada* is a compilation of verses*, principally from the Sutrapiṭaka, made at the first great council of the Buddhist Church (which was held in the year after the passing away of our LORD BUDDHA, at the Sattapanni cave near Rajagriha, under the presidency of the great Mahakasyapa) and confirmed at the two succeeding councils. The selection was made as a sort of manual for the student of the spirit of true Buddhism, and almost all the purely moral sayings of our LORD are included in it. It is not to be supposed that there is any chronological order to be observed in its compilation; in many cases where two or three verses are to be found upon the same subject they were delivered by LORD BUDDHA on entirely different occasions. The word *Dhammapada* is usually translated "Verses of the Law;" perhaps "Portions of the LAW" would be more correct, as there is a reference here to the *Sattatimsa-bodhi-pakkhiya-dhamma*, or "The Thirty-seven Portions or Parts of the LAW"† (or thirty-seven steps of the Path

* In the Chinese preface to the *Dhammapada* it is written:—"The verses called *Dhammapada* are selections from all Sutras. These are the words of BUDDHA Himself, spoken as occasion suggested, not at any one time, but at various times, and the cause and end of their being spoken is also related in the different Sutras. After BUDDHA left the world, Ananda collected a certain number of volumes, in each of which the words of BUDDHA are quoted, whether the Sutra be large or small, with this introductory phrase:—"Thus I have heard." It was from these works that the Shamans (monks) in after years copied out the various *Gathas*, some of four lines, some of six lines, and attached to each set a title according to the subject therein explained. But all these verses without exception are taken from some one or other of the accepted Scriptures, and therefore they are called 'Law-verses' or Scripture extracts, because they are found in the canon."

† The "Thirty-seven Portions of the Law" are the *Satipattahana*, or Four Earnest Meditations, the *Sammappadhana*, or Four Great Efforts, the *Idhhipada*, or Four Steps to the attainment of wonderful powers, the *Balani*, or Five Superhuman Powers, the *Indriyani*, or Five Superhuman Senses, the *Bodhi-anga*, or Seven Kinds of Wisdom, and the *Arya-ashtangika marga*, or Noble Eight-fold Path. These are explained in the second part of Mr. C. W. Leadbeater's *Introductory Catechism of Buddhism*, the English translation of which will commence to appear in the next issue of the *Buddhist*.

to NIRVANA) laid down by our LORD; but Buddhist terminology in the English language is at present so unsettled and unsatisfactory that it is very difficult to give a translation which shall at once convey the whole meaning of the original as understood by an Eastern student. The *Dhammapada* is said to have three meanings, one within the other: first, its obvious meaning, second, that contained in what is called "the abridged or contracted explanation," and third, that contained in the complete or perfect explanation. As known to the Southern Church, it consists of twenty-six sections, which are named as follows:—

1. *Yamakavagga* (the section of the pairs of opposites) containing a series of verses arranged in pairs, the second of which praises some particular virtue, while the first shows the evil of its opposite.

2. *Appamadavagga* (the section on hastening to do good), which shows the evils of delay and the necessity of hastening to perform good works.

3. *Chittavagga* (the section of the mind, or of thought) which speaks of the corruption and the cleansing of the mind, and the attainment of purity of heart.

4. *Pupphavagga* (the section of flowers) which shows the exaltation of the way to NIRVANA, and compares the life of a man who follows the thirty-seven Portions of the Doctrine to a carefully-woven garland of beautiful flowers—each virtue being a blossom fitted in the exact place where it can shew to the best advantage and most add to the beauty of the whole.

5. *Balavagga* (the section of the fool) explaining the nature of the foolish man.

6. *Panditavagga* (the section of the wise man) showing the nature and customs of the truly wise man.

7. *Arahatavagga* (the section of the Arahats) which speaks of the qualifications and powers of the Arahats or fully developed man.

8. *Sāhassavagga* (the section of thousands) so called because it states that one good word is better than a thousand foolish ones, that one verse well-understood is better than a thousand repeated without understanding, &c.

9. *Pāpavagga* (the section of sin) explaining the action of sin and the method of escaping from it and attaining salvation.

10. *Dandavagga* (the section of injuries or punishments), which condemns the infliction of injury on any one.

11. *Jarāvagga* (the section of decay) which explains the nature of the decay of the body, and the coming of old age.

12. *Attavagga* (the section of self—i. e., self-protection) explaining how to protect oneself from all spiritual harm.

13. *Lohavagga* (the section of the world) speaking of this world and the future worlds, and pointing out the Good Path.

14. *Buddhavagga* (the section of the BUDDHAS) in which the qualities of a BUDDHA are mentioned.

15. *Sukhavagga* (the section of happiness) showing in what true happiness consists.

16. *Piyavagga* (the section of affection) showing the good and evil of the affections, and on what objects they should be fixed, and bidding us beware of sin.
17. *Kodhavagga* (the section of anger) warning us against the evil effects of anger.
18. *Malavagga* (the section of impurity) adverting to the evils of impurity either of mind or body.
19. *Dhammatavagga* (the section of morality) explaining the nature of the true Doctrine, and the necessity of holding firmly by it.
20. *Maggavagga* (the section of the Path in which the nature of the Noble Eightfold Path is explained.
21. *Pakinnakavagga* (the miscellaneous section) containing advice on various subjects.
22. *Nirayavagga* (the section of the hells) describing the nature of the men whose *karma* will bring upon them terrible suffering after death.
23. *Nāgavagga* (the section of the great) which explains the nature of the truly great man. This is sometimes called the elephant section.
24. *Tanharagga* (the section of desire) showing what desire or lust is, and its evil effects.
25. *Bhikkhuvagga* (the section of monastic life) describing how a monk should live.
26. *Brahmanavagga* (the section of the Brahman) showing that the true Brahman is the pure-minded man, whether his birth be high or low—not the mere man of high caste.

There is at present no satisfactory English translation of the *Dhammapada*, for even that of Professor Max Müller contains many inaccuracies. I do not for a moment wish to depreciate Professor Max Müller's undoubted scholarship in Sanskrit, but I consider that when he has attempted through his knowledge of Sanskrit to translate Pali literature, he has frequently been unsuccessful. Unless one studies the commentary (*Atthakatha*) it is quite impossible fully to comprehend and enjoy the beauty of the ancient texts. European scholars spend much time and labour in studying philology and searching for roots and derivations, and yet they often mistake the simplest meanings for want of understanding the living spirit of our religion. We have a proverb which says:—“Among small shrubs the castor-plant passes for a great tree”—something equivalent, I suppose, to the English saying:—“Among the blind the one-eyed man is king:” and I think some of the European Sanskrit and Pali scholars must be estimated on this principle. I hear that Sir Monier Williams has lately presumed to write a book against Buddhism in which he assumes a perfect acquaintance with Sanskrit and Pali; yet when he came to see me a few years ago, his knowledge of both languages appeared somewhat rudimentary, and in the latter at any rate he was quite unable to frame an intelligible sentence.

