

# THE THEOSOPHIST

A MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO ORIENTAL PHILOSOPHY, ART, LITERATURE AND OCCULTISM: EMBRACING MESMERISM, SPIRITUALISM, AND OTHER SECRET SCIENCES.

VOL. 3. No. 3.

BOMBAY, DECEMBER 1881.

No. 27.

सत्यान् नास्ति परो धम्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

The Editors disclaim responsibility for opinions expressed by contributors in their articles, with some of which they agree, with others not. Great latitude is allowed to correspondents, and they are accountable for what they write. The journal is offered as a vehicle for the wide dissemination of facts and opinions connected with the Asiatic religions, philosophies and sciences. All who have anything worth telling are made welcome, and not interfered with. Rejected MSS. are not returned.

## NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Correspondents of the THEOSOPHIST are particularly requested to send their communications to the Editors.

## ERRATA.

In our last Number the following mistakes require correction :-

- Page 38, Col. 2, line 54. For "our age" read "an age."  
 " 52, " 2, " 51. For "foundation" read "fecundation."  
 " 4 (Supplement) Col. 1, line 46. For "Papal Zouave" read "Papal Zouave."  
 " " " " " line 52. For "Spiritualist Zouave" read "Spiritualist Zouave."  
 " " " " " line 54. For "Hiram" read "Hiram" and for "by illustrious." read "by an illustrious."  
 " 5 " " " line 64. For "parrorize" read "per-rorize."  
 " " " " 2 line 59. For "and 3" read "at 3"  
 " 6 " " " 1 line 4. For "Hierophant, as" read "Hierophant, who, as"  
 " " " " 1 line 5. For "learning, that" read "learning, to let him know that."  
 " " " " 1 line 27. For "revilations" read "revelations."  
 " " " " 2 line 25. For "magicien" read "magicien."  
 " " " " 2 line 27. For "chamelion" read "chameleon."

a Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church (as so many other clergymen have been of late before him) for the same heresy of denying endless torments in hell-fire, the English divines are seriously discussing the advisability of giving the doctrine up. They are ready, they say, to "thankfully acknowledge the truths of Spiritualist teaching, as weapons which we (they) are too glad to wield against Positivism, and Secularism, and all the anti-Christian 'isms' of this age of godless thought." (Rev. R. Thornton's speech). *Mirabile dictu!*—the reverend gentleman went so far as to say: "Let us lay to heart the hints given (by Spiritualists) as to our own shortcomings." !!

The extracts from the reports at the Congress which we here republish from *Light* will give the reader a better idea of the position of the Protestant clergy in England. It is evidently very precarious. The divines seem to find themselves most uncomfortably situated between the horns of a dilemma. How they will emerge from it is one problem; whether many Spiritualists are likely to succumb to the unexpected coquetry of the Church they have parted company with is another one—and of a still more difficult

solution. If, *en desespoir de cause* the reverend finally accept the theory of *spirits*—and we do not see how the reconciliation could be otherwise effected—then, acting upon the rule: "every spirit that confesseth not Jesus Christ came in the flesh is not of God"—they will have with the exception of a handful of "spirits" acting through a handful of so-called "Christian Spiritualists," or rather their mediums who accept Jesus Christ—to pronounce the enormous majority of the "angels" who do not, as—"of the Devil?" Then, they will have to encounter a still greater difficulty. Even the Christian Spiritualists have their own peculiar views upon Christ, which, according to the canons of the established Church are "heretical," but which, we doubt the Spiritualists will ever give up. Then again, how about—"Though an angel from Heaven preach unto any other Gospel than that which has been preached to us, let him be accused?" Well, time will show, and he is the only and best inspirer of wise schemes and ideas. Meanwhile, the Spiritualists,—and so far the Theosophists along with them—have won the day, for the reality of the phenomena has been admitted at the Church Congress; and we have as good hopes, that, whatever happens, it is neither the Spiritualists nor the Theosophists who will be the conquered in the long run. For, indeed as we may be in our conflicting beliefs as to the reality of the phenomena, we are at one as regards the reality of the manifestations, mediumship in all its various aspects,\* and the highest phases of Spiritualism such as social inspiration, clairvoyance &c., and even the *subtle* intercourse between the living and the disembodied souls and spirits under conditions fully defined in Part I. "Fragments of Occult Truth" (See *October Theosophist*.) In all events, there is a far lesser abyss between the Spiritualists and the Theosophists than there is between the testants and the Roman Catholic clergy, their common Christianity notwithstanding. Their house is one and divided against itself, it must finally fall: while our houses are two. And if we are wise and, instead of quarrelling, support each other, both will be found built on a rock, the foundation being the same though the architecture be different.

## THE "BANNER OF LIGHT."

We see that our old friend the Boston *Banner of Light*, the leading Spiritualist paper of America, begins its nineteenth Volume by enlarging its size with four additional pages. We heartily desire that veteran organ the success it so well deserves. For over a quarter of a century it has remained a staunch defender of its colours. It possesses qualities that many of us might well envy. Its spirit is uniformly exhibits, is that of tolerance, charity, and true brotherly feeling to all men. It always had on its staff, the most excellent and learned writers. It strenuously avoids acrimonious polemics and wrangling, and seems to have tacitly adopted the noble motto: "Better give the accused the benefit of the doubt and even forgive ten culprits, than unjustly accuse one innocent." We may and do differ with it in our views and opinions; nevertheless

\* We never denied mediumship, we have only pointed out its great dangers and questioned the advisability of giving way to it and to the control of yet (to Spiritualists) unknown forces.

# THE THEOSOPHIST

A MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO ORIENTAL PHILOSOPHY, ART, LITERATURE AND OCCULTISM: EMBRACING MESMERISM, SPIRITUALISM, AND OTHER SECRET SCIENCES.

VOL. 3. No. 3.

BOMBAY, DECEMBER 1881.

No. 27.

सत्यान् नास्ति परो धम्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

The Editors disclaim responsibility for opinions expressed by contributors in their articles, with some of which they agree, with others not. Great latitude is allowed to correspondents, and they alone are accountable for what they write. The journal is offered as a vehicle for the wide dissemination of facts and opinions connected with the Asiatic religions, philosophies and sciences. All who have anything worth telling are made welcome, and not interfered with. Rejected MSS. are not returned.

## NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Correspondents of the THEOSOPHIST are particularly requested to send their manuscripts very legibly written, and with some space left between the lines, in order to facilitate the work of the printer, and to prevent typographical mistakes which are as vexatious to us as they must be to the correspondents themselves. All communications should be written on one side of the paper on y.

*Magna est veritas et prevalebit.* The reality of the phenomena has prevailed, and the Church is now forced to seek alliance with the Spiritualists against "materialism and infidelity." How will the faithful Christian "sceptics" receive the news, and what effect it will produce on the church-going "scoffers of spiritual phenomena" is a question which time alone can answer.

For the first time, since the "raps" and "knockings" of an alleged disembodied pedlar, at Rochester, in 1848, inaugurated the era of Spiritualism, which has gradually led the people to accept the hypothesis of disembodied spirits communicating with the world of life, the divines have become alive to the danger of dogmatizing too strongly. For the first time, as the reader may see in the long account of the Congress we reprint further on (page 56), the divines seem ready for any concession—even to giving up their hitherto immovable and cherished dogma of eternal torments and damnation. And now they seek to compromise. While Dr. Thomas, the liberal-minded Wesleyan minister in America, is brought on his trial before a Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church (as so many other clergymen have been of late before him,) for the same heresy of denying endless torments in hell-fire, the English divines are seriously discussing the advisability of giving the doctrine up. They are ready, they say, to "thankfully acknowledge the truths of Spiritualist teaching, as weapons which we (they) are too glad to wield against Positivism, and Secularism, and all the anti-Christian 'isms' of this age of godless thought." (*Rev. R. Thornton's speech*). *Mirabile dictu!*—the reverend gentleman went so far as to say: "Let us lay to heart the hints given (by Spiritualists) as to our own shortcomings." !!

The extracts from the reports at the Congress which we here republish from *Light* will give the reader a better idea of the position of the Protestant clergy in England. It is evidently very precarious. The divines seem to find themselves most uncomfortably situated between the horns of a dilemma. How they will emerge from it is one problem; whether many Spiritualists are likely to succumb to the unexpected coquetry of the Church they have parted company with is another one—and of a still more difficult

solution. If, *en desespoir de cause* the reverends finally accept the theory of *spirits*—and we do not see how the reconciliation could be otherwise effected—then, acting upon the rule: "every spirit that confesseth not Jesus Christ came in the flesh is not of God"—they will have with the exception of a handful of "spirits" acting through a handful of so-called "Christian Spiritualists," or rather their mediums who accept Jesus Christ—to pronounce the enormous majority of the "angels" who do not, as—"of the Devil?" Then, they will have to encounter a still greater difficulty. Even the Christian Spiritualists have their own peculiar views upon Christ, which, according to the canons of the established Church are "heretical," but which, we doubt the Spiritualists will ever give up. Then again, how about—"Though an angel from Heaven preach unto us any other Gospel than that which has been preached unto us, let him be accursed?" Well, time will show, and time is the only and best inspirer of wise schemes and devices. Meanwhile, the Spiritualists,—and so far the Theosophists along with them—have won the day, for the reality of the phenomena has been admitted at the Church Congress; and we have as good hopes, that, whatever happens, it is neither the Spiritualists nor the Theosophists who will be the conquered in the long run. For, divided as we may be in our conflicting beliefs as to the genuineness of the phenomena, we are at one as regards the reality of the manifestations, mediumship in all its various aspects,\* and the highest phases of Spiritualism such as personal inspiration, clairvoyance &c., and even the *subjective* intercourse between the living and the disembodied souls and spirits under conditions fully defined in Part I. of "Fragments of Occult Truth" (*See October Theosophist*.) At all events, there is a far lesser abyss between the Spiritualists and the Theosophists than there is between the Protestants and the Roman Catholic clergy, their common Christianity notwithstanding. Their house is one and, divided against itself, it must finally fall: while our houses are two. And if we are wise and, instead of quarrelling, support each other, both will be found built on a rock, the foundation being the same though the architecture be different.

## THE "BANNER OF LIGHT."

We see that our old friend the Boston *Banner of Light*, the leading Spiritualist paper of America, begins its twentieth Volume by enlarging its size with four additional pages. We heartily desire that veteran organ the success it so well deserves. For over a quarter of a century it has remained a staunch defender of its colours. It possesses qualities that many of us might well envy. The spirit it uniformly exhibits, is that of tolerance, charity, and true brotherly feeling to all men. It always had on its staff, the most excellent and learned writers. It strenuously avoids acrimonious polemics and wrangling, and seems to have tacitly adopted the noble motto: "Better give the accused the benefit of the doubt and even forgive ten culprits, than unjustly accuse one innocent." We may and do differ with it in our views and opinions; neverthe-

\* We never denied mediumship, we have only pointed out its great dangers and questioned the advisability of giving way to it and to the control of yet (to Spiritualists) unknown forces—  
Ep.

less we most sincerely respect and admire it. All honour to our esteemed old friend, Mr. L. Colby, and that may his *Banner* prosper and wave for long years to come—is the hearty wish of the THEOSOPHIST and its editor.

### THE CHURCH CONGRESS AND SPIRITUALISM.

MEETING OF PERPLEXED DIVINES.—A NEW TOWER OF BABEL AT NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE AND CONFUSION OF OPINIONS.—DISCUSSING "THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH IN RESPECT TO THE PREVALENCE OF SPIRITUALISM".—DOGMATIC CHRISTIANITY FORCED TO COUNT WITH THE "DEGRADING SUPERSTITION".—IT CAPITULATES AND SEEKS ALLIANCE WITH THE LATTER.—COMES TO TERMS FOR FEAR OF A GRADUAL AND PERPETUAL SEPARATION OF THE PEOPLE FROM ALL CHURCHES AND CONGREGATIONS.—PROTESTANT MINISTERS READY TO GIVE UP THE DOGMA OF ETERNAL DAMNATION.—CANON WILBERFORCE STRONGLY ADVISING THE LATTER COURSE.—PHENOMENA RECOGNISED AND FACTS ACCEPTED, BUT THE THEORY OF "SPIRITS" DISCARDED.—DIVINES LEANING TOWARD THE THEOSOPHICAL RATHER THAN THE SPIRITUALISTIC EXPLANATIONS, AS TO THE AGENCY AT WORK IN THE MANIFESTATIONS.

October the 4th, 1881, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, the Church Congress assembled to discuss on "The Duty of the Church in respect to the Prevalence of Spiritualism." The Lord Bishop of Durham occupied the chair, and the attendance was very large. The debates were opened with a paper read by the Rev. R. Thornton, D. D., Vicar of St. John, Notting-hill.

THE REV. DR. THORNTON.

At the name of Spiritualism some will at once cry out "Frivolous!" others "Imposture!" and others "sorcery and devilry!" Let me protest in the outset against all hasty, sweeping condemnations. No doubt in approaching the subject we find,....that "the way has been defiled by fraud and blocked up by folly." Gross absurdity and gross deceit have been exposed in the doings of pretended Spiritualists. But we must not rush to the conclusion that all Spiritualism is pure deception, any more than we must involve all statesmen and all ecclesiastics in universal censure, because there have been political and religious charlatans. And as to the charge of diabolical agency, I do most earnestly deprecate the antiquated plan of attributing all new phenomena which we cannot explain to the author of all evil.....Galileo, and the ridicule with which we now speak of his persecutors, may teach us not to so mix up science and religion as to come to an *a priori* theological decision upon matters of simple fact. ....We are bound to accept facts, though we may decline the inferences which others draw from them; to watch, to investigate, and so to come gradually to our own conclusions....The doctrine of those who are said to profess Spiritualism is, if I do not misrepresent it, something of this kind:—"God is a Spirit and the visible universe is an expression to man of His infinite life. Man is a Spiritual being: each individual Spirit is a part of a great Over-soul, or Anima Mundi. The Spirit is enthralled in a body during this life; when released, it at once enters upon the possession of higher powers and more extended knowledge; and its condition is one of regularly progressive advancement. Disembodied Spirits are able to hold converse with those in the body not with all immediately, but through the instrumentality of privileged or specially gifted persons called mediums, who are on occasion influenced, or as they term it, controlled, by the Spirits..... A new era is now dawning on us. The old religions, Christianity included, have played their part and must pass away in face of clearer light. By intercourse with the Spirit-world, man will advance as he never has advanced before, in knowledge, purity, and brotherly love."

I may fairly, I think, speak of this teaching as opposed to the system of the Church. It sympathises deeply with what we hold to be error; it ranges itself on the side of Arius, and Photinus, and Macedonius, and Nestorius.

"Every heretic," says a Spiritualist writer, "of the church of all religions has been a pioneer in Spiritual discernment." "Priest-craft, hypocrisy and cant," their lecturers tell us, are characteristics of all existing Christian communities. "The Church," says another writer, "is such a partial thing, so antagonistic in spirit to the higher worlds, so literal, so dogmatic, that he who feeds there is kept down from the lofty tone necessary for Spirit communion." Nor is the Church the only object of censure. Mr. Spurgeon's intellect is "dwarfed and cramped," "he dogmatizes and plays the Pope in his own way." Like all free-thinkers, the Spiritualist is intensely dogmatic in his anti-dogmatism. ....

There is much of the Spiritualist's teaching with which the Church can most cordially agree.

(1) It is a system of *belief*, not of mere negation of all that is not logically demonstrated.\* Its adherents are not ashamed to avow that they hold as true, propositions which are incapable of mathematical proof...†

(2) It is in its very nature antagonistic to all sadducism and materialism...It proclaims that man is responsible for his actions...it tells of angels, of an immortal spirit, of a future state of personal and conscious existence.

(3) It inculcates the duties of purity, charity, and justice.

(4) It declares that there can be, and is, communion between spirit and spirit, and so by implication, acknowledges...Revelation, Inspiration and Grace."

Having touched upon the points on which Spiritualism warned "the Church that her trumpet sometimes gives but an uncertain sound," the Rev. Speaker proceeded to the great points of difference, to what it is the Church cannot approve in Spiritualist's teachings. They claim to hold intercourse with the Spirits of the departed. Now I am far from denying the possibility of such intercourse; on the contrary, I believe that in God's Providence it sometimes does take place. But I fail to see that the phenomena which they allege as proofs of spiritual agency and converse are by any means convincing. Strange knockings, we are told, are heard, which, on demand, are made to represent the letters of the alphabet—frame mysterious words; musical instruments sail about the room, and utter unearthly melodies; sentences are written by unseen hands; shadowy forms are descried in the darkness; light touches are felt; indeed, one Spirit has permitted herself to be kissed. The Spirits give their names; one of the most active calls himself John King; and we read and hear of "Ernest," "Pocha," "Irresistible," and others. One is reminded of the "Hopdance" and "Smolkin," which Shakespeare borrowed from Archbishop Harsnet's "Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures," and of Matthew Hopkins, Vulgar Pye-wacket and Peck-in-the-crown. Now, supposing for a moment that these are real spiritual beings, one would see a great danger in the practice of conferring with them. How can we know their character? It is curious that they are considered to shrink from daylight in general. "Your light hurts us," they are represented as saying, though we read "God saw the light that it was good."

One Spiritualist (Mr. Brittain) declares that, in 35 years, he has never met with a Spirit who has told him a wilful falsehood, but it is confessed that there is a danger of becoming associated with low Spirits. Indeed, we are told that on some occasions stones have been thrown by Spirits, so there would appear to be roughs, or Fenians among the Shades. But we need not, I think, be under any apprehension. There is no sufficient evidence that Spirits are at work at all. The so-called Spirit revelations seem to be limited by the intelligence and imagination of the medium. Just so with the beautiful dreams of the great Spiritualist, Swedenborg (and I mention his name with profound respect, though I esteem him a visionary): it is almost amusing to remark that, when

\* We are not sure Spiritualists will agree with this definition. They claim to take nothing on *faith*.—ED. THEOS.

† If so, the Theosophists disagree with the Spiritualists.—ED.

he wandered under angelic guidance through the stellar universe, he was not taken to view Uranus, Neptune, or Vulcan. The failure to visit the latter may be accounted for by what I consider extremely probable, namely, that there is no such planet; but I fear that the others were left out, simply because he did not know of them. The Spirits gave *him* no new information on physical astronomy; and no Spiritual séances have as yet, as far as I can ascertain, made any addition to our stock of useful knowledge. Whence, then, all the strange phenomena? for, deduct what you will for delusion and deluded imagination, it is proved by the evidence of men of unimpeachable veracity and sound sense, non-Spiritualists as well as Spiritualists, that strange things *are* witnessed at the séances, I suggest that all are manifestations of a simple human force, which we may call as we choose, psychic, biological, odylic, ectenic, whose conditions are as yet unknown (as those of chemistry were a century ago), but may, before many years, be as well known as those of heat, electricity, magnetism, and light, with which it is no doubt correlated; and may be perhaps represented as Biot proposed to represent the conditions of life, by an equation. This force was distinctly displayed in a series of experiments conducted a few years ago with the aid of a celebrated medium..... But farther, we cannot accept that degrading view of the body which seems to be an element in the highest Spiritualist teaching. It is represented,.....as a foul obstructive. Vegetarianism, and of course tectotalism, are essential to every one who would reach the higher knowledge; his very residence must be a place where no blood is or has been shed. We find ourselves at once in the presence of the Gnostics, Bardesanes and Tatian; and remember with horror how short and easy was the step from their stern asceticism to Carpocrates and the Ophites.

But still worse, we find in Spiritualists' teaching a terrible degradation not of our human body only, but of the great Master of bodies, souls, and Spirits. And here it is that I call it specially antagonistic to the Church. Jesus in their system is but an adept, an early Jacob Böhme, who gained his adeptship by an ascetic diet, for "there is no evidence that he partook of any animal food except the flesh of the Paschal Lamb." Or he is a Psychic, a remarkable medium, gifted with an exceptional amount of Spirit-force, and a peculiar power of communicating with and controlling Spirits. Or he is an Essene, a leader of a Buddhist sect, of high rank indeed, but inferior to the great Gautama who preceded him. His life is nothing more to us than a grand example of purity and charity, his death only a noble piece of self-sacrifice. With such views, it is hardly necessary to say that the personality of evil is almost contemptuously denied—the Scriptures displaced from the post of honour due to the written Word of God. What, then, is the duty of the Church in respect of the prevalence of this Spiritualism, so beautiful in part, in part so terrible, as if it were an angel face with a serpent train in its rear?

Let us guard carefully against rash argumentative assertions, and obstinate ignoring of facts, lest haply we deny, through imperfect knowledge, something that is, after all, a law in God's creation. Let us simply shew that phenomena, which we cannot now fully explain, need not necessarily be referred to the agency of Spirits, good, bad, or indifferent, but may well be manifestations of some hitherto unsuspected human force.....

After Rev. Mr. Thornton spoke, rose

MR. W. R. BROWNE.

Mr. Browne said, that, passing to the special subject of Spiritualism, his minutes would allow him to give only a series of facts, and to draw from them conclusions, and from these conclusions to point out what, as it appeared to him, was the duty of the Church with respect to Spiritualism. The facts were these:—Some years ago several men of the very highest culture agreed together to investigate the phenomena called Spiritualism. The

name of one of them—he was at liberty to mention—a name that stood as high as any amongst the scientific men of England, or indeed, of Europe—Lord Rayleigh. For a period of some two or three years these scientists spent a considerable part of their time in attending séances, in holding séances at their own houses, and in doing everything in their power to get at the bottom of, and to make up their minds on the cause of such phenomena. The remarkable feature was, that at the end, of the time they were unable to come to any final conclusion on the subject, or to make up their minds as to whether the claims of the Spiritualists were true or false. From that fact he was compelled to draw the conclusion that they must not pool-pool Spiritualism. They must not say that it was an imposture, all nonsense, and that no sensible man could spend his time in attending to it. If these men with all their experience and all their skill, could not settle the matter, there must be something in it. That was the first conclusion. The next conclusion was that the belief in the reality of these phenomena was not a mere hallucination, a delusion, which was a theory that certain medical men had very strongly put forward. He knew no one less subject to hallucinations than the distinguished man of science whose name he had mentioned, or some of his friends. It was absurd to suppose that over the period of two or three years they should be subject to hallucinations at the moments during which they were investigating this subject, and at no other time. Thirdly, they must adopt the view that the course of these phenomena was a very difficult scientific problem, and that it must be solved by scientific methods; that, firstly, there must be a supernatural cause, as the advocates of Spiritualism said; \* or, secondly, that there were certain natural laws of mind and matter which were not as yet understood, such as the power of reading thoughts; or, thirdly, that Spiritualism was a mere extension of the ancient and well-known science of conjuring. Looking at the subject from the point of view of those conclusions, what should be the duty of the Church? It appeared to him, in the first place, that the investigation of the phenomena was beyond their province. In the second place, while that subject was *sub judice*, they must be careful to treat it as an open one. Thirdly, they must be careful not to imply that these phenomena were incredible, because they were supernatural. The Church was founded on the belief of supernatural events having occurred at least 2,000 years ago. Therefore, it would not do for them to say in the next breath that these things were impossible, because they were supernatural. As a previous speaker had said, he did not believe in attributing the phenomena to a Satanic agency. ....It might be that there was an enormous amount of imposture, and a vast quantity of trickery in these manifestations.....and experience shewed that the discovery of the trick required an amount of patience, skill, and knowledge which very few persons were likely to possess. Those were the points which he wished to put before the meeting as to the attitude which the Church should have towards Spiritualism; and he would only further say that whatever Spiritualism was, at least it was not materialism, and that it was materialism which at the present day was the great danger that the Church had to face. (Hear, hear.) Thus it was that materialists like Bradlaugh were inimical to Spiritualism, because to prove that Spiritualism was true would be to put a final extinguisher upon all their doctrines. Therefore, he thought the Church might fairly hold herself in suspense in the matter, ready to welcome what truth there might be in the phenomena, assured they could not do harm; but at the same time recognising the great amount of imposture that accompanied them, and the very considerable likelihood that that which was not in itself corrupt might turn out something conducive to that character.

\* We never heard of a Spiritualist attributing phenomena to a supernatural cause, or even believing in the possibility of anything "supernatural" or miraculous.—ED. T. 1884.

## REV. CANON WILBERFORCE.

The Rev. Canon Wilberforce said: In the brief time necessarily allotted to readers at a Church Congress, it is impossible to enter adequately upon the history of the origin and development of those peculiar phenomena which would be more correctly described as "Psychism," but which are generally known as "Spiritualism." It may be briefly stated that the signs and wonders of Modern Spiritualism, which are now undoubtedly exercising a potent influence upon the religious beliefs of thousands, originated in the village of Hydesville, State of New York, in the year 1848; and amongst the men of science and learning who investigated the subject in America, in order to refute its pretensions, may be mentioned the names of Dr. Hare, Professor of Chemistry in the University of Pennsylvania, and the Hon. J. W. Edmonds, Judge of the Supreme Court of Appeal in the State of New York. In the year 1854, the phenomena which in America had been witnessed by thousands of people, many of whom were of the highest credibility and whose testimony no one would think of impeaching in a court of law, began to attract attention in England.....From that time the movement began, and continued to spread in England and on the Continent.....In July, 1869, the first noteworthy attempt at public investigation was made by the London Dialectical Society.....(Follow the details of the proceeding of the latter)...It appointed six sub-committees to investigate by personal experiment...Some of these attributed the phenomena to the agency of disembodied human beings, some to Satanic influence, and some to psychological causes, and others to imposture and delusion.....Appealing as it does to the yearnings of the soul, especially in times of bereavement, for sensible evidence of the continuity of life after death, belief in modern Spiritualism continues rapidly to increase in all ranks of society.....for its real strength does not lie in the claims or powers of professional mediums, or in the advocacy by means of the press or the lecture-room, but in the thousands of private homes, in which one or more of the family has mediumistic powers. But it may be asked, is there no evil in Spiritualism? Assured there is, especially as caricatured and misrepresented in the lives, sentiments, and language of many professed Spiritualists. The effects have been summed up by Professor Barrett, of the Royal College of Science, Dublin, who is convinced by painstaking investigations of the supernatural character of the phenomena in the following words:—(1) a morbid, unhealthy curiosity is excited; (2) the mind is distracted from the pursuits and present duties of daily life; (3) intellectual confusion is created by uncertain and contradictory teaching; (4) moral and spiritual confusion is created by anarchic manifestations; (5) the will is subjected to the slavery of an unknown power, and the spiritual nature of man may be preyed upon by unseen parasites; (6) it offers a demonstration which is the negation of facts, much so-called Spiritualism being merely a kind of inebriated materialism. "All these points," continues the Professor, "I can verify by actual cases; and, as a rule, I have observed the steady downward course of mediums who sit regularly; moral obliquity is the first symptom, then they become wrecks. This applies to mediums for physical manifestations chiefly. Indeed, is it not impossible to have a purely phenomenal presentation of any high spiritual laws?" In view of the spread of Spiritualism in its modern aspects, and of the consequences resulting from it, it becomes a most important question what ought to be the attitude of the clergy of the Church of England towards believers in the alleged manifestations. That they are affecting and will still more affect the Church is certain, and has made itself manifest here in Newcastle. Dr. T. L. Nichols, writing of its results in America, remarks that—"There can be no question about the marked effect of Spiritualism upon American thought, feeling, and character. Nothing within my memory has had so great an influence. It has broken up hundreds of

churches; it has changed the religious opinions of hundreds of thousands; it has influenced, more or less, the most important actions and relations of vast multitudes. Immense numbers of those who, a few years ago, professed a belief in some form of Christianity, or were members of religious organisations, have, under the influence of Spiritualism, modified such profession. Great numbers, perhaps, who doubted or denied the existence of a future state, have found, as they think, incontrovertible proofs of its reality." Just, then, recognising that the general teachings of Spiritualism are inimical to almost every organised body of professing Christians, I would, with much deference, suggest that we must shake ourselves free from the conventional unwisdom of the ecclesiastical poolpool! which is our modern substitute for the "anathematism" of less tolerant days. We must abstain from contemptuous reference to Maskelyne and Cooke, remembering that these inimitable conjurers have more than once been publicly offered a thousand pounds if they would, *under the same conditions*, imitate the most ordinary spiritual phenomena in a private house; but they replied that, as their apparatus weighed more than a ton, they could not conveniently accept the challenge. We must call to mind the fact that such eminent scientists as Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace and Mr. William Crookes, the discoverer of the metal thallium and of the radiometer, the latter through his investigation of Spiritualism, have both declared that the main facts are as well established, and as easily verifiable, any as of the more exceptional phenomena of nature which are not yet reduced to law. The movement is here, in the providence of God, whether by His appointment or permission; and through it he calls upon us to do what lies in our power to control and regulate it for those who are or may be affected by its practice and teaching. If from Satan, we ought not to be content with ignorance of his devices. Whatever danger may result to those who from mere idle curiosity venture where they ought not, duty calls on us to brave them courageously, as a soldier or physician hazards his life for the welfare of society. Spiritualism may be, and probably is, a fulfilment of the Apocalyptic vision of the Spirits of demons going forth to deceive the nations. It may be that the manifestations, mixed as they confessedly are, are part of the dark clouds which have to appear and be dispersed before the promised advent of the Lord with His saints to bring in a true Spiritualism. In the meantime, even regarding the fact in its worst light, we, as watchmen and shepherds, sustain a relation towards it which involves important duties.....Secondly, we should realise that the sole strength of Spiritualism lies in the knowledge, partial and imperfect though it be, of the future life. The weakness of the Churches as opposed to the strength of Modern Spiritualism is in the ignorance of that life, and in misapprehension of Scripture teaching concerning it..... While no one can be advised to give up or modify any sincere conviction, whether founded on rational or merely authoritative grounds, it may be confidently affirmed that the result of Spiritualist teaching and propagandism will be a gradual and perpetual separation of the people from all churches and congregations whose ministers maintain and teach the endless duration of torment or punishment in the case of any one soul. Except on this question the teachings of alleged Spirits and believers are as varied as those of men on earth; so much so that very many mediums and believers, in despair of certainty, have become members of the Church of Rome. Yet most of those who have gone over to that Church, and multitudes who are Churchless, would gladly have remained in their respective denominations if their teachers could have dealt kindly with them, and given rational grounds for the doctrines taught, and maintained an inquiring and conciliatory spirit towards the doubts and opinions of their hearers. The suggested attitude of the clergy towards Spiritualists may be thus summed up:—1st: As careful an examination of the facts as time and circumstances admit, that we may not condemn in manifest ignorance; remembering the words of Solomon, "He that

\* Prof. Barrett we know to be a firm believer in the phenomena; but why should he regard them as *supernatural*? Ed

answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him." 2nd: A frank admission of facts, and a conciliatory rather than hostile or dogmatic attitude towards believers. 3rd: A rational presentation of Christian doctrine,.....4th: While frankly admitting any good in its teaching or influence which may be fairly claimed for Spiritualism, it is also our duty to shew from the abundant written testimony of eminent Spiritualists that great dangers, physical and mental, frequently result from a too eager and unreserved submission to psychical control. 5th: To shew that in the Christian religion, rightly understood, is to be found all, and more than all of important truth that any Spirit has ever taught from the beginning of the world.

#### MR. STUART CUMBERLAND.

Mr. Stuart Cumberland said this was a question of evidence alone. In Spiritualism there was a variety of manifestations, of which the most objectionable was the so-called materialisation of Spirit forms, by which was meant the power of calling up deceased relatives and friends in the same material condition in which they were before leaving this world. Common-sense told them that those that left this world rested from their labours. It was not in the power of the professional medium to call up those we loved to masquerade in Spiritualistic séances for the amusement of fools and the enrichment of knaves. He had seen a great deal of these materialisations, and had found that the so-called Spirit was always the medium or a confederate. A few months ago he went to a séance by Mr. Bastian. A very eminent clergyman, who was present, recognised, in the form that was called up, the person of his deceased son, and a most painful scene ensued. Two nights after he (Mr. S. Cumberland) returned, in company with Dr. Forbes Winslow and other friends, determined to expose the true nature of these manifestations. They were kept sitting for so long a time in a state of expectancy that a person was disposed at last to recognise in even a dressed-up broomstick his maternal grandmother or paternal grandfather. At last the Spirit appeared. The medium was supposed to be in a state of trance in a neighbouring room meanwhile. The Spirit came up to him (Mr. Cumberland) and declared most emphatically that it was his brother. Very happily he had not lost a brother. In pursuance of a little plot he had arranged, he squirted over the Spirit some liquid cochineal. He tried to grasp the Spirit, but it nearly broke his fingers in the struggle. At the close of the séance they found that the medium was covered with liquid cochineal. This proved that the Spirit and the medium were one and the same person.\*