In conclusion I may say that I consider the study of the *Dhammapada* of the greatest importance, since it is of itself sufficient, if properly comprehended, to give a perfect understanding of the nature of BUDDHA's religion. I am much pleased to hear that Sir Edwin Arnold, to whom we already owe so much, has commenced a poetical translation of it, and I hope that he will find time to conclude it.

H. SUMANGALA,
High Priest.

[From the “*Buddhist*.”]

SELF-KNOWLEDGE AND SELF-CULTURE.

(Continued from page 663.)

IN the preceding paper we tried to explain that love of knowledge is the right motive in seeking knowledge. This means that we must seek knowledge for its own sake and not for gaining something else by its agency. With most people knowledge is a means to an end and not the end in view. Many seek it as a means of acquiring money or fame. The philanthropists of the day seek it, as a rule, as a means of comfort to their fellow-creatures, and not for its own sake. And, if we mistake not, even the Yogis as a body do not seek it purely and exclusively and knowingly for its own sake; they seek it as the means of obtaining emancipation, unfortunately losing sight of the fact, which they probably understand very well, that the distinction between self-knowledge and emancipation has no real existence, or that it is a distinction without a difference, a nonsensical distinction. ‘The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life.’

The selfishness of the first class of seekers is incompatible with self-knowledge. Selfish persons have very little attraction for the *higher self* that knows no selfishness. Likes attract likes, but a selfish person and the *higher self* are not at all like one another, and do not therefore attract one another. The seekers of the second class have strong natural affinity for the *higher self*, and are drawn towards him with great force owing to the likeness of nature, but most of them are blind to him, either because they do not believe in his existence or because they think him unknowable. ‘None are more blind than those who will not see.’ The materialists and the agnostics are incapable of acquiring self-knowledge, because they shut their eyes to it under the influence of prejudice or preconception. The seeker of the third class is nearest the mark. In one sense it is true that by acquiring self-knowledge he is to be emancipated from the bonds of matter or from the otherwise irresistible charm of the *Great Illusion*, under whose influence man takes the *phenomenal* for the *noumenal*, and consequently centres his attention upon the former, so as to work his own disappointment by seeking there THE TRUTH (embracing within its folds true happiness, true or real peace, true knowledge, true life, and true self) which is not to be found there, for the simple reason that it lies elsewhere, viz., in the *noumenal*.

But he must bear well in mind the exact sense in which this is true. It is true because self-knowledge implies emancipation and not because it is the means to that end. Self-knowledge and emancipation are two different aspects of the same reality and not two distinct realities. Viewing one and the same fact from two different standpoints we give it two different names. In seeking self-knowledge one does seek emancipation, since both words mean the same thing in reality. But then, he must seek self-knowledge *or* emancipation, and not self-knowledge *for* emancipation. This is an important point to bear in mind in practice, since in seeking self-knowledge *for* emancipation one seeks it as a means to an end, whereas in seeking self-knowledge *or* emancipation he seeks it as the end in view. Here we see the great importance of having a clear and accurate idea of what we are about. A single mistake, and apparently the most insignificant one, may, if left unnoticed and uncorrected, turn every thing upside down in the course of time. Indescribable are the divers ways in which the serpent of self contrives to regain if it once fails to maintain its hold upon its old victim, and so insidiously does it creep in from the most unsuspected and hence unguarded quarters, that he should make it a point to face it and subjugate it at each step he ascends instead of attempting to keep out of its way. In other words, while trying to work unselfishly in right earnest, his motive imperceptibly takes a selfish turn. To guard against this, in the first place, the motive must be free not only from all visible tinge of selfishness, but also from all sources of error, or from every association of idea that may possibly lead to misconception on some future occasion. Pure love of knowledge is the only motive in the student that stands this crucial test and is therefore the *right* motive for excellence. Strictly speaking, such a student does not seek self-knowledge; he seeks knowledge, and self-knowledge comes to him of its own accord as soon as he deserves it by his absorption in the pursuit of knowledge from pure love.

“Behold Christ comes like a thief at night and happy are they who are born during sleep.”

To sum up:—Pure love of knowledge is at once the right motive for the student and the best safeguard against his going astray; while selfishness, materialism and agnosticism are his great enemies. He has therefore to cultivate the first and subdue the other three. How to cultivate love of knowledge we have said before; to conquer selfishness we have to cultivate the opposite instinct by living in conformity with the grand ideal of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity; and to rise above materialism and agnosticism is needed the most careful study of the other side of nature, which has unfortunately been systematically ignored by modern scientists as a class, though accurately observed by the great scientists who have worked in a previous cycle of civilization, and clearly depicted by them in the annals of Aryan literature. We now see how important, nay essential, a part the first two objects of the Theosophical Society have to play in spreading the great blessing of self-knowledge.

If a member understands the objects of the Society and is in sympathy with them, as he distinctly declares* while seeking admission into the Society, and if he continues to be in sympathy with them as his continuation of the membership implies, he cannot but strive to live in conformity with the ideal of brotherhood, and to learn and teach Aryan literature to the best of his understanding and capability, and that is *just the way* to conquer selfishness, materialism and agnosticism, the three great obstacles in the way of acquiring self-knowledge on the one hand, and to cultivate pure love, the chief means of acquiring it, on the other.

J. K. DAJI.

A SHIN-SHU CATECHISM.

(Introduction.)

[The Shin-shu sect of Japanese Buddhism is the richest, most active, and, with one exception—the Nichiren—possessed of the greatest number of temples, having 20,000 as against 23,000 of the Nichiren. It is divided into two great bodies, the Eastern (*Nishi*) and Western (*Hingachi*) Hongwanjis; between which there is complete identity of creed but separate mastership, property rights, and government. Each has jurisdiction over about 10,000 temples, of which the chief ones at Kioto and Tokio are exceptionally splendid and huge. The “priests” of Shin-shu are, properly-speaking, not full monks or *bhikshus*, like the ordinary priests of Ceylon, Burmah, etc., or even of Japan, but rather of an intermediate class between the priest and laic; and they so describe themselves. They marry, wear civilian dress when they choose—save, of course, when engaged in temple services—and have the right to hold property. The caste or order is hereditary, but they are strictly amenable to discipline, the word of the Master or Pontiff being law. Naturally there is entire disagreement between them and the full monks of other sects, upon the marriage and some other questions. They are, I find, very active in educational works, having a number of large schools in successful operation, and at Kioto a large and well appointed and conducted college, with able professors and teachers. They have Buddhist propagation Societies, a large and growing temperance Society, and a number of magazines and other periodicals. The peculiar views of the Shin-shu sect have attracted much attention among European theologians and sinologists and, among others, Mr. Basil Hall Chamberlain, Mr. Satow, Captain J. M. James, and Mr. James Troup have published their views and researches from time to time. Two of their younger generation, Mr. Akamatsu and Mr. Bunyin Nanjio, graduates respectively of Cambridge and Oxford, have earned good reputations in the world of Oriental scholarship, and enjoy influence and universal respect in the Western and Eastern Hongwanjis. The most recent monograph upon Shin-shu is a paper read by Mr. Troup before the Asiatic Society of Japan while I was in that country. The compiler of the Catechism now published is a priest of the Hong-wan-jika, a personal friend of mine, and was a member of the Joint Committee of the eight sects which travelled with me throughout the Empire. Of course, it may be relied upon as a correct and orthodox presentation of Shin-shu doctrine and of the best arguments available for its vindication.