#### MR. JOHN FOWLER.

What does the Church propose to do in this matter? Of its seriousness proof is offered by the fact of this discussion. Until the facts of spiritual existence have been demonstrated, like Peter, who denied his Master, we want evidence, and, like Thomas, we want to put our fingers into the prints of the nails. If demonstration was needed to establish the faith in the hearts of the disciples, demonstration is as much needed to-day, to establish its claims in the experience of the present generation. The fabric cannot be maintained. It will fall to pieces without the interior leavening power of the Spirit. Narrow creeds and ceremonies cannot impose and influence for ever the minds of men. Therefore, Modern Spiritualism has appeared as a Divine necessity of the times. It does not come to destroy the law and the prophets, but to establish that which came aforetime, and to make the possibilities of spiritual growth and strength in the heart of man more possible. The extraordinary gifts of healing, of speaking, and of prophecy which the founders of the Church exercised, displayed the supremacy of the spiritual over the

temporal world. The blind were made to see, the sick were made whole, and the dumb did speak. The volume of heaven's wonders was revealed to us by the inspired speaker. These spiritual gifts, so extraordinary, and marvellous, were promised to be continued to the Church. Christ said to His disciples "Greater works shall ye do because I go to My Father." There is nothing inconsistent in the claims of Modern Spiritualism and Christianity. One is the expression and the development of the other. That which was phenomenally possible in primitive Christianity must be as needful and as possible now. Nowhere are these gifts declared to be withdrawn from the Church. If the Church had them in the beginning, they are retained till now. The Church did not bestow them in the beginning, and the Church cannot take them away. Healing the sick, and the marvellous works which were done of old, were done in harmony with the Divine plan, and if men would only submit themselves to the same conditions, the miraculous vitality of the primitive Church could be resumed by us. These extraordinary phenomena to which the Spiritualist lays claim are of the same nature and character as those which were witnessed in the early Church, and they are calculated to meet the growing skepticism of the age by a complete defeat. The Church should not stand aloof, and denounce Spiritualism as a fraud. It will prove the Church's best friend. It will defeat the Atheist, the Secularist, and the Materialist—the three formidable foes of modern faith. Fear and doubt are the strongest enemies to the believer's life in the sanctuary and in the closet. The anxious inquirer ponders the problem, and cries in his soul for some objective evidence of the truthfulness of the Church's teachings. Without Modern Spiritualism the Church affords not this invaluable succour. It stands helpless before the onslaughts of the infidel. Time will not permit us tonight to detail the nature of spiritual phenomena, as it is presented in your midst to-day. However, we may be permitted to testify to a few facts. We have known reliable and experienced men and women, bitterly opposed to the subject, have evidence presented to them of a most convincing nature. Departed friends have presented themselves and given undoubted evidence of their identity, by a narration of experiences only known to themselves. Fathers have met children, and children have met fathers, and have exchanged unmistakable proofs of a personal continuance of life. They have been recognised in the phenomena of materialisation. Their presence has been made known by the remarkable power of clairvoyance. Entrancement has developed a power of inspiration as beautiful as any which distinguished any age of eloquence. The healing art is practised with success to-day, and could be easily developed in usefulness, if the Church applied itself to the study of the spiritual force of human nature. The inherent capability of the human organism for removing or alleviating suffering would be recognised as a source of stability to the Church itself. We do not say that there is anything miraculous or contrary to the laws of nature in these phenomena. Man, originally, from the beginning, has remained the same. The marvellous works which were done by the Apostles can be done now. But nothing can be done now which is not in harmony with natural law. The sooner the Church brings itself to recognise this truth the better able will it be to struggle with its outward foes. We have in our midst now sensitive persons who can be operated on by Spirits, and made to do the will of an invisible intelligence. By acting upon the vital fluid of a sensitive, a Spirit can control a medium. A medium is a person who is more or less susceptible to the will and control of another, and this susceptibility is increased by repeated and frequent exercise of the power. Mediums are not all alike. Some have the gift of healing, some of speaking, some of writing, some of clairvoyance, and some even of speaking with tongues. Manifestations of these spiritual gifts are very widely spread over England. Thousands could bear testimony to its truth. The subject is and has been investigated by men of note in every

\* It proves nothing of the kind; but simply, that the "animal soul" or the *Kama-rupa*, the *living inner man* of the medium has more to do with the "materialisations" than the spirits of "dead" men.—Ed.

walk of life. Scientific men, noblemen, literary men, and men of all classes distinguished for ability and learning, after a full investigation, have, without hesitation, attested the genuineness of the manifestations which took place in their presence. Therefore, we say that a case has been made out on behalf of Modern Spiritualism to be recognised and utilised by the Church itself, that it may become strong to defeat its own doubts, and, in the full reliance of its hope, do battle with the hard foes which deny the immortality of the soul. If Spiritualists do not universally retain their allegiance to the doctrines of the Church of England, it matters but very little. The Church, by fairly and squarely investigating the alleged facts, will bring together into one focus philosophers and thinkers who otherwise might have remained outside the pale of the Church. To shelve the question by saying that Spiritualism is an imposition, displays either presumption or ignorance. All that we ask of you is to fairly and squarely investigate the subject without prejudice or partiality, and we doubt not but that soon the spiritual world, with its millions of happy Spirits, will help on with enthusiasm to do battle with the internal and external foes of everlasting truth.

DR. EASTWOOD.

Dr. Eastwood, President of the North of England Branch of the British Medical Association, said.....that the medical profession, as a whole, sets its face against either Spiritualism, skepticism, or infidelity; and, with regard to the Spiritualism, he said, as a physician, that the question concerned medical men very seriously, because without understanding the whole man, it was impossible to understand either bodily or mental diseases. For mental diseases themselves were the result of bodily diseases; they were the result of disease in the condition of our bodily structure, whether that structure be liver or brain. It was the universal belief, with very few exceptions, that the manifestations of Spiritualism were not the manifestations of Spirits, but were false, and that the majority were really caused in the way that had been mentioned that evening, and got up on purpose, the mediums themselves being Spiritualists. Spiritualism had added nothing to our knowledge of the human mind or spiritual part of our nature; and psychologists recognised that it had not added to our information in any degree whatever, for the manifestations might be fairly explained by the knowledge we already possess. Again, some persons might themselves be deceived, and assume the phenomena might be true—some persons might believe in what they exhibited, but they were at the same time deceived, and the manifestations brought forward were not true manifestations. The duty of the Church with regard to Spiritualism was to war against it on every occasion; and the duty of the Church against Spiritualism was very much to let it alone, and let it die away, as many other false impressions had died away.

MR. STEPHEN BOURNE

Mr. Stephen Bourne said that as to Spiritualism..... it was folly for the Church to waste its time in meeting Spiritualism, for the Spiritualists possessed an amount of ingenuity which would tax the ingenuity of the wisest and best men. It was not for the Church to enter upon this task. Let it be left to the scientists and conjurers...

The meeting concluded with a hymn and the Benediction.

Mr. T. P. Barkas, who had asked for an opportunity of speaking on behalf of Spiritualism, was not called upon by the chairman.

#### THE FIVE-POINTED STAR.

To

The Editor of The THEOSOPHIST.

Madame,

Having seen accounts of the efficacy of the "Five-pointed-Star" in the THEOSOPHIST I was induced to try my luck with it, and have now the pleasure of recording the results.

I have used it in nearly forty cases of scorpion-sting, head-ache, simple colic, intermittent fever, and other slight

functional disorders. In every case a cure was effected, sometimes instantaneously.

In scorpion-sting I enquire how "high" the spasm is, *i. e.*, how far it has spread towards the central part of the body *above the sting*, there drawing the star with a pen and ink, the spasm immediately recedes from it.

Again drawing the star over the highest point of the spasm, the pain recedes further and further until the part actually stung is reached. Finally, forming the star over it, the burning sensation, which in other cases remains for several hours, quickly disappears.

Yours most sincerely and fraternally,

HARRISINGHJI RUPSINGHJI, F.T.S.

Sihore, 18th October, 1881.

#### SUPERSTITION.

Owing to the fanciful reports of superficial and prejudiced travellers, to their entire ignorance of Asiatic religions and—very often their own—Western nations generally are labouring under the strange impression that no people in the world are as stupidly superstitious as the non-Christian populations of India, China and other "heathen" countries. Unblessed with the light of the Gospel, they say, these poor pagans groping in the dark, attribute mysterious powers to the most unseemly objects: they will stake the future happiness or woe of their father's soul, upon the hopping crow's accepting or rejecting the rice-ball of the "Shraddha" ceremony; and will believe, as the now famous Kolhápúr conspirators did, that "owls' eyes" worn as an amulet will make the bearer invulnerable. Agreed:—all such superstitious are as degrading as they are ridiculous and absurd.....

But greatly *mistaken*, or as grossly unjust is he who affirms that such strange beliefs are limited to paganism, or that they are the direct result of the heathen religions alone. They are international; the cumulative production and necessary effect of countless generations of the arts of an unconscientious clergy of *every religion* and in every age. Adopted by the archaic priestly hierarchies, the policy of subjecting the ignorant masses, by working on their untutored imaginations and credulous fears, with the object of getting at their purse *via* the soul, was found effectual and was universally practised by the priest upon the layman from the first dawn of history down to our own modern times. Everything in nature, whether abstract or concrete, has two sides to it as every poison must have its antidote somewhere. Religion or belief in an invisible world being based upon a dual principle—God and Satan, or GOOD and EVIL, if PHILOSOPHY—the outflow of true religious feeling—may be likened to a filtered stream, on the other hand, SUPERSTITION is the cloaca of all dogmatic creeds that are based upon blind faith. Literally speaking, it is the sewer carrying off the putrid waters of the Chaldeo-Noachian deluge. Unstemmed, it ran in a straight course, through Paganism, Judaism and Christianity alike, catching up with its current all the garbage of human dead-letter interpretations; while on its muddy banks have crowded the priesthood of all times and creeds and offered its unwholesome waters to the adoration of the credulous as the "holy stream,"—calling it now Ganges, anon the Nile or Jordan.

Why then, should the Western people accuse the non-Christian nations alone of such beliefs? Little does the "truth of God" abound through *such* lies, and it is showing poor respect to one's religion to introduce it to the stranger's notice under false pretences. History shows us that, while seemingly occupied in destroying every trace of heathenism, and condemning belief in ancient folk-lore and the effects of "charms" as the work of the devil, the Christian proselytizers became the keepers of all such superstitious, and, adopting them gradually, let them loose again upon the people, but under other names. It is useless for us to repeat that which was said, and better said, and proved by the statistical records of crimes perpetrated through superstition, in every Christian country. Beliefs of the grossest, as the most dangerous, character

are rife in Catholic France, Spain, Italy and Ireland, in Protestant England, Germany and Scandinavia, as in Greek Russia, Bulgaria and other Slavonian lands, and they are as alive among the people now, as they were in the days of King Arthur, of the first Popes, or the Varyago-Russian Grand Dukes. If the higher and middle classes have civilized themselves out of such absurd fancies, the masses of rural populations have not. The lower classes being left to the tender mercies of the rural priest—who, when he was not himself ignorant, was ever cunningly alive to the importance of his holding the passion in mental slavery,—they believe in charms and incantations and the powers of the devil *now*, as much as they did *then*. And, so long as belief in Satan and his legion of fallen angels (now devils) remains a dogma of the Christian Church—and we do not see how it could be eliminated, since it is the corner-stone of the doctrine of (now devil) salvation—so long will there exist such degrading superstitions, for the whole superstructure of the latter is based upon this belief in the mighty rival of the Deity.

There hardly came out one number of our *Journal* without it contained some proof of what we say. But last year from sixty to a hundred persons of both sexes were tried in Russia for arbitrarily burning alleged sorcerers and witches, who were supposed to have spoiled some hysterical women. The trial lasted for months and disclosed a ghastly list of crimes of the most revolting nature. Yet the peasants were acquitted for they were found *irresponsible*. For once justice had triumphed in Russia over the dead-letter law. And now, there comes news of the effect of the same superstition of a still deadlier character. The following will read like a mediæval tale during the days of the "Holy" Inquisition. The *Russian Courier* contains an official report from Tchambar (Government of Penza) to the governor of the province, which we will summarize thus:—

At the end of December last, during Christmas time, the village of Balkashemo became the theatre of a horrid and an unheard-of crime, caused by a superstitious belief. A land-owner, N. M., inherited a very large property and went just before Christmas-day to receive it at Penza. The inhabitants of the village—one of the many struck this year with famine—are generally poor; and two of the poorest and the hungriest of them resolved upon robbing the land-owner during his absence. Unwilling though to pay the penalty for their crime they went first to a village *Znacharka* (literally 'a knowing one,' a witch). In a Russian village where the witch is as indispensable as the smith and the public house, or an astrologer in a village of India, these professions multiply in proportion to the wealth and demands of each locality. So our two future burglars consulted the 'sorceress' as to the best way of effecting the robbery and avoiding detection at the same time. The witch advised them to *kill a man, and cutting out the epiploon from under the stomach, to melt it, and preparing of it a candle, light the latter and, entering the house of the landlord, plunder it at their ease: by the enchanted light of that human candle they would remain invisible to all*. Following out the advice literally, the two peasants sallied forth from their huts at 2 after midnight, and meeting on their way a half-drunken wretch, a neighbour of theirs, just leaving the public house, they killed him and cutting out his epiploon buried him in the snow near a cowshed. On the third day of the murder, the corpse was dug out by the dogs, and an inquest appointed. A large number of peasants was arrested, and, during the search of the village-houses for proofs, a pot full of melted fat was discovered, an analysis of whose contents was made, and the substance proved to be *human fat*. The culprit confessed and giving out his accomplice, both confessed their object. They pleaded guilty, but said they had acted upon the advice of the witch, whose name, though, they would divulge upon no consideration, dreading the revenge of the sorceress far more than human justice. The fact is the more remarkable as both the murderers had been hitherto regarded as two poor but steady, sober, and very honest young men. It seems

next to impossible to find out which one of the neighbouring 'witches'—for there are many and some are never known but to their 'clients'—is guilty of the murderous advice. Nor is there any chance of getting at any clue from the villagers, as the most respectable among them would never consent to incur the displeasure of one of these devil's familiars. We believe, indeed, having a right to say that the above *superstition* leaves far behind it, in criminality, the comparatively innocent belief of the Kollápur conspirators in the efficacy of the "owls' eyes."

Another recent case is that of an "enchanter." During the month of the same December last, the village-council of Aleksandrofsk voted the expulsion from their midst and forcible exile to Siberia of a wealthy peasant named Rodinine. The accusation showing the defender guilty "of the great crime of being thoroughly versed in the science of enchantments and the art of causing people to be possessed by Satan," having been read, the verdict of the jury was found unanimous. "As soon" states the Accusation Act "as the defendant Rodinine approaches one, especially if any person accepts a glass of brandy from him, he becomes possessed on the spot.... Instantly the victim begins to howl, complaining that he feels like a river of liquid fire inside him, and piteously assures those present that Satan tears his bowels into shreds..... From that moment he knows no rest, either by day or by night, and soon dies a death of terrific agony. Numerous are the victims of such wicked enchantments perpetrated by the defendant..... In consequence of which, the local jury having found him 'guilty', the authorities are respectfully requested to do their bound duty." The "bound duty" was to parcel Rodinine off to Siberia and so they did.

Every one in the West knows of the popular and universal belief—prevailing both in Germany and Russia about the miraculous power of a certain three-leaved fern wien culled at midnight on St. John's day in a solitary wood. Called out by an incantation to the evil one, the blade of grass begins growing at the end of the first verse and is grown by the time the last one is pronounced. If unappalled by the terrific sights taking place around him—and they are unsurpassed in horror—the experimenter heeds them not, but remains undismayed by the shoutings of the "forest imps" and their efforts to make him fail in his design, he is rewarded by getting possession of the plant which gives him power during his life-time over the devil and *forces* the latter to serve him.

This is faith in Satan and *his* power. Can we blame the ignorant or even the educated yet pious persons for such a belief? Does not the Church—whether Catholic, Protestant, or Greek—not only inculcate in us, from our earliest age, but actually *demand* such a belief? Is it not the *sine qua non* of Christianity? Aye, will people answer; but the Church condemns us for any such *intercourse* with the Father of Evil. The Church wants us to believe in the devil, but to despise and "renounce" him at the same time; and alone, through her legal representatives, she has a right to deal with his hoary majesty and enter into direct relations with him, thereby glorifying God and showing the laymen the great power she has received of the Deity of controlling the Devil in the name of Christ, which she never succeeds in doing, however. She fails to prove it; but it is not generally that which is the best proved that is the most believed in. The strongest proof the Church ever gave of the objectivity of Hell and Satan, was during the middle ages when the Holy Inquisition was appointed by Divine right, the agency of kindling hell-fire on earth and burning heretics in it. With laudable impartiality she burned alike those who disbelieved in hell and the devil, as those who believed too much in the power of the latter. Then the logic of these poor credulous people who believe in the possibility of "miracles" at all, is not quite faulty either. Made to believe in God and the Devil, and seeing that evil prevails on earth, they can hardly avoid thinking that it is good proof that Satan has the upper hand in his eternal struggle with the Deity. And if so—his power then and alliance are not to be scorned



at. Torments in hell are far off, and misery, suffering, and starvation are the doom of millions. Since God seems to neglect them, they will turn to the other power. If a "leaf" is endowed with miraculous powers by God in one instance, why should not a leaf be as useful when it is grown under the direct supervision of the Devil? And then do not we read of innumerable legends, where sinners, having made a *pact* with the devil, have dishonestly cheated him out of their souls toward the end, by placing themselves under the protection of some Saint, repenting and calling upon "atonement" at the last moment? The two murderers of Tcheibar, while confessing their crime, distinctly stated that as soon as their families would have been provided for through their burglary they meant to go into a monastery and taking the "holy orders, repent.:" And if, finally, we view as gross, degrading superstition, belief in the one leaf, why should the State, Society, and hardly a century ago—*law* have punished for disbelieving in the Church miracles? Here is a fresh instance of a "miracle"-working leaf just clipped out of the *Catholic Mirror*. We commend it for comparison, and then perhaps our readers will be more merciful to the superstitions of the "poor heathen" unblest with the knowledge of, and belief in, Christ.