Its strange resemblance to Christian dogma at once strikes the attention and piques the curiosity of the student of comparative theology. An erudite Catholic priest who has passed many years in Japan expressed to me his absolute conviction that Shin-shu is neither more nor less than a *rechauffée* of the Christianity which the Nestorian missionaries taught in China in the 6th century.

The MSS. of the Catechism was edited by a careful hand before being handed to me.—H. S. O.]

* Vide form of application to be signed by the applicant.

SHIN-SHU CATECHISM. COMPILED BY SHO-KWAKU KATO OF THE
KON-GWAN-JI-HA OF THE SHIN-SHU.

EVERY one knows that Sâkyamuni is the original founder of Buddhism in the world. Buddhism is, in a few words, a religious system (doctrine) that looks for the perfect knowledge in order to escape from the sufferings of birth and death, and obtain the eternal happiness of Nirvâna.

But as the energy and inclination of different human minds differ, so Sâkyamuni has explained various methods to suit each one, just as a doctor gives various medicines according to various kinds of illness. This is the reason why there are so many sects in Buddhism. These sects are the different ways which alike lead to Nirvâna. The most of them, however, are too hard and toilsome to go along. Then, how can we pass through who are destitute of the eyes of wisdom, and want the feet of practice?

But to our great blessing, there is a way that we may have recourse to! It is to get on the ship of Buddha's *Prayer* (vow!) that is able to bear us in the so stormy ocean of birth and death without any danger. Therefore Nagar-juna, the Indian saint, said: "There are innumerable gates or forms in the Law of Buddha, just as there are paths in the world either (some) difficult and (or) some easy. To travel by land on foot is painful, but to cross the water by ship is pleasant. The way of the Bodhisattvas is the same. Some are practising (religious austerities) diligently with pain, others are able to attain to the state of 'not returning again' (Avaivartya) by means of the easy practice, viz., by faith (in Amitâyus, otherwise called Amitâbha)." The latter is the doctrine of our Shin-shû sect which I am now going to explain. The full name of the sect is Jo-do-shin-shû, or 'True sect of the Pure Land.' It is so called, because to be born in the Pure Land of Amitâbha, or Paradise, is the object of the followers of this sect. The main (principal) patriarchs of the doctrine of the sect in India, China and Japan, were the so-called seven High Priests, namely, Nâgârjuna (Ryû-ju) and Vasubandhu (Ten-jin) in India, Thân-lwan (Don-ran), Tào-chho (Dō-shaku) and Shân-tào (Zen-do) in China, and Gen-shin and Gen-kû in Japan. Nâgârjuna lived in Southern India about seven centuries after Buddha, and about two centuries afterwards Vasubandhu lived in Northern India. In China, Don-ran, Dō-shaku and Zen-do lived fifteen to sixteen centuries after Buddha. In Japan, Gen-shin was born in 1657 year after B. (A. D. 942), and died in his seventy-sixth year. The birth of Gen-kû took place in 1847 (A. D. 1133) and his death in his eightieth year. He was the teacher of Shiuran, the founder of our Shin-shû sect.

Sage (the Saint?) Shin-ran was born in the noble family of Fujiwara, in 'Rigen' 1888 (A. D. 1173). In his ninth year he became a priest of the Ten-dai sect, and during twenty years he studied the doctrine of that sect. In his twenty-ninth year he became a disciple of Gen-kû, from whom he received the tradition of the "Power of Another" (another power, Ta-riki). When he was fifty-two years old he established the sect, adding a word 'Shin' or 'True' to the name Jo-do-shû, so called previously with the view of maintaining the principles of his teacher, because although

the teacher Jue-kû established the principal sect holding the doctrine of the Pure Land, his leading opinions were almost forgotten after his death.

And, as the standard of the sect, he compiled a book with the title of Kyō-gyō-shin-shō-mon-rui, or 'Collection of Maxims concerning Doctrine, Practice, Faith and Enlightenment.' He died in the ninetieth year of his age.

Now I shall have the terms of these four methods for the text of my catechism; but as the subjects themselves are of very profound signification [meanings], and moreover, unfortunately, I am not a very good hand in English, I beg my readers not to expect too much from me. This work is only a single instalment of the treatise of the doctrine of the sect.

Q. What is the principal subject of the Sutra?

A. About the True Doctrine.

Q. What contains the True Doctrine?

A. The Dai-mu-ryō-ju-kyō, or Larger Sukhâvatīyûha.

Q. What is the Dai-mu-ryō-ju-kyō?

A. That is the title of a Sûtra or sacred book preached by (containing (the preaching of) Sâkyamuni.

Q. What kind of Sûtra is it?

A. The highest and most perfect of the Sûtra.

It is this that Buddha Amitâbha has made forty-eight great prayers (vows?) and these prayers (vows?) have been fulfilled fully, by which he saves all beings who rely upon him. This is the doctrine that is most fitted to all sinful beings, and the preaching of this doctrine was the original desire of Sâkyamuni, because he appeared in the world for the purpose of making this subject known everywhere.

Q. How do you know that the preaching of this doctrine was the original desire of Sâkyamuni?

A. Because it is explained by him in the Sûtra, and, moreover, it is Buddha's mercy to pity them who are sinful and helpless; just as a life-boat is prepared for drowning men and not for any one on the bank.

Q. When did Amitâbha make his prayers?

A. Immeasurable Kalpas ago, when he was as yet a Bhikshu, with the name of Dharmâkara, at the time of the Buddha Lokeshvararâja.

Q. Stop: What is Kalpa?

A. It is a Sanskrit term given to a certain vast period or cycle of time.

Q. What is Bhikshu?

A. It means a religious mendicant.

Q. Was Amitâbha then only a mendicant?

A. No, he was originally a Buddha without beginning.

Q. Why without beginning?

A. Because he is the truth itself—the body of abstract existence.

All other Buddhas have attained to the perfect knowledge only after worshipping him, and he is, therefore, called the original matter of all Buddhas. Still more, it is said even that all Buddhas are the transformed bodies of him.

- Q. Why then did he become a mendicant ?
- A. To prepare (get ready) the means (cause ?) of our salvation for us, because he knew that we should be incapable absolutely of doing it ourselves.
- Q. Proceed. Can you tell me some of Amitâbha's prayers (or vows ?) that (are) important above all (the rest ?)
- A. Yes, there are five important prayers (or vows ?) the 11th, 12th, 13th, 17th and 18th prayers.
- Q. What is the 11th prayer ?
- A. It says that those who are born in his country should certainly attain to Nirvâna.
- Q. The 12th ?
- A. That his light should be boundless.
- Q. The 13th ?
- A. That his life and the lives of those in his country should be immeasurable.
- Q. The 17th ?
- A. That his name should be glorified by all Buddhas.
- Q. The 18th ?
- A. That those who have relied upon him with true faith should surely be born in his country.
- Q. What did he do after having made his prayers (vows ?)
- A. During immeasurable Kalpas he practised immeasurable virtuous actions to fulfil his great vows.
- Q. Why did he take so prolonged periods to fulfil his prayers ?
- A. Because he alone took upon himself so many practices, as the vicar of all living beings.
- Q. When did he finish his great works ?
- A. Ten Kalpas ago, and then he became again (?) a Buddha called Amitâbha and Amitâyus.
- Q. What do these two names mean ?
- A. Amitâbha means boundless light ; and Amitâyus, infinite life.
- Q. Why is he so called ?
- A. It is explained minutely in the Dai-mu-ryō-ju-kyō mentioned above.
- But now, for convenience, I shall quote here a passage of the Smaller Sukhâvatīvyūha, one of the three principal sacred books.
- Q. Wait ; what are the titles of the three sacred books ?
- A. They are :
1. Dai-ryō-ju-kyō, or Larger Sukhâvatīvyūha,—the same Sūtra as above mentioned as containing the true doctrine.
 2. Kuvvan-mu-ryō-ju-kyō.
 3. A-mi-da-kyō,—the Sūtra from which I am going now to give you an extract.
- Q. Why do you not mention these three Sūtras together as containing the true doctrine ?
- A. Because the last two have two ways of meaning, the apparent and the hidden ; the apparent meaning being the temporary doctrine, and the hidden, the true.
- Q. Why do these two Sūtras contain such double meanings ?
- A. For the sake of inviting beings (men ?) to the true doctrine through the temporary.

- Q. Now, proceed with the quotation from the Smaller Sukhâvatīvyūha for the explanation of Buddha's names.
- A. Yes, that is as follows :
- “ Now what do you think, O Sâriputra, for what reason is that Tathâgata (Nyo-rai, *i. e.*, Buddha) called Amitâyus ? The length of the life (âyus), O Sâriputra, of that Tathâgata and of those men there is immeasurable (amita). Therefore that Tathâgata is called Amitâyus. And what do you think, O Sâriputra, for what reason is that Tathâgata called Amitâbha ? The splendour (âbhâ), O Sâriputra, of that Tathâgata is unimpeded over all Buddha countries. Therefore that Tathâgata is called Amitâbha.”
- Q. What is Buddha's light ?
- A. It is the appearance of wisdom that breaks the darkness of ignorance.
- Q. How did the Buddhas acquire those excellent attributes—‘ infinite life ’ and ‘ boundless light ’ ?
- A. They are the rewards for his immeasurable merits that he has accumulated during so long periods to fulfil his 12th and 13th Prayers (vows ?). This life and light are the principles of Buddha's mercy for his saving of all beings. But I must stop here on this subject, for this chapter is only to show that the true doctrine of the sect is contained in the Dai-mu-ryō-ju-kyō, and not in any other Sūtras.
- Q. About the True Practice. What is the true practice ?
- A. Na-mo-a-mi-da-buten, the virtuous name of Buddha Amitâbha.
- Q. Why is Buddha's name called the true practice ?
- A. Because it is the essential practice for our salvation.
- Q. How can we get salvation by this practice ?
- A. By repeating the name. Nay, by listening to it, because the true practice or Buddha's name itself is an audible law, by hearing which we can receive the mercy of Buddha.
- Q. Is this Namamidabutsu the same name as Amitâbha who wished in the 17th Prayer (vow ?) to be glorified by all Buddhas ?
- A. Yes.
- Q. But why did he make the 17th Prayer (vow ?) by which he means to be so solicitous about his own reputation ?
- A. That is not for himself (his own) renown, but for the sake of making all Buddhas proclaim the law of Namamidabutsu in the ten regions, so that all beings there can hear it.
- Q. What does the law of Namamidabutsu mean ?
- A. In a few words, Namamidabutsu means “ Rely upon me ! I will save you.”
- Q. Will you explain it literally to me again ?
- A. Yes. Namō means adoration, obeisance, etc., and Amidabutsu is the contraction of Amitâyus or immeasurable life, containing also the meaning of Amitâbha or boundless light. Accordingly Namamidabutsu means literally adoration of Amidabutsu.
- Q. But have you not given “ rely upon me ” as the meaning of the word Namō before ?
- A. Yes, but Namō is a command, “ rely upon me,” when we consider Namamidabutsu as the law of Buddha simply.

Reviews.

(From the "National Reformer.")

The Secret Doctrine. By MME. BLAVATSKY. In two vols. (London: Theosophical Publishing Co., 7 Duke Street, Adelphi, W. C.)

The *National Reformer* reaches so many different types of readers, all of whom must be more or less liberal-minded, that it seems likely that among them all some will be found to take interest in the unfamiliar views of the universe set forth in this very remarkable work. M^{me}. Blavatsky, from whose pen it comes to us, is a personality as remarkable as her book. She has been lauded as the apostle of a new revelation; denounced as the inventor of the greatest imposture of the age. That she is an impostor no one who knows her will believe; while the fact that she is possessed of wide and deep Oriental learning, and has access to rare and recondite sources of information, will be apparent to anyone who even skims these volumes. But skimming is more likely to repel than to attract: the unfamiliar archaism and yet more unfamiliar mysticism of the book of Dzyan, which is claimed as one of the oldest MSS. in the world; the subtle metaphysics, which become wholly unintelligible and even contradictory unless the delicate gradations of phrase be noted and understood; the Oriental atmosphere in which the mental images live and move; the antagonism of the whole intellectual trend to the thought of our Western civilisation; all this is but too likely to make the 19th century Englishman raise his eyebrows, shrug his shoulders, and throw the book down. For the Orient begins to study the universe just where the Occident ceases to study. With telescope and with microscope, with scalpel and with battery, Western Science interrogates Nature, adding fact to fact, storing experience after experience, but coming ever to gulfs unfathomable by its plummet, to heights unscalable by its ladders. Wide and masterful in its answers to the "How?", the "Why?" ever eludes it, and causes remain enwrapped in gloom. Eastern Science uses as its scientific instrument the penetrating faculties of the mind alone, and regarding the material plane as *maya*, illusion, seeks in the mental and spiritual planes of being the causes of the material effects. There, to it, is the only reality; there the true existence of which the visible universe is but the shadow.