#### A MIRACLE-WORKING LEAF.

Father Ignatius, who is at present preaching a mission at Sheffield, furnishes the following account of a very remarkable "miracle" of healing, alleged to have been wrought on a Brighton lady by a leaf from the bush on which the Virgin Mary is said to have descended during the recent celestial manifestations she is alleged to have vouchsafed at Llanthony Abbey. After describing the apparitions, Father Ignatius goes on to say that God was confirming the truth of these apparitions by the most blessed signs possible. The leaves from the bush had been sent to many persons, and were being used by God to heal. He would mention one great miracle that had been wrought. An elderly lady who kept a ladies' school in Brighton, and was, therefore, well known, had suffered the most excruciating suffering for thirty-eight years from a diseased hip-joint that would not allow her to lie or sit down with comfort. She was a complete cripple. In fact, he himself had seen her turn quite livid with the pain from the joint. He sent her a leaf, not that he thought it would cure her, but with the idea of giving her some memorial of the apparitions. When she went to bed that night she took his letter and the leaf with her, and the words, "According to thy faith be it unto thee," which she had read in "Hawker's Morning and Evening Portion," were ringing in her ears. She prayed, and applied the leaf to the abscess on her leg, and instantly the abscess disappeared, instantly the discharge ceased, instantly the pain ceased, and instantly she was able to place her foot properly on the ground. Since then she could walk about like other people, and she had been delivered entirely from a life of terrible excruciating suffering. He would give the name and address of the lady to any one who wished to investigate the case, and the lady was quite willing to afford every information.

An "apparition" at Llanthony Abbey, or an "apparition" in the cabinet of a medium,—we really do not see much difference in the two beliefs; and if God condescends to work through a leaf, why should not the devil, the "monkey of God," do likewise?"

#### THE "PHILOSOPHY OF SPIRIT."

"PHILOSOPHY OF SPIRIT, with a new version of the BHAGAVAT GITA, by William Oxley" is the name of the volume before us. It comes fresh from England, and is written by a gentleman widely known among the English mystics, and one, whose intelligence and learning are generally admitted. With such an author, the new work recommends itself well. Our journal being devoted to modern literature as much as to Oriental Philosophy and Spiritualism, we must try to do the volume full justice by reviewing it from all these three aspects. Let us then see, what will be the probable, and, we must say, very natural

effect the *Philosophy of Spirit* is likely to produce upon the mind of the average Anglo-Indian, and the educated native of India, especially. Without falling into undue prophecy, we may predict, to a certainty, that before these two classes of readers, beauty of thought, the literary excellency of the style, and the many other fascinating features of the book, will vanish entirely, leaving in their place but its one prominent defect—always speaking with this class of readers in mind—the one unpardonable sin, namely—what they will term "a superstitious belief in spirits." The subject is so unpopular, that one cannot help regretting that it should ever have been made to interfere with the otherwise probable success of this publication in India. Even in England, with the exception of Spiritualists and Theosophists, very few will, for the same reason, appreciate its value. But we must not anticipate. The work is inscribed by Mr. Oxley to—

#### THE RESURRECTING INTELLECTUAL LIFE OF INDIA; AS A

MARK OF PROFOUND AND REVERENTIAL RESPECT,  
TO THE MEMORY OF

#### THE ANCIENT INDIAN SCHOOL OF THOUGHT, WHICH MAY JUSTLY BE REGARDED AS

THE PARENT SOURCE OF LITERATURE,  
THE IMPRESS OF WHICH IS FOUND INDELIBLY STAMPED ON ALL THE  
CHIEF RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD;

IN THE HOPE THAT THIS HUMBLE EFFORT MAY AID IN ATTRACTING  
MORE ATTENTION FROM WESTERN MINDS

TO THE BEAUTIFUL LITERARY GEMS THAT ABOUND IN

#### THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE,

THE OFFSPRING OF THAT GREAT NATION WHICH FLOURISHED AGES AGO  
IN THAT PART OF THE HABITABLE GLOBE NOW KNOWN AS

INDIA.

So far so good, the dedication being sufficiently enticing to move every educated Hindu patriot to patronize the work which bears it; and, were it not for a very strange claimant, whom the reader encounters on the very first pages of Chapter IV upon the *Ancient Wisdom of India*—he would have remained charmed with it. The claimant is certainly calculated to startle and bewilder one, for it is no less historic a character than "BUSIRIS THE ANCIENT"—a "Spirit," who upsets the uninitiated by announcing himself as the *bona-fide* author of that most celebrated poem—the *Mahabharata*! It is the nature of that personage, whom, considering the hoary antiquity of the poem, the reader is forced to view as a well-disembodied spirit by this time, and the fortuitous introduction of such a supernatural character that throws a colouring of incredibility upon the whole work and will, we fear, sorely stand in the way of the new version, which would otherwise deserve every possible success in the old motherland of the *Rishis*. Leaving for the present, the English reader aside, let us see what the native reader will have to say. The name of "Busiris" who claims to be an old Aryan sage, has in itself a too outlandish ring to the Hindu tympanum to make an Aryan recognize in it very readily that of the long-lost and forgotten author of his national Iliad. Our young India, especially the *jeunesse dorée*, is skeptical, and sadly ignorant of the string of names in the calendar of its venerable ancient sages and authors. Even the name of the living "Koot-hoomi" a purely Aryan, Sanskrit name, and one, moreover, mentioned at length in the *Padma Purana*, which gives it as one of the thirty-six *Rishis* who were the authors of *Smriti*, was for a considerable time regarded as a *non-Aryan* name. And, since even those directly concerned with, and particularly at home among the old Indian as well as the Jewish *disembodied* sages—namely, the pious Apostles of the New Dispensation Church—inquired through their learned organ, the *Sunday Mirror*, whether "Koot-hoomi" was "a Singhalese, Burmese or Tibetan name"—the chances of "Busiris" to recognition as an Aryan Rishi become infinitesimal, indeed. True, Mr. Oxley explains to us that "*Busiris* is not a Sanskrit name, but a form of speech which forms a connecting link between the ancient Indian system and the Egyptian one, in which 'Osiris' was the great presiding *genius*."

But that helps very little; the situation will prove to no purpose, as it can never move the Indian mind. While the orthodox Hindus have their own version of the *Bhagavata Gita* and steadily avoid to learn English, or accept anything, from a foreign source, their sons—the said *jeunesse dorée*,—who scoff even at the sacred writings of the well-authenticated national *Rishis*—will still less accept the *dictum* of a Western “Busiris,” howsoever “ancient” and venerable that ghost may be. Writings which have “angels” for their revelators and authorities, are now steadily losing price on the market of universal scepticism. And people, who refuse to believe even in a *living* man, their own countryman, unless that man exhibits himself for their delectation in the *maidans* and bazaars, are still less likely to open their arms to a “Maâtma” of Western origin, who, to boot, controls an English medium.

We feel constrained, therefore, in all sincerity and sympathetic kindness for the author, to say again that we regret to see “Busiris the Ancient” mentioned at all in a work, so full of valuable suggestions and throwing such a flood of light upon at least one of the aspects of the *esoteric* meaning of the *Bhagavata Gita*. We regret it the more, as it is not easy to conceive what possible good purpose can be answered by the introduction of that venerable, disembodied “angel”—who, moreover, is introduced into the volume quite casually. We believe the book could but have gained, had the express declaration of “Busiris” in an audible voice, (that of his medium, of course,) “I am the author of the Mahabharata”—been left out. Nor is the additional paleographic and chronological information given by the ethereal sage to the effect that the epic poem was written “five thousand years ago,” for he, the author “was then on earth”—much calculated to dispel the reader’s doubts. For, following this fling at Max Müller—one, which, had it come from any other source, would have been justified and gladly welcomed by many—the reader is made to glean that other and far more startling fact, namely, that the fossil ghost, or the “now angel,” who rejoices in the name of “Busiris” is one of the “historical controls” who descends occasionally from “the third or celestial heaven”—wherever that might be—to give us, mortals, the glad tidings that (1) Busiris means “Light-giver,” and (2) that in consequence of it he “appears as the Angel of Light, or as a Herald of the New...Dispensation.”

Now there are several good reasons why the majority of the cultivated Hindus might object to a “spirit” announcing himself in the latter character. To begin with, it requires but a moderate dose of that national pride which will always lead one to prefer the products of one’s mother-soil to foreign importation—to view the venerable Busiris as a rival, hence an unwelcome claimant, to a dignity already honourably occupied in India. Thus, some might object to him on the plea that the country has already its own native “Herald of a New Dispensation,” who, if not precisely settled in the “third or celestial Heaven,” but in a “Lilly” cottage, proves, nevertheless, an undoubted acquaintance with the said locality, having, *en plus*, over the alleged author of the “Mahabharata,” the evident advantage of being a living “Babu” instead of a dead “Angel.” And, we are not so sure but that some others might protest against the importation of a new “Herald,” bringing along with him a second “New Dispensation,” for reasons quite the reverse of profound reverence for the original local edition; on the ground, perhaps, that they have quite enough of even that solitary copy.

From the average spiritualistic standpoint, the book, welcomed on the whole, will be perhaps criticized for certain explanations in it, as the latter approach the author’s views far nearer to the theosophical than to the spiritual doctrines. It is but a small number of progressive, liberal-minded spiritualists, who will fully appreciate the profoundly philosophical theory of the writer who adds that it “must not be supposed that it is the likeness of the great angel as he appears in the spheres”—the

likeness referred to being the head of Busiris drawn through the agency of his medium, photographed on wood and then cut by an artist. That *class* of Spiritualists, who maintain that the *dramatis personæ* of the séance-room—the “Angels” in general and their deceased friends, especially,—return to them on this earth, rematerialized in the emanations of their own skin and bones and the magnetic aura of their mediums, will not be pleased at Mr. Oxley’s profoundly truthful explanations: “What the actual appearance of the angels is,” he writes in page 52, “in their own state and home, is inconceivable by embodied mortals, who can only see through the organs or senses; and consequently when an angel or spirit appears clairvoyantly or otherwise to mortals, he or she projects or *assumes an appearance* whereby they can be recognized by human beings.”

That is just the position of the Theosophists who have always maintained that the “spirits only” *assumed* an appearance. On the other hand, they disagree with the author when he supports the spiritualistic assertion that *historical* or any other controls can enlighten “the world on the subject of spirit-communion and prove by incontestable facts the immortality of the soul.” Belonging to that class of people who “refuse to be charmed” by the contradictory statements of the alleged spirits, the Theosophists hold that, even were the facts of the materialization proved in every case to be genuine, and produced by really *disembodied* men, it would yet be no proof of the “immortality of the soul,” “but at best of its *surviving* the body.”

Leaving, however, spirits aside, we will briefly glance at the new version of the *Bhagavata Gita* as given by the author in his *comments*. According to his idea, with which we fully concur, that poem which is the brightest gem of the “Mahabharata” “contains an epitome of the whole system; and its philosophy, as expounded by Krishna, stands out amidst all the constellations of spiritual literature—a brilliant, whose lustre is surpassed by none.” The suggestion that the “Mahabharata” might prove to be the last Book of the Wars of Jehovah, as reference in the Hebrew Scriptures, “where a Book or Books which are not found in the Canon” is distinctly made in Numbers XXI, 14, is novel and might prove to contain more truth in it than is now generally supposed. We doubt, though, whether the names of the localities as given in verse 14—“wherefore it is said in the Book of the Wars of ‘Jehovah’ what he did in Vaheb in Suphah and in the brooks of Arnon,” could be so easily proved when interpreted to “have their equivalents in the more ancient Indian Scriptures.” The authorized text of the Bible gives the sentence a little differently: for it speaks of what the *Lord* “did in the Red Sea and in the brooks of Arnon”—the Red Sea having never formed part of the Indian territory, not being mentioned in either the Indian Scriptures or the “Mahabharata,” and the brooks of Arnon having no equivalent, as far as we are told by the most learned Pandits, in any of the Sanskrit works. The evident object of the author being to show the Old Hebrew Records full of parallels found in the *Bhagavata Gita*, he is likely to fail in this. Though antecedent Christianity and the New Testament, the *Gita* is certainly far posterior to the “Mahabharata,” and even to the Old Testament, at least, to its oldest parts, having been added to the main body of the epic poem subsequently. Were the *Bhagavata Gita* however, as old as the author would have it, the twelve names of “twelve of the chiefs of the Pandus,”...with which the sons or tribes of Israel are said to correspond, could not have been meant for the twelve signs of the Zodiac. In those days of hoary pre-historic antiquity, the nations, who were acquainted with astronomy, had but ten signs, and the two additional ones being regarded as the most sacred of the twelve,—were known but to the initiates. Relating, as they do, to the final mystery of the secret doctrine of cosmogony, they were held in too high a veneration to allow any reference of them being made in relation to such secondary personages as the twelve chiefs of the Pandus. The *Bhagavata Gita* has certainly an astronomical and astrological basis;

but the true meaning of the sacred drama is in the hands of a few so called "orthodox" Brahmans, who keep it too well to allow Western interpreters to get at the key of it. And though, in one sense, Krishna, "the *Revelator*," may represent "the celestial source from which such revelations are given;" and *Arjuna* may be regarded as "embodied humanity"; yet Krishna is doubtless an historical, though subsequently deified personage, and the history of *Arjuna*, his *Chela*, or disciple, is better known to some learned Pandits and Swamis than that of Alexander the Great is to any Western Professor of History.

The Sanskrit poem is taken from Wilkin's prose translation, and presented to the reader in a clear and,—considering the difficulty of combining a strict adherence to the spirit of the text, and the exigencies of the rhythm—in a mellow, and, at times, fascinating blank verse. The personages of the *Gita*, scenes as well as things, are shown as allegorical and symbolical representations of the secrets of nature, and Yogism, the awful mystery of Good and Evil, Adeptship, and finally, the *microcosm* or MAN, are defined from the stand-point of modern spiritualism. There are some sublime ideas, some great truths found here and there, as well as strange misconceptions owing to the predetermined idea of the author, and his strong desire to identify modern spiritualism with the most ancient philosophies of the world. So, for instance, he seeks to prove ancient *Yoginism*, corresponding in its two aspects, of pure phenomenalism and pure Soul-Philosophy, with *Spiritism* and *Spiritualism*. "The former," he says, "covers all the ground of phenomenalism only, but the latter (Spiritualism) includes the former, and brings the soul of men *en rapport* with the best, wisest, and purest in Spirit-life...In the junction of present *spiritualism* with ancient *Yoginism*, extremes meet, and by that meeting a new form of life will be developed on this earth, which will characterize the *role* of the New Dispensation.\*"

This juxtaposition of *Yoginism* and *Spiritualism* would be regarded as rather fanciful, were we to consult the learned Aryan exponent of the former—Professor Mahadev Moreshwar Kunte. But we go deeper into the author's mind, and discern, under his belief in modern phenomenalism, the better germs of that which might lead him on to the threshold of self-taught Eastern adeptship. Many of his ideas coincide entirely with those of the esoteric Buddhist and Brahmical doctrines, while not a few are entirely opposed to the spirit of these. "What is action?" he asks (pp. 111 and 112.) and answers—"Action is nothing more and nothing less than *spirit in motion*. Spirit in motion is nothing more nor less than the one universal Life, forming and creating new and changing conditions whereby to express itself. Now action is performed in a state of profound ignorance, in which every form of created life is involved, while in earthly or physical conditions. The very forms of life are working (although under the illusion of the personal Ego) and yet are totally unconscious of the work they are performing. The whole philosophy of wisdom only throws a gleam of light on the transference of consciousness from the personal to the Universal Ego. This is the whole secret, and happy they, to whom the secret is entrusted. It solves the problem of 'extinction in Brahm,' and the 'Nirvana of Buddhism...'"

Having directed the flight of his soul into the very adytum, so to say, of the esoteric philosophy, it rather startles one to find the author giving expression to the following revolting doctrine which, moreover, he fathers quite unjustly upon Krishna. "The real progress and ascent of the human Spirit," he explains in page 122, "is not affected by anything that mortal man can do or leave undone; but this truth is only for those who can bear the full light of truth without being blinded. The great Power, or life, is above and in all, equally the same, and is working out its own design and purpose quite independently of the power

which the finite unenlightened mind arrogates to itself. The *appearance* is that we, mortals, can think and act as we think proper; the real truth to such as can bear it—is that we are thinking and acting out the design of the *Infinite Mind*, and actually form a part of that Mind, but are *ignorant of the fact*." Hence, we can murder, steal, be immoral, and yet expect and demand respect on the plea that we are "acting out the design of the Infinite Mind"? This is neither esoteric nor exoteric Brahmism or Buddhism, but is rather a strange admixture of the most superstitious Mahomedan *fatalism*, and of the worst kind of Presbyterian *predestination*. We can assure the esteemed author that no Adept or "Initiate" of any philosophical system would ever recognize, in the above sentence, anything but a dangerous and very pernicious doctrine. Regretting sincerely that such a teaching should have found room among a number of thoughts of a really highest philosophical character, it must be only hoped that we have misunderstood the author's meaning. Meanwhile advising those of our readers, who may feel interested in the subject, to read the *Philosophy of Spirit* notwithstanding, we must bring this too lengthy article to a close.