It is clear that for such investigations some further mental equipment is necessary than that normally afforded by the human body. And here comes the "parting of the ways" between East and West. For the study of the material universe, our five senses, aided by the instruments invented by science, may suffice. For all that we can hear and see, taste and handle, these accustomed servitors, though often blundering, are the best available guides to knowledge. But it lies in the nature of the case that they are useless when the investigation is to be into modes of existence which cannot impress themselves on our nerve ends. For instance: what we know as color is the vibration frequency of etheric waves striking on the retina of the eye; between certain definite limits—759 trillions of blows for the maximum, 436 trillions for the minimum—these waves give rise in us to the sensation which the brain translates into color. (Why the 436 trillion blows at one end of a nerve become "Red" at the other end we do not know; we chronicle the fact, but cannot explain it). But our capacity to respond to the vibration cannot limit the vibrational capacity of the ether; to us the higher and lower rates of vibration do not exist, but if our sense of

Q. May it be taken to have any other meaning?

A. Yes, when Namô is bestowed on us it is our faith. In this case, Namôamidabutsu means that we "rely upon Amidabutsu."

Q. Why is the word Namô of such ambiguity or double meaning?

A. It has a double meaning because Buddha's command contains also our faith. But these two, Buddha's command and our faith, are not entirely different.

Q. Why?

A. Because our faith is originated from Buddha's command. This may be explained better by an analogy, namely, when the moon is shining and the water is calm without waves, there are two moons, one being in the sky above and the other in the water beneath.

Now, Buddha's command is the moon in the sky, and our faith is that in the water. But if there is no moon in the sky nothing can be seen in the water; so our faith is only the reflection of Buddha's command.

Q. Why does Amidabutsu mean "I will save you," while it means literally "immeasurable life" and "boundless light"?

A. Literally it means immeasurable life and boundless light, but it derives the meaning of "I will save you," because Buddha saves all beings by means of his immeasurable life and boundless light, viz., by the former he supports his eternal existence and by the latter he breaks Avidyâ, or the ignorance of all beings, which is the original cause of all suffering.

Q. Why are his life and light immeasurable and boundless?

A. Because he has the object in view to save those beings who are in interminable future time and those who are in boundless worlds. If Buddha's life were limited, he would be unable to save those in the far future time; and if his light were bounded, he would fail to secure (save) those in the widely scattered worlds.

Q. What is Avidyâ or ignorance?

A. Darkness of mind, preventing the discernment of truth.

Q. Why is ignorance the original cause of all suffering?

A. Because by ignorance we raise various passions, and by it we also commit various crimes that are the cause of miserable effects.

Q. Why can Buddha's light destroy our ignorance?

A. Because his light springs from his true wisdom that has taken possession of truth.

Q. But how must we be touched by his light, in order to have our cause of suffering destroyed?

A. That will be explained in the next chapter.

(To be continued.)

vision were more sensitive, we should see where now we are blind. Following this line of thought we realise that matter may exist in forms unknown to us, in modifications to which our senses are unable to respond. Now steps in the Eastern sage and says: "That which you say *may be, is*; we have developed and cultivated senses as much superior to yours as your eye is superior to that of the jelly-fish; we have evolved mental and spiritual faculties which enable us to investigate on the higher planes of being with as much certainty as you are investigating on the physical plane; there is nothing *supernatural* in the business, any more than your knowledge is supernatural, although much above that accessible to the fish; we do not speculate on these higher forms of existence; we *know* them, by personal study, just as you knew the fauna and flora of your world. The powers we possess are not supernatural; they are latent in every human being, and will be evolved as the race progresses. All that we have done is to evolve them more rapidly than our neighbours, by a procedure as open to you as it was to us. Matter is everywhere, but it exists in seven modifications of which you know only four, and until lately knew only three; in those higher forms reside the causes of which you see the effects in the lower, and to know these causes you must develop the capacity to take cognisance of the higher planes."

Unless evolution be a dream, or we have reached the topmost rung of its ladder—a tolerably absurd assumption—there is nothing irrational *per se* in this statement. Whether it be true, whether such men with highly evolved psychical faculties exist, is a matter for evidence: some people are as certain of their existence as they are of the existence of their own fathers and mothers; and those who know nothing about the matter are somewhat hasty if they take on themselves to deny it. It may be further suggested, as a hint towards further mental evolution, that it is beyond the possibility of doubt that psychical faculties not yet normal are showing themselves in many persons: clairvoyance, mesmerism, hypnotism, point to the existence, under abnormal conditions, of an inner vision that transcends the eye-power, and of faculties not yet understood. The grave difficulty in all investigations in this, as yet, little trodden region of psychology, is the tendency to lose control of the judgment in face of the abnormal; the grave danger lies in the possibility of upsetting the mental balance, of so straining the mind that the student may cross the line which separates sanity from insanity.

This introduction seems to me necessary in order to lead any reader who is new to the phase of thought with which we are concerned, to grasp something of the ideas which underlie "The Secret Doctrine." For these ideas come from "The Wise Men of the East," in whose hands, as in the hands of their predecessors, it is stated that the MSS. are on which the present work is based. In an antiquity before which Roman and Greek and Hebrew are but as plants of yesterday, Indian sages thought, observed, and pondered on their observations, generation after generation taking up the task. The garnered knowledge was ever kept secret from the mass of ordinary men, revealed only to those who after long probation became Initiates. With the evolution of the race has come the time when some of this knowledge would be useful to mankind, and during the last few years portions of it have filtered out. In the book before us we have the record of the evolution of the universe, and the genesis of man, which whoso will read let him gird up the loins of his mind for prolonged and strenuous effort.

Briefest outline only can here be given for two reasons: first, that space would not allow of lengthened exposition; second, that any one

who wants to understand the Secret Doctrine must study it for himself. You cannot map a continent on the palm of your hand, nor compress a mountain into a marble. Briefly then:

Ere the visible universe comes into existence there is Absolute Being in the abstract—boundless, infinite, changeless. On this conception we will not dwell: every student knows the endless contradictions into which we flounder when we strive to describe the Absolute in terms of which relation is the essence. The moment we begin to precise, we contradict. At the commencement of a cycle awakens the Unmanifested Logos—abstract and potential ideation, the root of the later Mahat, the universal intelligent soul—and thence the second Logos with its double aspect, Purusha and Prakriti—Spirit-Matter, "Father-Mother"—and Mahat the Son. From this Triangle of Being, Purusha, Prakriti, and Mahat, go forth all life and form, in numerous hierarchies, on the seven planes of existence. Spirit crystallises, as it were, into matter through the first three, becoming more and more consolidated and gross, reaching its turning point in the fourth, becoming intellectually self-conscious as it thus grows denser; from the fourth it climbs upward again, shaking off the grossness of its material envelope but retaining the experience it could not otherwise have won, until, wise with all it has gathered during its struggles and its wanderings, it returns whence it came forth and rests. Such a cycle forms a Manvantara, and this is followed by "the sleep of Brahma"; when he awakes, another cycle commences, but on a higher plane. My readers must turn to the book to fill in this bare outline, and they will find it worth their while.

What part does man play in this vast drama of a universe? Needless to say, he is not the only living form in a Cosmos which, for the most part, is uninhabitable by him. As Science has shown living forms everywhere on the material plane, races in each drop of water, life throbbing in every leaf and blade, so the "Secret Doctrine" points to living forms on higher planes of existence, each suited to its environment, till all space thrills with life, and nowhere is there death, but only change. Amid these myriads are some evolving towards humanity, some evolving away from humanity as we know it, divesting themselves of its grosser parts. For man is regarded as a sevenfold being, four of these parts belonging to the animal body and perishing at, or soon after, death; while three form his higher self, his true individuality, and these persist and are immortal. These form the Ego, and it is this which passes through many incarnations, learning life's lessons as it goes, working out its own redemption within the limits of an inexorable law, sowing seeds of which it ever reaps the harvest, building its own fate with tireless fingers, and finding nowhere, in the measureless time and space around it, any that can lift for it one weight it has created, bear for it one burden it has gathered, unravel for it one tangle it has twisted, close for it one gulf that it has digged.

The physical and mental evolution of man is traced step by step for us in the second volume, the life of each race, with its characteristics, being sketched. How curiously this Eastern teaching now upholds, now contradicts, our Western views, will be marked with interest by the careful reader. One matter, small in itself, but significant in its bearings, may here be put on record—the knowledge, quite lately reached by Western Science, that the pineal gland, of much debated function, is the remains of "the third eye." This has now been "discovered" by the West, but it is a very very old story in the East.

Very attractive, and showing wide acquaintance with the latest discoveries of science, is the third section of Volume I, "Science and the Secret Doctrine Contrasted." It is of curious interest to note how some of the latest theories seem to catch glimpses of the occult doctrines, as though Science were standing on the very threshold of knowledge which shall make all her past seem small. Already her hand is trembling towards the grasp of forces beside which all those now at her command are insignificant. How soon will her grip fasten on them? Let us hope not until social order has been transformed, lest they should only give more to those who have, and leave the wretched still wretcheder by force of contrast. Knowledge used by Selfishness widens the gulf that divides man from man and race from race, and we may well shrink from the idea of new powers in Nature being yoked to the car of Greed. Hence the wisdom of those "Masters" in whose name Mme. Blavatsky speaks, has ever denied the knowledge which is power until Love's lesson has been learned, and has given only into the hands of the selfless the control of those natural forces which, misused, would wreck society.

ANNIE BESANT, F. T. S.

Correspondence.

MADRAS, July 18, 1889.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "THEOSOPHIST."

SIR,—The following lines, floating around the press, are well worthy preservation. Can you give the author?

Yours truly,
WANDERER.

"Thou great eternal Infinite, the great unbounded whole,
Thy body is the Universe, Thy spirit is the soul.
If Thou dost fill immensity, if Thou art all in all,
If Thou wert here before I was, I am not here at all.
How could I live outside of Thee? Dost thou fill earth and air?
There surely is no place for me outside of everywhere.
If Thou art God and Thou dost fill immensity of space,
Then I am God, think as you will, or else I have no place.
And if I have no place at all, or if I am not here,
"Banished," I surely cannot be, for then I'd be somewhere.
Then I must be a part of God, no matter if I am small,
And if I am not part of him, there is no such God at all."

[Perhaps some of our readers can help us in the matter. The little poem is very remarkable, and is sure to have impressed anyone who read it *in situ*.—Ed.]

A VEXED QUESTION.

SIR,—I am sorry to see you wasting your time and energy over the Purda question; the whole thing lies in a nut-shell: we cannot do away with it, we cannot give you the most important of the reasons for ever so doing. The system is not of Hindu origin.

There is an under-current of national life quite unsuspected by a foreigner unless he, like Col. Olcott, learns to become one of us. I may tell you however that none of you have any idea of the amount of liberty given, and respect shown to our women when free to act as we like. The majority of us quietly ignore our so-called social reformers, who fume and bluster before you for fame and self-interest. You may however discuss to your hearts content "on general principles" as you say; but would not a less respected paper suit you? Why not write to the *Englishman* or even the *Pioneer*?

Yours sincerely,
YOUNG HINDU.

[We have much pleasure in publishing the above defence of the Purdah system, which is the only one we have received.—Ed.]

EASTERN AND WESTERN THEOSOPHY.

SIR,—In criticising the doctrines of Oriental Theosophy, as propagated by members of the Theosophical Society, and advocating American Theosophy as more scientific, I have sadly disturbed the equilibrium of your correspondent HERMAN, who probably means well, but very thoroughly fails to understand what he is writing about, and also forgets that some degree of courtesy and dignity should be maintained by any one admitted to the pages of so respectable a magazine as the *Theosophist*.

I have objected to the doctrines of re-incarnation and the fanciful division of the human being into many distinct elements or beings, and have spoken of these and their associate Aryan doctrines as *Hinduism*; in which I thought myself fully justified by the language of Col. Olcott, which I quoted. He says these doctrines are but the "*uncolored recapitulation*" of ancient wisdom, which he traces back to ancient India. Hence my use of the word *Hinduism*, which gives offence.

But if I understand the English language, the word *Hinduism* may very properly be applied to the doctrines, practices, religion, philosophy and literature of India, ancient and modern. Yet HERMAN construes this to mean the vulgar superstitions and ceremonies of the uneducated masses in India. This was certainly not my meaning. The superstitions to which I referred are those presented in the *Theosophist* as profound philosophy and venerable religion.

If this old philosophy and religion to which I referred have not been indifferent to the debasement of women heretofore, I shall be most happy to receive authentic information of it, and if the Mahatmas have been actively engaged in checking these horrors, let me have the evidence and I will publish it widely. But it seems to me the religion and philosophy of India have been as passive in this matter as the Christian churches of America were in reference to African Negro slavery. Yet I have indulged a faint hope that the Theosophical Society though wedded to some ancient errors, might in this matter introduce a new spirit. Will the Society pledge itself to this?

If my language really admitted of HERMAN's construction, I would regret the inadvertence, but I really thought the adjective *Hindu* as respectable a word as Persian, French or Russian, and still think so, but to please my critics I am willing to substitute *Oriental* for *Hindu*.

I do not object to the Theosophical Society as some writers describe it, viz., a brotherhood for the fraternal investigation of the highest truths—for that is my Theosophy: but I object to its espousal of ancient doctrines which science does not sanction, putting them forward as *the*

supreme and only Theosophy in the world, and attacking in a discourteous partizan spirit an American Theosophist, who dares to dispute the ancient Oriental view of Theosophy, as Catholics have assailed Protestant reformers. For all that I have said has been met with a minimum of argument and a considerable amount of scornful personality and misrepresentation.

I regret that members of the Society thus show themselves unworthy of such a leader as Olcott, whose brilliant writings are instructive to both the East and the West, although he has one of the weaknesses of generous and confiding natures—an unlimited faith in possibilities, not guarded by critical caution.

If HERMAN were qualified to discuss this subject, he would try to answer my arguments, which no one has yet answered, as my opponents all avoid the points at issue, to ridicule or censure myself; which, to an impartial spectator, is a virtual confession that my essays are unanswerable, and that my critics have lost their temper.