#### THE THEOSOPHIST AND HINDU PANTHEISM.

It is upon the above subject that we find Mr. Henry Atkinson, of Boulogne, France, treating in the *Philosophic Inquirer* of Madras. This gentleman is an able and widely-known writer, generally perfectly clear and definite in his ideas. It, therefore, surprises us the more, to be unable to find out his motive for dragging the Theosophists into the above-named article. Having condensed from Professor Flint's "Anti-Theistic Theories," the author's analysis of the Vedanta system, which led him to conclude that the negation of the reality of the worlds, along with the affirmation that Parabrahma is an impersonal deity—is a kind of Pantheism which is *Acosmism*, Mr. Atkinson confirms the remark by adding that "Pantheism is just as likely to issue in Atheism." Not that we know of,—is our answer. As taught by the ablest and most learned Vedantins of Benares, Pundits and Sanskrit scholars, their Pantheism has quite a contrary result. But we must not digress from the direct subject. Says the writer:—"From this virtual atheism there is but a step to avowed atheism. The Sankhya philosophy and Buddhism are the Hindu exemplifications of this tendency of pantheistic speculation. 'It takes for granted that material atoms existed from eternity. The reasoning by which the belief in creation is set aside by Hindu philosophers is ever substantially that which we find thus expressed in a Sutra of the Sankhya system: 'There cannot be the production of something out of nothing; that, which is not, cannot be developed into that which is: the production of what does not already exist potentially is impossible; because there must, of necessity, be a material out of which a product is developed, and because everything cannot occur everywhere at all times; and because any thing possible must be produced from something competent to produce it.'"

This quotation is immediately followed by the wholly unexpected—hence rather startling—question. "Now do the Theosophists ask us to return to such self-refuting, dreamy abstractions,—such wilful wandering of an early unscientific age and country," (?) and—that is the *only* reference we find to the THEOSOPHISTS in the whole letter.

We fail, therefore, to perceive the relevancy of the query in relation to anything in Mr. Atkinson's article; nor do we see that the quotation from the Sutra has anything so "unscientific" in it; nor yet, the possible bearing upon theosophy the writer finds in the case in hand, in general. What have the "Theosophists" to do with Professor Flint's speculations, with Vedantism, the Sankhya, or even with Buddhism in this application? The Theosophists study all the systems and—teach none,

\* The reader is again warned not to confuse the term used by the Spiritualists, when speaking of their modern belief, with the *New Dispensation* of the Calcutta Apostles.—E.

leaving every one to think and seek out truth for himself. Our members but help each other in the common work, and every one of us is open to conviction, wherever the probable truth of any given hypothesis is demonstrated to him by the light of modern science, logic or reason. Less than all does any one of the theosophists "ask any one else to return to, remain in" or proceed in "self-refuting, dreamy abstractions" and "wilful wandering of an early unscientific age" unless such "wandering" is necessitated by the far greater wandering, and many an unproved speculation of our own "scientific" age—modern science ever balancing on one leg at the brink of "impassable chasms." If Science, to enable herself to put two and two together so as not to make of it five, had to return to the atomic theory of old Democritus and the heliocentric system of the far older Pythagoras,—both of whom have lived in ages which are generally regarded as "unscientific,"—we do not see why the Theosophists should not wander in such ages in quest of the solution of the most vital problems which, do what he may, no modern philosopher has yet succeeded in even approaching. But what we do ask and most decidedly, is that people should study, compare and think for themselves before they definitely accept anything upon second-hand testimony. Hence we protest against more than one authoritative and as arbitrary assumption of this our so-called "enlightened and scientific age." Till now, our daily accumulative and joint experience shows to us the adjective no better than a vain boast and a misnomer; and we feel quite ready to maintain our position, inviting and promising to feel grateful to Mr. Atkinson or any one else who will disprove it.

Why should we, to begin with, call our age a "scientific" age, in preference to, or with any better claim to it than, the age of Alexander the Great, or even that of Sargon the Chaldean? Our century is a period which gave birth to many scientific men; to a still greater number of those who fancy themselves very scientific, but could hardly prove it in a crucial test; and—to teeming millions of "innocents" who are quite as ignorant, as superstitious, and as mentally weak and uneducated now as any of the citizens in the days of the Hyksos, of Perikles or of Rama ever were—then. No one will deny that to every genuine man of science, there are, at least, one hundred sciolists—pretenders to learning,—and ten millions of thorough ignoramuses throughout the world. Nor could any one contradict the assertion that to every enlightened and thoroughly well-educated person in society, we have to throw in several hundreds of half-educated boobies, with no more than a superficial society-varnish to conceal their gross ignorance. Moreover Science, or rather Knowledge, and Ignorance are relative terms as all other contraries are in nature—antagonistic, yet rather proving than disproving each other. Thus, if the Scientist of to-day knows infinitely more in one direction than the Scientist who flourished in the days of the Pharaoh Tutlmosis, the latter knew probably immeasurably more in another direction than all our Tyndalls and Herbert Spencers combined know, proof of the above being shown in the "lost" arts and sciences. If this age of ours is one of wonderful achievement in physical sciences, of steam and electricity, of railroads and telegraphs, of telephones and what not, it is also one in which the best minds find no better, no more secure or more reasonable refuge, than in *Agnosticism*, the modern variation on the very ancient theme of the Greek philosopher—"All I know is that I know nothing." With the exception of a handful of men of science and cultured people in general, it is also an age of compulsory obscurantism and wilful ignorance—as a direct result, and the bulk of the present population of the globe is no less "unscientific" and quite as grossly superstitious as it was 3,000 years back.

Is Mr. Atkinson or any one else (but a Christian) prepared to deny the following very easily verified assertion—that one million of uneducated Buddhists chosen at random—those, who hold to the "good law" as taught in Ceylon, ever since it was brought there by King Asoka's son

Mahinda, in the "unscientific" age of 200 B. C.—are a hundred times less credulous, superstitious, and nearer to scientific truths in their belief, than a million of Christians, equally chosen at random and instructed in this "scientific" age? We would advise any person, before he undertakes to contradict what we say, to first get Colonel Olcott's "*Buddhist Catechism*"—intended for the poor, ignorant children of as ignorant and unscientific Sinhalese parents, and placing along with it the *Roman Catholic Catechism*, or the highly elaborate Westminster Confession of Faith, or yet the Church of England 39 articles—compare notes. Let him read and take these notes by the light of science and then tell us which—the Buddhist or Christian dogmas—are nearer to the teachings of Modern Science? And let us bear in mind in this connection that Buddhism, as now taught, is identically the same as it was preached during the first centuries which followed Buddha's death, namely, from 550 to 100 A.D. in the "early and unscientific age and country" of early Buddhism, while the above-named expositions of the Christian faith—especially the two Protestant works,—are the elaborately revised and corrected editions, the joint productions of the most learned theologians and the greatest scholars of our "scientific" age. That they are, moreover, the expression and the profession of a faith, deliberately accepted by the most cultured classes of Europe and America. Thus, while this kind of teaching remains in authority for the bulk of Western population—both for the learned as well as for the unlearned—we feel entirely justified in saying, that our age is not only "unscientific" on the whole, but that the Western religious world is very little ahead, indeed, of the fetish-worshipping savage.

#### TRANCE MEDIUMS AND "HISTORICAL" VISIONS.

SOPHIE PIEROVSKY AS A "SPIRIT."

The reliability of the identifications of returning spirits, may be inferred from this bit of fresh intelligence recently received through the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, of July 23. A lady from Rochester, U. S.—a Mrs. Cornelia Gardner—writes to narrate a personal experience of her own clairvoyant powers. Treating of the "identity of spirits, and their messages," she says:—"I usually take them for what they are worth, and if I get evidence of truth, I am more than glad; if not, I put it into the scales with much else that comes, and wait for evidence before deciding, for I believe the spirits need trying as well as their mediums."

Precisely; and a great pity it is, that the writer should have departed, in the present instance, from her wise policy. Having neglected to "wait for evidence," she now throws a considerable doubt upon the reliability and lucidity of her clairvoyance. This is the substance of what she tells us: *Madame (?) Pierovsky*—the Nihilist executed for the foul murder of the Czar Alexander II.—hastened, as it seems, on the Saturday afternoon following the execution of the five Nihilists at St. Petersburg, to put in an ethereal appearance, at Rochester, before Mrs. Gardner who heard her exclaim; "I am glad I did it! It was the cause of freedom and of my countrymen. I had suffered with others of my family from the power of tyranny, and I felt a power impelling me onward that I could not resist. Now I know what that unseen influence was, and why I could not resist it. I acted in concert with the invisible forces of higher intelligences, who are bringing about the great changes upon the earth that will prove that the people's hour has come."

To the clairvoyant's question "who are you?" the voice replied: "I am Madame Sophie Pierovsky. I was executed in St. Petersburg with the Nihilists for the assassination of the Czar."

The upper features of a face becoming visible, they showed "a clear cut, broad, high forehead," which fore-

head helped the clairvoyant to identify the face as that of Sophie Pierovsky. On the following day, she found in a newspaper the account of the execution. "The most noticeable object," she writes, "in the conveyance that carried the prisoners to the scaffold, was the 'broad high forehead' of Madame Pierovsky, who rode to her execution bareheaded. This answered to the head I had seen clairvoyantly."

Very well. And now we will analyze this remarkable vision. To begin then. In hardly a dozen of lines said to have been pronounced by the "spirit," we find about half a dozen of *posthumous* fibs. Sophie Pierovsky, who, by the way, never had "a broad, high forehead," but a very narrow and high forehead—we have her photograph—a brow enhancing but little her natural beauty—could not have—"rode to her execution, bareheaded." Besides the regulations demanding that all the prisoners should have their black caps on, her hands were tied. And, with that cap she appears, at least in the photographed illustration of the ghastly procession and the official reports of the execution, where, poetical fancy finding no room, the caps are mentioned. Nor would Sophie Pierovsky have introduced herself after death as "Madame," no more than she would have done so during life, since she was unmarried and was always called "Mlle." Pierovsky in the Russian, as in all the European papers. Again—all "others of my (her) family" suffered but through the eternal disgrace brought by that wretched, heartless creature upon her family. That family, established for years in Crimea, is known to all the Odessa society, and to the writer personally as well; and we say, with little fear of being contradicted, that no Russian was ever more loyal or more devoted to the late Emperor than the unfortunate father of Sophie Pierovsky—the father who, unable to survive the dishonour, has since died of a broken heart, or, as many suspect—a suicide. The "cause of freedom" and of *her* countrymen! By the insane act of the regicides, unfortunate Russia was thrown forty years back, her political fetters being now made heavier and stronger than ever. But the most damaging part (damaging to the "angels") in the Pierovsky—Spook's *tirade* is the concluding sentence of her short communication. If that cold-blooded murderess acted "in concert with the invisible forces of higher intelligences," and those "higher intelligences" influenced her to perpetrate the most foul of crimes—that of killing *an old man* (the fact of his being *the Emperor* adding nothing to our indignation)—and the kindest, most patriotic, as the best-disposed man and ruler towards his people that Russia ever had, and who, if left alone instead of being daily threatened, and given time, would have brought about to a certainty every needed reform and so added to the great reforms already accomplished—then of what character, may we ask, must be the "lower" intelligences? And to think that such a "spiritual communication" was published just at the time when the U.S. President, General Garfield, was himself dying from the hand of a vile assassin and has actually died since... Is it also the "higher intelligences" that prompted Guiteau's hand? If so, the sooner we mortals shut our doors against the intrusion of such dangerous visitors, the better it will be for the world's morality.

This remarkable letter is wound up by another information of no less damaging a character. "Once since," writes Mrs. Gardner, "at the house of a friend, she (Pierovsky) came again, and with her the *woman whom Russian justice took from childbed and cruelly tortured to death.*"

How very remarkable! Now, had the clairvoyant but waited "for evidence," she might have learned from the August papers, the official news that the "woman whom Russian justice... had cruelly tortured to death" (an ignoble in vention of the Russian Nihilists at Paris,) namely, the Jewess Jessie Gelfman—has just been pardoned by the Emperor, and her death-sentence commuted into transportation for life. It is in consequence of a petition sent by her to the Empress, begging for mercy in the

name of the Imperial children and her own—the regicide's—innocent babe, that her worthless life was spared. Would Mrs. Gardner expect the murderess made, in addition to the pardon, "lady in waiting" upon the Russian Empress?—We would advise her, in such a case, to use her psychological powers to move the U. S. Republicans to vote for the murderer Guiteau's nomination as State-Secretary, if not the President of the U. S. in lieu of his victim.

These two little psychological blunders remind us of another blunder of the same kind, which found room likewise in the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, a few years back. In a series of letters, the reminiscences of a stay at St. Petersburg, a Mr. Jesse Sheppard—a really genuine, though rather erratic, medium, a "trance pianist" and singer of America, through whose marvellous wind-pipe, the late Mesdames Catalani, Malibran, Grisi and the Signori Lablache, Ronconi and Co., with a host of other deceased operatic celebrities, give daily their posthumous performances—narrates some remarkable "visions" of his. These visions which we may term *historical*—were obtained by him in a state of clairvoyant trance, in Russia. The thrilling subject of one of them is the assassination of the Emperor Paul I. Mr. Jesse Sheppard was at that time visiting the palace in which the awful regicide had been perpetrated, and the trance and subsequent vision were induced, as he tells us, by the gloomy associations hanging like an invisible shroud over the palace. How, in the world, that remarkable medium could have ever got into a palace which was razed to the ground more than eighty years back—in fact almost as soon as the crime had been committed a military school now being erected on its emplacement—is something that has always puzzled us to explain. However, and nevertheless, Mr. J. Sheppard was there—since he himself so tells us—and there it was that he beheld, in an apocalyptic and well retrospective vision, the scene of the ghastly murder, with all its sickening yet *historical* details. He saw the Emperor Paul having *his throat cut* by two serfs rejoicing in Russo-Yankee names, the favourites of Catherine II,—the "*wife of Paul*"—whom the medium saw quietly waiting for the *finale* of this little conjugal drama in her own chamber &c. &c. .... Now, taking into consideration the trifling and undeniably historical fact, which informs us that Catherine the Great was *Paul's mother*, and had died before Paul ever ascended the throne of Russia, and that, as a logical deduction, she could not be at the same time his wife *ergo* had nothing to do with his unpleasant death; and thirdly,—that the Emperor Paul having *been strangled* with his own regimental sash, to cut, therefore, *his throat* in addition to that, would be only most rashly adding insult to injury—for the life of us we could never, since we read and pondered over this remarkable vision, make out the *rationalité* of such a "phenomenon!" Nor can we make head nor tail of most of the modern mediumistic *visions*. Can any one else?

As a matter of course, these remarks will bring upon our head a new tornado of abuse, which, during its whirling and progressive motion, will develop at each rotation a fresh column of most wonderful and unexpected vilification and abuse. So, we expect to be called again an "impostor"; a subsidized agent of *living* Jesuits, hired to ruin Spiritualism; and the "medium" of *dead* Jesuits, namely, "Jesuit Spirits" who use us with that object. We will be accused of bigamy, trigamy and polygamy; of having robbed the Bank of England and, perhaps, killed with our "psychological powers in combination with jugglery" a Pope and several British Premiers; of being one of the heroines of Emile Zola, and of speaking French *argot* (slang) like one of Eugene Sue's pickpockets in the *Mysteres de Paris*; (rather a compliment to our linguistic capabilities, than otherwise, the more so as most of our detractors can hardly speak even their own language grammatically). To wind up the list of our ghastly iniquities, we will be placed under the direct accusation of pipe and "cigar-smoking" (!), "violent profanity" (!!), and—"habitual

INTEMPERANCE" (!!!) All that, because we question the veracity of "Spirits" who neglect to study history, and refuse to recognize the "ghosts" of persons, whom we know to be alive. *Furor arma ministrat*.....Indeed, truth alone, and very unwelcome truth it must be,—is capable of throwing people into such fits of absurd fury!

*Editor's Note.*—In relation to the above we regret to find a hitherto respectable and "philosophical" paper descending to the level of the most scurrilous little journal—a certain crazy spiritual *Weekly* of Philadelphia. It is grievous that the conductors of a journal claiming to be devoted to religion and philosophy should permit unscrupulous correspondents to convert their columns into a vehicle for the dissemination of most ignoble slanders concocted together for the gratification of private malice. A disgraceful letter (disgraceful for the journal that printed it) for the appearance of which, we hope that Colonel Bundy, the Editor of the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, then absent from the country, was not immediately responsible, directs a flood of foul calumny against the editors of the THEOSOPHIST. This tirade—which no gentleman, not even one with the weak instincts of a gentleman, could have ever written—is beneath notice as regards the details, as it is calculated to provoke, in a few, a sickening feeling of contempt for the writer and in all the rest—a homeric laugh. As it stands, however, it appears to be due to the revengeful hostility of a half-witted French woman, from the "far West," a would-be *medium* for "spirit photographs," who will never forgive the Theosophists for denying her the honour of being constantly surrounded by the late illustrious Bonaparte family in astral shape. The "facts in my possession" of which the writer so naively boasts, are mostly due to the second-hand information derived by him from that poor, deluded creature. The fact that he accuses us of *intemperance* and *connivance with Jesuits* will be enough in itself, in the eyes of every one who knows us, to determine the character of an attack concerning which we need say no more.