HERMAN tries to atone for his discourteous language and misrepresentation by giving a generous estimate of Psychometry, and describing its discoverer as a "poor old" man of germs, soured and lost in egotism. HERMAN knows too little to write on such a subject. He cannot even spell my name correctly, and seems to think I have done nothing worthy of notice, but the discovery of Psychometry. He does not know that my life has been given to a much larger labor, to which the development of Psychometry was but incidental—the discovery and practical demonstration of ANTHROPOLOGY and showing its practical applications to Philosophy, Education, Religion, social progress and THERAPEUTICS, any one of which applications would be more than enough for a lifetime labor. At the present time I am engaged in developing its applications in Electro-Therapeutics, and devising new apparatus for electric treatment, which, I think, will be more valuable in therapeutics than the discovery of Faraday.

SARCOGNOMY, which I am teaching to medical students, is a far more profound and original development of science than Psychometry. In combination with Psychometry it is organizing an entirely new medical practice, which will make a greater revolution than that of the worthy Hahnemann.

I am not at all disturbed or soured by the slow progress of Psychometry, owing to the fact that I have given it so little of my time—other matters equally or more important demanding my attention. Of their comparative importance, it must be admitted, I am the proper judge.

To counteract the misrepresentations of the impatient HERMAN, I beg leave to state briefly the leading thoughts of the essays he misconceives—essays which have carried conviction to their readers, and which seem to be irritating to some persons, because they find them unanswerable.

In the first I expressed great admiration of Theosophy, but protested against that word being appropriated as the exclusive proper name for the doctrines of Oriental Theosophists who disregard American research and opinions to follow an antiquated system of doctrines which in India have been associated with gross superstitions that have tolerated or maintained the debasement of woman. I have no apology to offer for this. India, Arabia and Palestine have had systems which are unworthy of this century, and I claim the right to refer to the moral degradation occurring under all ancient religions. If Col. Olcott can extract from any ancient system its best features, let him do so—I feel no necessity of going to the dark past for either philosophy or religion.

I spoke also of the barren and mystical character of ancient and modern Hindu writings, and referred to the practical burlesque of these Oriental doctrines by the fraudulent Brother of Boston whose visionary nonsense was cordially received by some leading Theosophists. I also illustrated the folly of dividing the human constitution into forty-nine imaginary elements.

In the second essay I quoted Col. Olcott's statement of the ancient origin of the doctrines of the Theosophical Society, mentioned briefly their leading characteristics, which I illustrated as incredible, and asserted that their acceptance required a great deal of credulity, and that this credulity was characteristic of the Society,—verifying my statement by extracts from Olcott's lectures (which the voracious HERMAN says I have not read) and his other writings, and finally I defied the production of any valuable psychic knowledge from Orientals, which is not as well or better understood in the West.

In my last I replied to misconceptions of my opponents, and stated that its broad humanitarian principles were not the chief characteristics of the Society in America, for its leading impulse was to act as the zealous propaganda of certain objectionable Oriental doctrines, which were adverse to true Theosophic science, and as my opponents claimed for modern Hindu writings great profundity and elevation of thought, I said "I would merely refer those who have an appetite for chaff to the pages of the 'Theosophist' and to the majority of the matter not written by Col. Olcott, who always writes clearly and vigorously." The innocent HERMAN quotes the first portion, omitting that italicised, thus changing its meaning.

If Oriental Theosophy would make any progress among sound thinkers, it should restrain its feebler and more illogical writers, should show some respect to Western intelligence, should be more modest in asserting its own great pretensions, and should subordinate the propagation of its debatable doctrines considered visionary by other investigators to the nobler aim of organizing a confraternity of liberal minds—not credulous or ignorant partizans, but solid thinkers, free enquirers and true philanthropists, in accordance with the philanthropic doctrines so well expressed by Col. Olcott.

JOSEPH RODES BUCHANAN.

BOSTON, 4th July 1889.

Note.—A friendship which dates back to the year 1852 makes Professor Buchanan and myself understand each other too well to require any fresh proofs of mutual confidence and respect. He is one of the greatest men of our times, and however misunderstood he may be by his contemporaries, posterity will certainly do him character full justice. As to the article in the *Theosophist* to which he takes exception, he will kindly observe that I have just returned from Japan and Ceylon, and that during my absence the magazine has been edited by one who is as yet somewhat inexperienced in the rôle of theosophical Editorship. He has not got me into quite as many rows as Mark Twain did his Editorial Chief, but he may in time! Meanwhile, my dear old Ohio friend has had his innings.

H. S. O.

THE DOCTRINE OF KARMA.

TO THE EDITOR.

I have read with a great deal of interest many of the more or less intelligible things which are now being said in English and American publications of almost all classes about Reincarnation and Karma, and there seems to me to be one difficulty which none of the Western lights that shine on these subjects has taken into consideration. It is a difficulty so simple and obvious, so very much on the threshold, that I really feel extremely diffident in bringing it forward in the *Theosophist*; but still it is probable that the same difficulty, over which such giants in these doctrines as Mr. Sinnett, Prince Chandrahath, or Mr. Bertram Keightley, have stridden without remarking it, has presented itself formidably to a good many other simple people, who like myself are brought up sharp thereby. A man strides over the "threshold" of a doorway without noticing the half-inch of elevation, which to one of Natures smaller creatures looks like a high wall.

The difficulty I allude to is much the same as that which has puzzled all those moral philosophers who have attempted to fix a scale of punishments for wrong doing; and which the Theologians of the world have carefully avoided taking into consideration;—namely, the utter absence of any scale of comparison between misdeeds and penalties, once one forsakes the good old maxim of "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." Will any learned Pandit be good enough to inform me how much toothache should go to a lie? How many of my children I ought to lose to wipe out a murder? What limb ought to be accidentally or otherwise maimed in order to square an adultery? These questions answer themselves. *There is no known or possible scale of equivalents.* If you say that there *must* be an equivalent in each individual case—that "Tom Smith" enjoys his adultery so much that the loss of a finger would not be an adequate punishment, but the loss of a hand would,—why, what you do is to establish, not a scale of *punishments*, but a scale of *prices*. "Tom Smith," you say, may be fairly called upon to pay three fingers for "Mrs. Jones's" favours; but if you make him pay four, when he is only willing to pay three, you *cheat* him,—in other words "the punishment is excessive," or contrary to "Eternal Justice."

Now, in the case of Karma, where are you going to get your scale of equivalents? It is just as hard to find such a scale when you call these equivalents "effects" as when you call them punishments. Just fancy, turning a ploughman into a wood-yard without any weights or scales, or tables of measurement, or of specific gravity, and expecting him to tell you by the help of a foot rule the weight in tons, cwts., pounds, and ounces of a yard full of logs of different kinds of timber. Still this would be a trifling task to that of determining the equivalent value of human actions and moral results in the terms of pleasure or pain.

Theosophists say, "there is no great and no small." The ancients acted on that principle when they apportioned tremendous rewards and penalties for actions that our modern moralists would regard as trifles. The Buddhist books, for example, are full of instances in which a wretched man spent thousands of years in a hell for (say) killing some small beast or insect; or enjoyed thousand of years in paradise for giving a drink to a thirsty medicant. Who can say that these views of the fitness of things are wrong? Certainly the taking of pleasure in killing an inoffensive butterfly or ant denotes precisely the same condition of the inner man as would the taking of pleasure in killing a dog or an elephant, or even a human being. It shows a soul devoid of the

feeling of humanity and of the sense of justice, and what more do you want, if *noumena* and not *phenomena* are the important things?