(Concluded from the last Number)

### THE WAR IN HEAVEN.

BY MIRZA MOORAD ALEE BEG, F.T.S.

I know very well that this characteristic difference has been accounted for on other and, so to speak, on more material\* grounds. It has been alleged in short that Northern Nations adopted a cold Hell, because cold was the greatest pain they knew of practically, and the Southern Nations *vice versa*. But independently of the consideration that some of the Aryans, whose opinions have been cited, certainly lived far enough South to understand the torment of summer sun-heat (the Greeks and the Indians—the sunshine, too, is said to be often most unpleasantly potent in Persia, Kabul, Tartary, and even parts of Russia) and that undoubtedly no one who was possessed of a "Fire-drill" could long remain ignorant of its painfully burning and disintegrating properties †, which are, I believe, more *evidently* capable of inflicting great torture than snow or ice, yet even allowing this to have colored the Anthropomorphic and Exoteric form of the legends, a little further prosecution of our inquiry will, I hope, convince the reader that such a fact (if fact it be) can only serve to still further increase our admiration for the intellectual grasp of the great pre-historic Sages, who could lay so skilfully under contribution conspicuous natural facts in order to convey, with the limited vocabulary and means we *know* they enjoyed at the period to which Antiquarian resource has as yet reached, and to the narrow comprehensions of the rude hunters and shepherds who surrounded them, (in ways suited to their understanding and

\* I am compelled to use the expression for want of a better, though I hate it, believing as I do, that the distinction of "Material" and "Spiritual" has no foundation in fact. Either *Everything* is "matter" or "*Everything*" Spirit, in whatever way we work out the Great Problem. "More solid" or "more physical" would be better, but unfortunately these words have been employed to convey other ideas.

† The first time he burnt his fingers!

ideas,) as much as was then practicable of the great Esoteric truths which their study of the Kosmic problems had discovered.

Notwithstanding all the above, however, there is one trace, and one only, of similarity in the Punishments of Satan and Prometheus. Both are to be afflicted with the agony of UNREST. The vulture is to tear the entrails of the Titan. The Elohite is to be tossed upon the never-ceasing waves and whirl-pools of a raging sea of fire. And, remembering the identity of the two, there is a striking "fitness" in both sentences. It is, so to speak, a legitimate conclusion that the "Fire-Producer" should burn in the conflagration of which himself was the origin, and that the conferrer of "thought"—of the "Knowledge of Good and Evil"—should feel the vulture of his *own* consciousness gnawing at his vitals.

But if such was the sentence of "Satan" that pronounced on his Adamite accomplices by Jahveh was "Death." In order to comprehend the Esoteric Verities locked up and allegorized, and nearly defaced by the time-honored but wholly erroneous interpretation of this portion of the anthropomorphised Eden-Legend so long put forth as the "Truth", we shall first have to take a flying glance at the signification of the word "Death" itself, and then consider its relations to the story of the "Thought" or "Fire"-spark.

Without going too far into a subject which is of itself one on which volumes might be indited, on which I have already touched in "No more Death," and to which I trust to return again, I think no one can deny that the word "Death" may be susceptible of two interpretations. It may be either taken as signifying what I personally understand by it—that is to say, an absolute annihilation, moral, physical, material and spiritual,\* of conscious existence and its elements alike—a Resolution into Negation—or it may be held to be that process which we see daily taking place before our eyes,—which I prefer to call "Dissolution" or "Disintegration", but which in the ordinary Christian view is accepted for the thing meant by "Death."

We must call Science to the help of Mythology, and Tradition, and Allegory before we can get any further in our speculation. Take a flint and steel, and strike them smartly together. Out springs a shower of sparks. Fire! Fire! You yourself are a Prometheus—a—excuse my indecorum—a Satan! Why? Because you acted the part of the "Adversary"—you "opposed" something Active to something Passive—the Energy of your individual Will to the Immovable "I AM" of the Stone. This is no joke—no quibble. Science says explicitly that the source of the sparks was the *heat* "developed by the impact of the steel against the stone." Motion arrested by RESISTANCE is resolved into Heat, and Heat is a corollary of LIGHT. And the microscopical pieces knocked off by the Impact of flint and steel went burning away until they were consumed in their *own heat*. You had "created" so many miniature Hells in which "Satan" (of course, the steel in your hand was the *true* allegorical Satan—the *immediate* Assailant of Immobility) was burning in the Fire produced by himself. But you will say there was no Original Energy—no *Initiative*, in the steel which collided with the flint—that the momentum or Energy which produced the Heat and Light generating impact was derived from *you*. Yes! And what was *your* Energy derived from? Without going into scientific details which would be out of place here, it is sufficient to appeal to the well-established fact that all known forms of *Life, Light and Motion*,—in other words all known Energy—on not only this earth but also every planet of the Solar system—are directly or indirectly produced by the action of the Sun. And what is the Sun himself? A great Sea of Fire—

\* Let the Reader remember that though for want of a better Vocabulary I use these words, I do not intend by them any *essential* difference in the States alluded to. The difference in the functions of the Kosmic "Things" is one of *Condition*, not of *Essence* or *Origin*—the difference between solid and extra gaseous matter, not that between "Matter" and "Spirit" as understood by the Christians.

an immense *Hell*—differing only in dimensions from the spark.\* And whence came *His* Energy? From the contraction of the Gaseous Nebulae which once filled our Universe, say the scientists. And what caused the intense Heat which had so dispersed the now congregated atoms? We cannot—we may not—say. But so much can be legitimately inferred by any intelligent student who reads the ordinary Science Manuals, that it must have still been some yet more remote and proportionately powerful form of Energy, of Momentum, of Struggle—still Friction producing the Fire-Spark—still the Impact of the Insurgent Satan striking out Light and Life by the fury of his collision with the *loyal, painless, happy, but unconscious* Immobility of the Jehovah.

Thus Life and Light are *identical*. And what a *radiance* is thus shed over hitherto inexplicable parts of the Bible, of the Vedas, of the Avesta, of the Eddas, at all of which Sceptics and Atheists have been accustomed to rail as paradoxes or forgeries. It was the *perverted and narrow interpretations*, and not the *Books themselves*, which were in fault. We wanted to bind down the metaphorical exuberance of the old Eastern sages to our own rigid, hair-splitting scientific nomenclature. Cannot the reader now see the true meaning of those curious passages in which Jehovah and the Serpent (personifying the Adversary) flatly contradict each other—the former saying to Adam†—“In the day thou eatest thereof (the Tree of Knowledge) thou shalt surely die”—and the latter telling Eve that the Elohim have deceived her and her husband—“Ye shall not surely die!”‡

Neither lied, for each referred to the *kind* of Death most repugnant to Him. The Representative of Static Inertia and Authority informed his creatures that the moment they, by the acquisition, of “knowledge,” should pass from his realm to that of his Adversary, they would become subject to the ceaseless series of dissolutions and re-constructions which were the very conditions of the kingdom of the “Adversary” *par excellence*. And, on the other hand, his Opponent to whom Death meant the annihilation of Individual Effort and the cessation of Motion and Variety, confident that in his own universe of change and struggle there was no such thing, assured the woman *with equal good faith* that “Death” certainly could not be entailed by the acquisition of Science. And we see also the Esoteric wisdom of the Christian Dogma that *he who would have Life should lose it and vice versa*.

But in the Jehovite sense the “Curse of Adam” was undoubtedly, “Death”—*i. e.*—the cessation of a continuous, passive, painless, but unconscious existence with Jehovah and the acquisition of a Consciousness which necessarily involved the *sensitive* unhappiness of a series of “dissolutions” and renewals. So also, in the historic phase of this great Truth, “Man” by the act of discovering fire, lost the state of happy but ignorant existence which he enjoyed along with the “Animals” while in harmony with, and submissive to, the Necessities of the Kosmic Life—and initiated himself with the first spark into the “Knowledge”, but at the same time into the struggles and permutations and misery of that Great Strife against the Passive Universe which we call vaguely and often erroneously “Civilization” and “Progress.” Verily the Bible is *after all right*, and the Tree of Knowledge was *not* the tree of Immortality, that is to say, of Continuous and Painless and Peaceful Existence.

Well says Jules Baissac and he is supported by the Arabian tradition of Azazel, that “Pride” was the “original sin” and that “saying, to equal God, § I AM, the individual entity and its affirmation of existence, a work of Satan, is a crime for which death is a debt and the sole expiation” and “Sin, it is the *Life* of this World.”¶

*This* then is the Mystery of the “War in Heaven”—of Satan against Yava; of Hormuzd and Ahriman; of Surya and Indra and Agni against the Clouds and the Darkness; of the Asa against the Rheim-Thursar and Loki; of the wars of the Gods and the Titans. Yet these are *not* only “Sun-Myths” as Max Müller and his followers would have us believe. They contain *really* portions of Pre-Historic History, but their incidents are the *vehicle* which the Initiated Wise Men of Old availed themselves of to convey the Scientific and Theosophic facts which they had “evolved” from their commune with “Nature” under circumstances which perhaps are no longer so favorable for us.

To sum up, Satan represents the *Active*, or as Baissac calls it, the “Centrifugal” Energy of the Universe—He is Fire, Light, Life,\* Struggle, Effort, Thought, Consciousness, Progress, Civilization, Liberty, Independence. At the same time he is *Pain*, which is the Reaction of the *Pleasure* of Action and *Death*,† which is the Revolution of *Life*—Satan burning in his own Hell, produced by the fury of his own momentum,—the expansive disintegration of the Nebula which is to concentrate into New Worlds. And fitly is he again and again baffled by the Eternal Inertia of the *Passive* Energy of the Kosmos—the Inexorable “I AM”—the Flint from which the sparks are beaten out. And fitly as regards our world are he and his adherents, whether EloHITE or ADAMITE, consigned to the “Sea of Fire”—because *it is* the SUN—the Font of Life in our system, where they are purified (meaning thereby disintegrated) and churned up to re-arrange them for another life (the Resurrection)‡—that *Sun*, which, as the Origin of the Active Principle of our Earth, is at once the *Home* and the *Source* of the Mundane Satan.

On the other hand, Science informs us that Cold, Darkness, Quiescence, and an *Absence* of Life (as we understand it) is the characteristic of Inertia. The dark Interstellar spaces of the Kosmos are known to be horribly cold. Furthermore, as if to demonstrate the accuracy of Baissac’s general theory, cold is known to have a “Centripetal” effect. Under the influence of Cold, everything contracts. It is, without any joking, an illustration of the “centralising” tendency of “Authority.” Under it Life *hibernates*, or dies out, Thought congeals, and Fire is extinguished. Satan is Immortal in his own Fire-Sea—it is only in the “Nif-Heim” of the “I AM” that he cannot exist. But for all that, there is a kind of *Immortal* Existence in Nif-Heim, and that Existence *must be Painless and Peaceful because it is Unconscious and Inactive*. In the kingdom of JEHOVAH there is no Misery, no War, no Marrying and Giving in Marriage—No Change—NO INDIVIDUAL CONSCIOUSNESS. All is absorbed in the spirit of the Most Powerful. *It is emphatically a Kingdom of Peace and Loyal Submission, as that of the “Arch-Rebel” is one of War and Revolution.*§

We must now return to human History in order to consider the bearing of these Truths on the Theology and Ethics of our own and past ages. In the peculiar constitution of the Shemitic mind, the causes of which I cannot detail in this article though I hope to revert to them on another occasion, the general tendency of races of that stock was to an exaggerated Reverence for Authority, and an exaggerated admiration of Passivity. Hence their universal proneness to Monotheism and the uniformity with which in their traditions, the Great Kosmos-struggle was made to result in the victory of the EloHITE represented by our Jehovah. In the course of historical “Selection” his allies were degraded to “Angels” and his Opponent and *his* friends to “The Devil” and “Imps.” Furthermore, the same process of “Selection”

\* That is to say, of life in the usual sense “the life of this world”—not of *Immortality* in the Jehovite sense of *continuous* Changeless Rest.

† In the sense of Dissolution and Re-organization.

‡ It must be remembered that the best Biblical modern critics regard the word defining the duration of “damnation” as *not* signifying unlimited but only “for a long period.”

§ It is in fact what Theosophy calls “Nirvun”. But then Theosophy teaches that separation from the Primal Source *having once occurred*, Re-union can only be achieved by WILL-EFFORT—which is distinctly Satanic in the sense of this essay. So the Bible testifies that “the Kingdom of Heaven is taken by violence.”

• Of course, here I do not refer to *Chemical* composition.

† Genesis II, 14.

‡ Genesis III, 4.

§ This must be understood to mean “Jehovah” the Universal Static Inertia personified.

¶ “Le Diable” p. 13.

wecded out the other "Elohim" who in other Shemite mythologies occupied the place of "Yava" in that which has come down to us, and sent them to swell the army of the "Adversary" as subordinate Demons. In the meantime, the "centralising" tendency of the Shemites had caused them to forget that both "Yava" and "Satan" were "Elohites," both alike the progeny of the Great "El"—the Father of the Gods,\*—and, in fact, to confuse "Jehovah" up with and allow him to supersede the latter—with all of whose primitive attributes they decked him. And the "Christians," far less clear-sighted than the Great Mystic and Liberator whose name they have assumed, whose doctrines they have misunderstood and travestied, and whose memory they have blackened by their deeds—took over the Jewish Jehovah as he was, and, of course, strove vainly to reconcile the "Gospel of Light and Liberty" with the Deity of Darkness and Submission.

But the followers of the defeated "Elohim," first massacred by the victorious Jews and then persecuted by the victorious Christians and Muhhumudans, continued in scattered, broken-up, and degraded sects—some of which have lost even the tradition of the true rationale of their belief—to worship in secrecy and mystery the Principle of Fire, Light, and Liberty. Why do the Sabeen Bedouins (avowedly Monotheists when dwelling in the Muhhumudan cities) in the solitude of the desert night yet invoke the starry "Host of Heaven"? Why do the Yezidis, the "Devil Worshipers," worship the "Muluk†—Taos"—"The Lord Peacock"—the emblem of *Pride* and of Hundred-eyed Intelligence which was expelled from Heaven with Satan according to an old Oriental tradition? Why do the Gholaites and their kindred Mesopotamo-Iranian Muhhumudan Sects believe in the "Noor Illahee"—"the Light of the Elohim"—transmitted in *anastasis* through a hundred Prophet-Leaders?‡ It is because they have continued, in ignorant superstition, the traditional religion of the "Light-Deities" whom Jahveh overthrew!

And it was from these faint scintillations of the Past that the "Wizards"—the Templars—the Rosicrucians—the Free-Masons—the *Illuminati* of Mediæval and Modern Europe obtained their mystic knowledge. "Ex Oriente, LUX." Those that had the Will—the followers of the *Active Energy*—could alone strike out sparks from the dark solidity of the I AM. What was the Rosy Cross but a policy—Christianized symbol of the Red Rosy beams of the Central Luminary smiting North, South, East and West the Darkness of the Universe? From whom did the traditional founders of Masonry get their secrets but from Hiram, the Phœnikian Ba-al Worshipper, who was obliged to practise with his *foreign* artisans, his "Light" worship in secret, while in the kingdom of the Jehovist Israelites? And to what Grand Central Principle is it that our "Scientists" are groping back?

It was *not* for nothing that the Catholic and Protestant clergy burnt the "Wizards" and "Adepts" of the Middle Ages—their instinct told them truly that these were enemies of the God of Darkness and Authority, and Inertia they themselves served—worshippers of "Satan" to slay whom was doing a service to the Jewish Jehovah of a corrupted Pseudo-Christianity. §

And thus it is that owing to the primitive Shemite divorce of "God" from "Nature", by the supersession of "Ba-al" by "Jehovah" and the antagonism of the latter to "Satan," and by the Christian adoption of the Jewish Deity as that of "Orthodoxy", the modern world has been overspread by a net-work of theological and ethical

ideas, which influences even those who profess themselves *Deists and Atheists*—the tendency of which is to the utter proscription of all forms of Individuality—which has reduced Art to a decorous non-entity and made Liberty a crime—which has pronounced Mirth "frivolous" and Pleasure "sinful"—which has transformed the most simple-natural impulses into "damnable" transgressions and hard-hearted severity into "proper discipline"—which has anathematised the "Life" of this world and made *purposeless*\* asceticism the highest good, until the earth is taking the dead level of a desert-prison †—which has denounced Truth as "indecent" and made systematised, Hypocrisy a praise-worthy object of endeavor—of which in short, the latest *barbarity* is the *judicial* murder of men whose only crime is that of resisting an invader and whose latest and crowning *absurdity* was the Pharisaiacal raid at Umballa by the Indian Government on a lottery in which, no doubt, many of the Officials composing that Government, had, themselves, taken tickets !!!

There could be no more fitting deeds to crown the edifice. Well was it said by the Revolutionists of 1791 that "wherever there is a priest he will always be found in league with a tyrant—" at least it always will be so as long as they are priests of JEHOVAH,—of the Principle to whom Self-Assertion is a crime, and Thought and Light odious—whose *raison d'être* is to *control* (and by consequence meddle in) every thing "for the good" of every thing—in short, to reduce the Universe to a Dark, *Painless* and Uniform, but *Unconscious* and Motionless Mass.

Yes! There has been the Mistake of Centuries—there is the Mistake of this Day. We have forgotten that Jehovah and Satan are both Elohim—both "Sons" or Emanations of the Primeval "El,"—the "Brahm" of the Hindoos,—from whom in the Abysses of the Zurooana Akarana—the "Boundless Time and Space" of the Parsees,—proceeded both Hoormuzd and Ahriman. In the Universe both principles are necessary—both useful—neither can be called "Evil" in the vitiated Christian sense—each is the necessary complement of Visible Kosmic Existence, but of the two, no doubt, that of Fire and Light has, for obvious reasons, more pleasant and, so to speak,—*good*—relations with the ordinary every-day "Life of Mundane Beings." Satan is the "God of this world!"

And yet this is the Principle we have been denouncing as "bad" and "devilish" so many thousand years. No wonder that we have made ourselves, and the Earth too, base, wretched and miserable—no wonder Mirth dies, Truth vanishes, and Tyranny reigns supreme. We shall never be more happy till we acknowledge the necessity of *both* the Static Inertia and the Active Energy—that Jehovah and Satan are only brothers, struggling in a pleasant love-wrestle of exercise, the outcome of which is the Visible Universe—not mortal enemies striving to destroy each other—till we have once more acknowledged the identity of "God" with "Nature" which originally existed, and admitted that, on earth, Struggle and Individualism are at least as Praiseworthy as Passivity and Unity—Effort and Resistance as little abhorrent—as little "*bad*"—as Quiescence and Submission.

And here I must end my article. There are many other branches of the subject into which I was repeatedly in danger of digressing. Some of these, if the foregoing pages prove interesting to the Reader, I hope to go into at some subsequent period. Such are—Why Prometheus, instead of being punished by *fire*, like Satan, was punished by *cold*? Why the Shemites had a leaning to Monotheism, and why in developing it, they selected the Dark or Passive Energy as the Victor-God? These and other questions I intend to treat of in an article on "The Difference of the Root-Ideas

\* The "Middle" Bible is particularly hard on the "Ba-al" worshippers.

† "Mahuk (Ruler)"—which in its various spellings and pronunciations of Moloch, Melek, Molech, Malayak &c, (angel-Hebrew)—was indiscriminately applied by different Shemite races at various epochs to Gods, Kings, and Angels.

‡ It is *this* which the Khojas believe to reside in Aga Khan's family.

§ I trust to be able to show in another article that what is called "Christianity" is not, and never was—the religion of *Christ*. Rightly understood, every word of the Gospels, even mutilated and interpolated as they are proves it. Jesus worshipped Baal—not Jehovah.

\* I say *purposeless*, because Theosophic or Aryan asceticism bears a different Rationale.

† Europeans—why do you wear black hats and dull-coloured clothes, while the Brahm and "El" worshippers like gay and pretty colors? It is because you are Jehovah worshippers. You may laugh at this, but I beg you to remember that in Dr. Brainly's recent researches into Color Blindness he finds it most prevalent among Jews and Quakers—typically Jehovite Sects. This is at least suggestive. The Wahabees also (the most Jehovite of Mussulman sects) affect  *sombre* hues in general.



of the Aryan and Shemite Religions." Then there is the interesting inquiry into the connexion of Satan or Prometheus with the "Old Dragon" or "Serpent," and of the Morning and the Evening Star with Ishtar, the Moon, and Venus, Queen of Love.

In conclusion, I must admit my obligations to two writers who have already gone over much of the ground covered in this article and from whom I have received material assistance. I allude to Lord Byron's "Cain" and Jules Baissac's "Devil." The former, considering the materials which were available when it was written to elucidate the question, is a superb rendering of much here advanced, and no one who reads it after perusing this article, can, I think, fail to render homage to rondrous poetic intuition under difficulties, but as might be expected from the want of data to decide on, and from the bent of the author's mind, he brings the questions raised to no clear logical issue and leaves the reader, as he himself was—"Sceptical"—neither Christian nor Rationalist. Jules Baissac, aided by our modern discoveries and initiation into Eastern Lore, goes further towards the solution of the Problem, but his conclusion is the utterance of a Half-Truth. With his eyesight still dimmed by Christian prejudice, he does not recognize the *Historical Transposition* of Evil and Good and ends in a glorification of "Centripetal" Unity and the Philosophy of Sacrifice. I feel bold enough to think the unprejudiced reader—*Christians* are hopeless cases—will allow I have supplemented and completed the one-sidedness of his theory—I try to demonstrate a Philosophy of Sacrifice too—but also one of Struggle as a corollary of sacrifice.

#### "WE WILL NOT QUARREL BUT SIMPLY ARGUE."

Our much respected contemporary *Light* has taken us quite unexpectedly to task. Turning a sentence of ours—the one which heads the present protest—into a weapon, it gives us a friendly rap of warning with it on the head, admonishing us in the following wise:—

"WE WILL NOT QUARREL—BUT SIMPLY ARGUE," says Madame Blavatsky in the September number of the *Theosophist*. Yet on another page of the same number we find the following strange announcement:—"The proprietors of the *Theosophist* are preparing to publish a large work, unique in its kind, save perhaps Wagner's 'Dictionary of faulty arguments and abuse, by his musical critics.' They have been collecting for over six years materials for the publication of a *Synopsis*, arranged alphabetically, and which will contain all the rude and abusive expressions, all the slanderous and even libellous sentences, Billingsgate phraseology, pious fibs, malicious insinuations, and glaring untruths coupled with the term 'Theosophy' in general, and directed against the two Founders of the Society especially, as found printed in missionary and other Christian organs, since January 1, 1876, till January, 1882. In each deprecatory sentence the name of the paper and the date will be scrupulously and correctly stated." With all due deference to the proprietors of the *Theosophist*, we venture the suggestion that they are making a sad mistake—that the course they threaten to adopt is very much like "quarrelling" and very little like "simply arguing." It is, moreover, a great waste of energy which might be directed to a better purpose. And it is vulgar! In the pursuit of truth it is conscious rectitude, self-possession and dignity, that command attention and respect.

In our turn "with all due deference and sincere esteem" for the opinions of the able conductors of "*Light*," while admitting the justice of a portion of the remarks above quoted, we most emphatically protest against some of the remainder. It would perhaps, be "a sad mistake" to carry out the publication of the "*Synopsis*" as proposed, *le jeu ne valant pas la chandelle*, so far as time and energy are concerned, and which, indeed, might be applied to better purpose. But we most strongly object to the course, we proposed, being called "vulgar," or, if we did carry it out—that it would be "very much like quarrelling" and very little like "simply arguing." It would be neither, as it takes two to quarrel. The publication of a *Synopsis* containing the abusive terms and slanderous statements that have been used about the Theosophists without any comment from them, would be no more

"like quarrelling" than the compilation of a dictionary or glossary. Nor can the simple act of publishing an historic record of the opinions that have been circulated against us, in any sense be regarded as "vulgar," howsoever "vulgar" may be found the contents of the record itself—"the rude and abusive expressions," the "slanderous and libellous sentences," the "malicious insinuations, pious fibs" &c., &c. It might be characterized as "wicked," "uncharitable," "vengeful"—and we would have accepted any of these terms without protest—but as well might the publication of the Books of the Prophets—Hosea especially—or the reverend Revisers of the Holy Bible be termed "vulgar" for publishing textually the old Pentateuch full, as it is, of sentences couched in the most indecent language. It is surprising that such an able and well-conducted paper as "*Light*" should be found tripping in its logic, even through its exaggerated ideas of charity and forgiveness.

#### WHAT IS A "FACT?"

Once fairly started on a friendly discussion—not "quarrelling," we hope—with *Light*, we may just as well set matters right regarding another topic, about which, it seems to us to use a rather faulty argument. Remark- ing in another paragraph that it desires to treat its "friends, the Theosophists perfectly fairly, and to give them the fullest credit for honesty and sincerity of purpose" it adds—"Spiritualism, we say, *is* a fact. Theosophy, we also say, *may be* a fact for aught we know, but at present we are without sufficient proof."

Now to this we must take exception. We find ourselves forced to reply as follows:—Either both Spiritualism and Theosophy are "facts" or—neither. For how is either of them "a fact" except through its respective votaries? As an existing and, we may say, an effective organization, a society,—Theosophy is as much of a "fact" as Spiritualism is, and certainly no less so than any of the established recognized bodies, and sects, whether they be in the domain of philosophy or religion. As regards phenomena produced—limited to a very small fraction of our Society—the manifestations stand, or fall along with those of the Spiritualists. We may suppose then, that, when asserting Spiritualism to be a "fact," the writer had in his mind the "Spiritual" manifestations or rather the agency, the disembodied intelligences claimed to be at work in their production? If so, then once again *Light* used an incorrect, or we should say, an incomplete expression. For, if the theory of communicating "spirits" is an undeniable axiom for Spiritualists, it is yet an open question—or oftener—positive delusion in the eyes of the majority of non-Spiritualists, and sceptics. Moreover, the manifestations which even to the Theosophists are a truth, are considered illusory and impossible to a much more larger portion of the people in the world. Again we, the theosophists, though accepting the phenomena as a fact, refuse to accept it as a "fact" that such manifestations are produced only by the spirits of persons deceased. As with Spiritualism, so with the Occultism of Theosophists; to some persons it is a fact, and to others it is not. Spiritualism and Theosophy are both forms of belief, and nothing more: inasmuch as there are persons who believe in them, they are both facts. In the same way Christians, Brahmans, and Mahomedans are an existing fact, while neither Christianity, nor Brahmanism, nor Mahomedanism are "facts" *per se*, or for those who are opposed to these creeds. The divine inspiration of Mahomed and his direct communion with Allah is an undeniable "fact" for about 300 millions of the followers of the Prophet, but is rejected as the grossest error and imposture by as many Christians. The phenomena of the Spiritualists being a genuine proven, incontrovertible reality—whether many or few believe in it—so far the "facts" of Spiritualism have a far better claim to acceptance than those of dogmatic Christianity or of any other creed, based exclusively on blind faith. Their personal views, however, the orthodox theories

regarding "spirits" being not a matter of fact but of opinion and simply a belief, they can no more claim to be regarded as a "fact" than any other emotional belief. If the physical senses, intellect and reason of the Spiritualists testify to them that "Spirits" are at work in their phenomena, the physical senses, intellect and reason of the Occultists testify to them, in their turn, that the subjective world outside and around us containing a great variety of *non-human* intelligences, and beings, more associated with humanity than Materialism, Positivism and even Spiritualism, will ever consent to admit—most of these manifestations are produced by Forces and Powers quite outside and beyond the calculations of the orthodox Spiritualist. In so far as the existence of higher, pure Spirits outside of our sphere of physical senses is concerned, the Theosophists and Spiritualists agree. But they entirely disagree in their respective theories regarding the nature and cause of the so-called "communicating intelligences." Our friends, the Spiritualists, who are visited by them, are pleased to call the latter the spirits of deceased persons; and, notwithstanding their contradictory statements, they believe what these "spirits" tell them and regard it as a revelation and a "fact." Our mystics are visited by what every one of them knows to be living men of flesh and blood, whose wisdom can scarcely be denied (even by those who disbelieve in their powers), and who tell us quite a different tale of the weird visitors of the Spiritualists from that given by the "spirits" themselves at their sances. The assertions of the "spirits" and "Brothers," however, are, and can be accepted as "facts" by only their respective believers. No one would ever think of offering these assertions to the world as something mathematically demonstrated. Spiritualists and Theosophists may dispute interminably without convincing each other, and the facts of one will probably for ever continue a delusion in the eyes of the other. Alleged gods—Avatars and Incarnations—have descended from time to time on earth, and every word they uttered remained a fact and a gospel truth for those who believed in them. Yet these dogmatic utterances have made their respective votaries neither happier, better, nor wiser. Quite the contrary; for they have often proved conducive of strife and misery, of fratricidal wars, and of interminable crimes due to fanaticism and bigotry. Men naturally disagree on most subjects, and we cannot hope to force others to accept as facts the things that appear so to us. But what we can do is, to show more mutual tolerance and abstain from dogmatism and bigotry as there is too much of it already outside of our two unpopular and equally talcoed systems. One undeniable fact exists on earth; a sad, a tacitly and universally recognized yet as universally ignored "Fact," namely—that MAN is man's worst enemy. Born helpless, ignorant, and doomed to a life-long struggle through that ignorance, surrounded by intellectual darkness which no amount of scientific or spiritual research can entirely dispel, instead of helping each other in that life-struggle, one half of humanity is ever striving to create obstacles, over which the other half may trip, stumble and even break its neck, if possible. Were we wise, instead of boasting of our partial knowledge, we ought to unite and act on the principle common to the Books of Wisdom of all nations; on the sublime precept taught by all sages; by Manu, Confucius and Buddha alike, and finally copied into the Christian Gospels: "as ye would that men would do to you, do ye also to them." Time alone will show who of us is right, and who wrong, in the matter of Spiritualism; or, perchance, the great problem might be docted for ever to remain unsolved for the majority, while the minority will go on explaining it, each according to its lights and understanding. Still, instead of abusing and endeavouring to annihilate each other, as Protestants and Roman Catholics do on account of their faiths, we ought to confine ourselves to a correct presentation of our facts and of the theories we found on them, allowing every one to accept or reject what he pleases and quarrel with no one on that account. This is the position, we, of the Theosophi-

cal Society, composed of so many different creeds and beliefs, have always desired to take. In our turn—firmly convinced of "the honesty and sincerity of purpose" of the Spiritualists, if the THEOSOPHIST has occasionally derided some of their too tricky mediums, it has ever, on the other hand, defended those it knew to be genuine; and the journal has never insulted or tabcoed their whole body, as the Spiritualists have our Society. Some of our best and most devoted members are Spiritualists, and very prominent ones, who have ever been the best friends and supporters of the movement. This has not prevented the London *Spiritualist* (see every weekly number since the beginning of last July) from denouncing, mocking, laughing and allowing its contributors to revile us individually and collectively. We need not mention the American so-called "Spiritual" organs in this connection. They, with the single exception of the *Banner of Light*, have been throwing every impermissible missile at us for the last seven years. From its beginning the THEOSOPHIST, if it has not always advocated, has, at least, warmly defended, Spiritualism, as a careful perusal of its back numbers will show. It has defended it from the attacks of Science, of Journalism, and against the denunciations of private individuals, while the *Spiritualist* has never lost an opportunity of caricaturing us. With Spiritualists as a body, we have never quarrelled, nor do we ever mean to quarrel. Let our esteemed contemporary *Light* give credit for so much at least to those who profess themselves the enemies but of BIGOTS, HYPOCRITES AND PHARISEES.

## HAZY NOTIONS.

### Enter Ghost.

*Hamlet*....." Ministers of grace, defend us!  
Be thou a spirit of health, or goblin damn'd  
Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell,  
.....  
Thou comest in such a questionable shape  
That I will speak to thee.....

The *Sunday Mirror* honours us with a direct notice. The Calcutta organ of piety, generally so contemptuous and reserved, actually begins to show signs of interest for its humble contemporary and—speaks to it. Our star is evidently in its ascendancy. Let not pride overwhelm our better feelings, but may our prayers reach Saraswati, the sweet goddess of wisdom, to inspire us in the answers we shall have to give to our stern cross-examining critic.

"Our notions about the Theosophists are so hazy that we feel a diffidence in pronouncing upon the merits of the system which they have come to preach."

We read in the *Mirror* of November 20. To feel "a diffidence in pronouncing upon the merits" of a system, with notions about it confessedly "hazy," shows wisdom and betokens prudence. Nevertheless, the *Mirror* "notes" two facts about us. They believe—it says—(meaning the Theosophical culprits)

"They believe in the Hindu *yoga*, and they proclaim themselves to be Buddhists. It is related that they gave themselves out as such before the Madras people who had mistaken them for Hindus."

Oh foolish Madrassces! However, the Theosophists, who do "believe" in *Yoga* "must surely be ubiquitous." To give one's self out as one thing or the other, in a place where one has never been, is a feat of which even the Theosophists might well be proud. Let it be understood that when we say—"Theosophists"—we but answer the secret thought of the estimable *Mirror* painting itself under that generic name the two humble founders of the Society, but for reasons best known to itself, avoiding to specify them by name. Well if so, neither Colonel Olcott nor Madame Blavatsky ever graced yet by their presence Madras, the former having gone no further than Tinnevely, and the latter having trod the shores of the Southern Coast for the last time some twenty-three years back. There might have been in Madras hundreds of Theosophists for all we know, who

"proclaimed" themselves—but what they were: natural-born Buddhists from Ceylon or Burmah. So much the worse for Dravidean perspicacity if they were "mistaken for Hindus." We are inclined though to regard the accusation as a wicked slur upon the Madrasses' mental capacities, because, perhaps, of our Southern Brothers showing themselves rather slow in the appreciation of the New Dispensation missionaries.