It strikes me forcibly that "Karma" with its "natural effects" is only another name for "God Almighty" with his arbitrary "rewards and punishments." In both cases it is *we* who in our ignorance adjust the scale to our own satisfaction, and attribute our fancies to the "will" and "justice" of a higher, or, at all events, stronger power. What is the difference between saying "God will punish him," and "he will meet his Karma;" except perhaps that one repeats the former declaration with an expression of sanctimonious regret, and the latter with a self-satisfied grin?

I ask these questions only in order to elicit information. I wish to know how the leading lights of theosophy have arranged about the scale of equivalents, call them causes and effects, or misdeeds and punishments, as you will,—it comes to the same thing as far as the scale is concerned. I ask for nothing unreasonable, for surely those gentlemen who talk learnedly on the subject, must have settled this matter long ago, at the very beginning of their studies, and before they dreamed of setting themselves up to teach others all about their Karma, and how they will come back to earth to "work it out."

ALEXANDER.

SIMLA, 13th August, 1889.

[It strikes us forcibly, to use ALEXANDER'S expression, that he will never arrive at very valuable results in regard to the doctrine of Karma (or Reincarnation either) if he argues about it, after getting only the merest smattering of knowledge on the subject, instead of continuing to study in respectful and becoming silence what Eastern writers have said on the subject. Of course for those whose chief object is to hear themselves talk a mere smattering of the doctrine of Karma is quite sufficient; for it will enable them either to preach about it, or to ridicule it. It would be easy to ridicule the binomial theorem in the same way. In "Light on the Path" it is distinctly stated that so long as men are subject to Karma, they cannot understand its workings and its laws. The reason of this is plain enough. We can with our present consciousness only trace causes and consequences on one plane—that of matter,—and Karma involves and evolves causes and consequences on many planes. If instead of searching for the doctrine of Karma in the writings of Western poets and preachers,—which are the true "lipings of baby man,"—or trying to evolve it out of the depth of his moral consciousness, as a spider evolves his web from his own inside, Alexander would deferentially study what is said about it by even such Eastern writers as are translated into English he would do better. After a few years of mental chewing of the cud of these passages and opinions, he might be able to put together a theory of Karma that would seem to him a little less ridiculous, and perceptibly different from the theological idea of arbitrary rewards and punishments. There is not the least doubt that he states an exceedingly strong objection to the Karma doctrine *as developed in the playful fancy of Western "thinkers,"* when he says that to *enable us to adjust it* would require a scale of values between causes in the material and effects on the moral plane. Happily, however, *we* have not got to adjust it. Karma is never adjusted, but is always being adjusted; just as water is constantly finding its own level and never finds it; for no sooner does it fall in rain than it rises again in vapour. It is water in the shape of vapour just as much as in the shape of rain; and so Karma, like water, is indestructible, although in the shape of *human Karma* it may be "worked out" or

"exhausted," as Western writers put it. How is this accomplished? If the law of Karma be the law of cause and effect, how can we expect to arrive at a cause at the end of the karmic rope which will not produce an effect? The fact is that the effect disappears from one plane and appears in another, beyond our vision; just as we cannot see the vapour that rises as the rain dries away from the ground. Karma has for vehicle the astral body or Lingadeha, and it is only when that is dissolved that a man's Karma ceases to effect him. It is only "the absolved ascetic" who gets rid of his Lingadeha; but the eternal law of cause and effect, and also the law of the "conservation of energy,"—both of which are recognized to the fullest extent by the Occultist,—demand that having no longer the Lingadeha for its vehicle, it should re-appear in the form of some other force or potency or influence, in a plane where we cannot follow it, any more than we can follow an absolved ascetic into the arupa world. Let ALEXANDER listen to a passage on the subject in the "Shri Vakya Sudha," translated by Professor Manilal Nabhubhai Divedi, and perhaps his somewhat flippant ideas may be modified; it relates to the manner of getting free from the bonds of Karma; but we must remember that the highest adepts have their proper Karma, so have the worlds, and even the whole "creations" that succeed, and inherit from each other through all eternity; therefore to get free from Karma can mean at most for us, to get rid of the Karma of human beings:—

"The identification of the phenomenal as well as the noumenal with the one eternal unchangeable Brahma being realized, the knot (of the unreal identification of Ahankāra with Atman) of the heart is at once split open; all doubts vanish in a minute; and all Karma (Sanchita, Prarabdha, and Kriyamana) is destroyed in the very bud.* [Karma does not affect the absolved ascetic. Prarabdha or that part of Sanchita, of which this life is an evolute, runs its course and ends with this life; Kriyamana, or that which is being done at present in obedience to Prarabdha, has no stability inasmuch as its storehouse is destroyed by the destruction of the Lingadeha; and Sanchita (or that portion of past Karma which has not yet borne fruit, plus the results of present Karma which are to bear their fruit) also has no room for its operation; for the Lingadeha, through which all its future manifestations on the platform of our physical frame become possible, has no existence.]"

There is nothing in this passage sufficiently explicit or authoritative to warrant anyone building a philosophy of Karma upon it, but it is a brick with which to build, when a heap of other similar bricks have been collected, examined, and sorted out.—*Ed.*]

* This Shruti is taken from the Manduka Upanishad.

GENERAL REPORT
OF THE
THIRTEENTH CONVENTION AND ANNIVERSARY
OF THE
THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

AT THE HEAD-QUARTERS, ADYAR, MADRAS, DECEMBER THE 27TH, 28TH,
AND 29TH,—1888.

With Official Documents.

THE thirteenth anniversary of the Theosophical Society was the most important in several years, though not so well attended as usual, owing principally to the fact of the majority of our leading Fellows being occupied with the business of the National (Political) Congress at Allahabad. Two most serious changes were made in the Society's policy, viz., the re-organization of the administrative machinery upon the basis of sectional autonomy; and the abandonment of the system of obligatory cash payment of fees upon entrance into membership, and annually in the form of a tax of 1 Rupee *per capita*. The first was simply the adjustment of the plan of management to correspond with the expansion of the movement. The Society, having now 173 Branches scattered throughout the four quarters of the World, has outgrown the old system of centralization of executive responsibility. The Annual Convention of the General Council has ceased to be, save in name, the true parliament or congress of the Branches; their distances apart, and the heavy cost of the journeys to and from Adyar, making a thorough convocation of their Delegates or the expression of their will respecting Society affairs impracticable. To say nothing of those in Europe, America and Australasia, there was never a full representation of even those in Asia—those nearest, geographically, to Adyar. Experience at last prompted the adoption of a better working system, one embodying the true spirit of equality and parliamentary justice more than the one in vogue. As an autonomous section had been in existence and successfully working for two years, and a British section had just been formed in London, the fair thing was evidently to extend the sectional scheme to all countries, keeping the Head-quarters as the hub, and the President-Founder as the axle, of this wheel of many spokes under