However it may be, further on the S. M. is more explicit and even becomes authoritative.

"Now what we wish to know about them is this" it declares—"What is the creed which they profess? Buddhism is accepted in various ways by scholars. Its morality is admired by many, while its directly godless character is commended by agnostics. We contemplate the founder of Buddhism as the revealer of a particular idea to his countrymen, and in that way include him in the rolls of the world's great prophets. Now if the Theosophists are Buddhists in what sense are they such? They cannot be simply contented with the morality of Sakya Muni, since the very same morality they have in the religion of their own countries.\* Nor are they probably inclined to view him in the way the New Dispensation does † Are they then agnostics in an old Buddhistic dress ‡ The Theological position of Buddhism is not yet clearly ascertained. § Mr. Rhys Davids assigns, we think, in one of his latest works, a purely atheistic conception to the system. Do the theosophists belong to that class of thinkers?"

A direct plainly-put question demands as direct and plain an answer. Unfortunately, with all our good-will and sincere desire to satisfy our esteemed contemporary's curiosity (and very laudable it is) we are placed in a very awkward position. It is that of an inhabitant of the earth who would find himself suddenly apostrophized by—say a citizen of the moon meteorically fallen from that luminary. "Oh, child of a strange planet," might say the latter to the former, "a learned astronomer from our satellite tells us that there are living animals on your earth, which notwithstanding their great variety are all called men and who deny an atmosphere to our planet. Do the like of you belong to that class of beings?" What could man answer to such a question? There would be no more denying of his being a "living animal" called *man*, than there is of our being "Theosophists;" while his ideas might be as diametrically opposed to those of his fellow-beings who deny an atmosphere to fair Luna, as the views and creed of some Theosophists are opposed to the views and creeds of other Theosophists. The members of our Society may be reckoned by thousands and their respective religions, sects and various philosophies, by hundreds. When, therefore, any one desires to learn to what religion or systems belongs this or that one of our Brotherhood, the least he could do would be to specify that particular individual by his or her name.

To afford, however, some slight consolation to our Calcutta contemporary we will take it into our confidence, and unbosom ourself, of a great secret. Colonel Oleott is a thorough-going, genuine Buddhist—though not of the "prayer-wheel turning," kind; while his humble corresponding Secretary, Madame Blavatsky is—what she is: her religious—or if the *Mirror* so prefers it—irreligious views forming part of her private property, with which the public has not the slightest concern. As to the Society in general, or rather its members, they are bound to respect the religion of everybody; never to attack any system *per se*, nor yet any religionist who keeps his faith sacredly locked up within his own heart, abstaining from waving it into the public's face like a red rag before a bull, or flinging it into the teeth of all those he meets with; at the same time, it is our bounden duty and pleasure to oppose harsh-voiced bigotry, religious intolerance, sectarian prejudice and arrogance whenever, and in whatever religion we find it; from the oldest "Dispensation"—downward.

\* Not quite "the very same" (morality).

† Oh, heavens—no!

‡ No; but some of us may be "agnostics in a new Theosophical dress"

§ Alas! as little ascertained and as "hazy" as the *Sunday Mirror's* notions about Theosophy.—*Ed. Theos.*

(Continued from the last number.)

## ANTIQUITY OF THE VEDAS.

BY KRISHNA SHASTRI GODBOLE.

*Mr. Bentley's Speculations.*

21. We shall now endeavour to find out the precise period of time when the months received their present names. As is well known, the names of the months are derived from the asterisms in which the Moon became full; and we have to see at which time all the months had their full moons in the asterisms which give them their names. Mr. Bentley has partially considered this subject in his "Historical View of the Hindu Astronomy." At pages 6-8 he says thus:—

"It now remains to be explained the principle on which the months were formed and named, and the time to which they refer. I have already observed, that the Lunar Mansions were fabled by the Hindu poets to have been married to the Moon, and that the first offspring of that poetic union were four of the planets (Mercury, from Rohini called Rohineya; Venus, from Maghâ, called Maghâbhû; Mars, from Ashâdâ, called Ashâdâbhava; and Jupiter, from Pûrva Phalgunî, called Pûrva Phalgunî bhava).\* In a like manner, the Hindu poets feign, that the twelve months sprang from the same union, each month deriving its name, in the form of a patronymic, from the Lunar Mansions in which the Moon was supposed to be full at the time."

"Let us, therefore, in the case before us, apply this principle. At the above epoch 1181 B. C., the Sun and the Moon were in conjunction at the winter solstice; and as the months began when the Sun entered the signs, the first month, therefore, began at the winter solstice. Now to find the name of that month, the Moon would be full at about 14½ days after the winter solstice, and would then be in the opposite part of the heavens to the Sun. The Sun would have advanced in 14½ days about 14°½, and, therefore, would have entered the second Lunar Asterism Śatabhishâ; a line drawn from the point in which the Sun is thus situated, through the centre, would fall into the Lunar Asterism Maghâ, in which the Moon was full, on the opposite side; and consequently, on the principle stated, the solar month was from thence called Māgha, in the form of a patronymic. At the next full, the Moon would be in Uttara Phalgunî, and the solar month from thence called Phālguna; and on this principle were all the months of the year named."

"On the principle above stated, though the Moon has been introduced by way of explanation, it is not at all necessary. All that is requisite to be understood is, that a line drawn from some part of the Lunar Mansion, through the centre, must fall into some part of that month to which it gives name, otherwise it does not answer the condition requisite. Hence, it is very easy to demonstrate the utmost possible antiquity of the time, when the months were, or could be, so named: for there are certain limits beyond which the line cannot be drawn; and these are the termination of the Lunar Mansion and the commencement of the solar month, which determine the time; because it points out the commencement of the solar month in respect of the fixed stars at the time. Thus, at the time of the above observations, the summer solstitial point was found in the middle of the Lunar Asterism Āśleshâ, and the solar month Śrāvaṇa then began; for, in the ancient astronomy of the Hindus that month always began at the summer solstice. Now the month Śrāvaṇa derives its name from the Lunar Asterism Śrāvaṇa (the 27th, commencing with Dhanishlā), then in the opposite part of the heavens. Let, therefore, a line be drawn from the solstitial point, or commencement of the month, cutting the centre, and it will fall into the very end of the Lunar Asterism Śrāvaṇa

\* They are supposed to be occultations, because they are not made in the time of a single revolution of the Moon, but take in the space of about sixteen months, from 19th August 1425 to 19th April 1424 B. C.; and this idea of the observations being confined to occultations, is supported by Saturn not being included, because that planet was then out of the Moon's course.' (Vide page 3 of the same.)

from which it derives its name Śrāvāna; which line is, therefore, at its utmost limit, as it cannot go farther without falling into a mansion of a very different name. This position of the line, therefore, proves that the months received their names at the time of the above observations, and not before. For, if we wish to make it more ancient, let the solstitial point be supposed more advanced in respect of the fixed stars, say one, two, or three degrees, then a line drawn from the solstitial point or commencement of the month Śrāvāna, cannot fall into any part of the Lunar Asterism Śrāvāna, from which it derives its name, but into Śravishṭhā (the 1st). Therefore, the name which it possesses, could never be given to it till the solstitial point and commencement of the month actually coincided with the middle of the Lunar Asterism Āśleshā (the 14th), being the same with the observation which refers us to the year 1181 B. C.; and this is the utmost antiquity of the formation and naming of the Hindu months, from which a very useful inference may be drawn, which is that no Hindu writer, or book that mentions the names of the Hindu months can possibly be older than this period, let its pretensions to antiquity be ever so great."

This extract has also been noticed by Professor Max Müller in his Preface to Rigveda-samhitā, Vol. IV. (page XXXVI-XXXVII). Let us now examine it critically. Mr. Bentley along with others who have treated upon this subject, admits that each month derived, or ought to have derived its name from the lunar mansions in which the moon was full at the time. On this principle about the period noticed by Mr. Bentley, not only the first two months, but also the third month, can be proved to have in their middle, or on the 15th or Pūrṇimā, the Moon full in the asterisms Maghā, Uttara Phalgunī, and Chitrā respectively. But the weakness of his argument is shown by the fact that all the twelve months in order have not in their middle or on the 15th, the moon full in the asterisms from which they get their names, if the period be fixed so late as 1181 B. C. For, in the next two months (or the 4th and 5th) the Moon was full not in the asterisms Viśākhā and Jyeshṭhā, but in Anurādhā and Mūla, and hence these two months could not have been named at the time of the observation in 1181 B. C. Again, when Mr. Bentley begins to apply this principle to the month of the summer solstice which then coincided with the middle of Āśleshā, he overlooks the position of the Moon altogether; for, from verses 9 and 10 of the Śesha Jyotisha which contain the observation in question, we see that the day on which the summer solstice occurred was the 7th, and not the 15th, of Śrāvāna, when the Moon was in Chitrā and not in Śrāvāna; and hence the month could not have then derived its name from the asterism. The Jyotisha to which Mr. Bentley had access, contains distinct verses which enable every one to find out the places of the Sun and the Moon on the 1st and 15th, that is, at the commencement and middle of each lunar month in the cycle of five years. In a cycle which contains 62 lunar months, the Sun makes five revolutions through the 27 asterisms, and the Moon sixty-seven (*vide* para 18); the Sun's motion in half a lunation is hence  $\frac{27 \times 5}{124} = 1 \frac{11}{124}$

asterism = 1 ast. 11 lavas, supposing an asterism to contain 124 lavas; and the Moon's motion in half a lunation is  $\frac{27 \times 67}{124} = 14 \text{ ast. } 73 \text{ lavas.}$  According to verse

6 of the Śesha Jyotisha (see para 9), the Sun and the Moon were together in the beginning of the asterism Śravishṭhā on the first of the bright half of Māgha (January-February), and they were in consequence on the fifteenth of the same month in 11 lavas of Satabhishā and 73 lavas of Maghā respectively, and on the first of Phālguna, viz., 15 lunar days after, they both were together in 22 lavas of Pūrva Bhādrapadā. In this way the following table showing the positions of the Sun and the Moon in the beginning and in the middle of each lunation during a cycle of five years can be prepared.

N. B.-- When the asterism on the 15th or full-moon day is a patronymic of the month, it is then marked with R.

Months.	I Samvatsara.		II Parivatsara.	
	The sun in	The moon in	The sun in	The moon in
Māgha 1	lav.	lav.	lav.	lav.
15	0 Dhanish	0 Dhanish	16 Śrāvāna.	16 Śrāvāna.
	11 Satabhishā.	73 Maghā R.	27 Dhanishṭhā.	89 Āśleshā.
Phālg. 1	22 P. Bhādrapadā.	22 P. Bhādrapadā.	38 Satabhishā.	38 Satabhishā.
15	33 U. Bhādrapadā.	95 U. Phalgunī R.	49 P. Bhādra.	111 P. Phalgunī R.
Chaitra. 1	44 Revati.	44 Revati	60 U. Bhādra.	60 U. Bhādrapadā.
15	55 Āsvini.	117 Chitrā R.	71 Revati.	9 Chitrā R.
Vaiśākh. 1	66 Bharani.	66 Bharani	82 Āsvini.	82 Āsvini.
15	77 Kṛittikā	15 Anurādhā.	93 Bharani.	31 Viśākhā R.
Jyesh. 1	88 Rohini.	88 Rohini.	104 Kṛittikā.	104 Kṛittikā
15	99 Mṛiga.	37 Mūla.	115 Rohini.	53 Jyeshṭhā R.
Āshādh. 1	110 Ārdra.	110 Ārdra.	2 Ārdra.	2 Ārdra.
15	121 Punarv.	59 U. Āshādhā R.	13 Punarvasu.	75 P. Āshādhā R.
Śrāvāna 1	8 Āśleshā	8 Āśleshā.	24 Pushya.	24 Pushya.
15	19 Maghā.	81 Dhanish.	35 Āśleshā.	97 Śrāvāna R.
Bhādra 1	30 P. Phālg.	30 P. Phālg.	46 Maghā.	46 Maghā.
15	41 U. Phālg.	103 P. Bhādrapadā R.	57 P. Phalgunī	119 Satabhishā.
Āsvina 1	52 Hasta.	52 Hasta.	68 U. Phalgunī	68 U. Phalgunī.
15	63 Chitrā.	1 Āsvini R.	79 Hasta.	17 Revati.
Kārttik. 1	74 Svāti.	74 Svāti.	90 Chitrā.	90 Chitrā.
15	85 Viśākhā	23 Kṛittikā R.	101 Svāti.	39 Bharani.
Mārga 1	96 Anurādhā.	96 Anurādhā.	112 Viśākhā.	112 Viśākhā.
15	107 Jyeshṭhā	45 Mṛiga R.	123 Anurādhā.	61 Rohini.
Paush 1	118 Mūla.	118 Mūla.	10 Mūla.	10 Mūla.
15	5 U. Āshādhā.	67 Punar.	21 P. Āshādhā	83 Ārdra.
Months.	III Idvatsara.		IV Anuvatsara.	
	The sun in	The moon in	The sun in	The moon in
Māgha 1	lav.	lav.	lav.	lav.
15	32 U. Āshādhā	32 U. Āshādhā.	70 Śrāvāna.	70 Śrāvāna.
Phālg. 1	43 Śrāvāna	105 Pushya.	81 Dhanishṭhā	19 Maghā R.
15	54 Dhanish	54 Dhanish.	92 Satabhishā.	92 Satabhishā.
Chaitra. 1	65 Satabhishā	3 P. Phalgunī R.	103 P. Bhādrapadā.	41 U. Phalgunī R.
15	76 P. Bhādra	76 P. Bhādrapadā.	114 U. Bhādrapadā.	114 U. Bhādrapadā.
Vaiśākh. 1	87 U. Bhādrapadā.	25 Hasta.	1 Āsvini.	63 Chitrā R.
15	98 Revati	98 Revati.	12 Bharani.	12 Bharani.
Jyeshṭhā 1	109 Āsvini	47 Svāti.	23 Kṛittikā.	85 Viśākhā R.
15	120 Bharani	120 Bharani.	34 Rohini.	34 Rohini.
Āshādhā 1	7 Rohini.	69 Anurādhā.	45 Mṛigaśr.	107 Jyeshṭhā R.
15	18 Mṛiga	18 Mṛiga.	56 Ārdra.	56 Ārdra.
1 Śrāvāna 1	29 Ārdra	91 Mūla.	67 Punarvasu.	5 U. Āshādhā R.
15	40 Punarv.	40 Punarva		
11 Śrāvāna 1	51 Pushya.	113 U. Āshādhā.		
15	62 Āśleshā	62 Āśleshā.	78 Pushya.	78 Pushya.
Bhādra. 1	73 Maghā.	11 Satabhi.	89 Āśleshā.	27 Dhanishṭhā.
15	84 P. Phalgunī.	84 P. Phalgunī.	100 Maghā.	100 Maghā.
Āsvina. 1	95 U. Phalgunī.	33 U. Bhādrapadā R.	111 P. Phalgunī.	49 P. Bhādrapadā R.
15	106 Hasta	106 Hasta.	122 U. Phalgunī.	122 U. Phalgunī.
Kārttika 1	117 Chitrā.	55 Āsvini R.	9 Chitrā.	71 Revati.
15	4 Viśākhā	4 Viśākhā	20 Svāti.	20 Svāti.
Mārga. 1	15 Anurādhā.	77 Kṛittikā R.	31 Viśākhā.	93 Bharani.
15	26 Jyeshṭhā.	26 Jyeshṭhā.	42 Anurādhā.	42 Anurādhā.
Pausha. 1	37 Mūla.	99 Mṛiga R.	53 Jyeshṭhā.	115 Rohini.
15	48 P. Āshādhā.	48 P. Āshādhā.	64 Mūla.	64 Mūla.
15	59 U. Āshādhā.	121 Punarvasu.	75 P. Āshādhā.	13 Punarvasu.

Months,	V Idvatsara.	
	The sun in	The moon in
Māgha	1 lav. 86 U. Āshādhā.	lav. 86 U. Āshādhā.
	15 97 Śrāvāṇa.	35 Āśleshā.
Phālg.	1 108 D h a - nishthā.	108 D h a - nishthā.
	15 119 Śatabhishā.	57 P. Phalguni R.
Chaitra	1 6 U. Bhādrapadā.	6 U. Bhādrapadā.
	15 17 Revati.	79 Hasta.
Vaiśākha	1 28 Āsvini.	23 Āsvini.
	15 39 Bharani.	101 Svāti.
Jyeshthā	1 50 Kṛttikā.	50 Kṛttikā.
	15 61 Rohiṇi.	123 Anurādhā.
Āshādhā	1 72 Mṛigaśirsha.	72 Mṛigaśirsha.
	15 83 Ārdra.	21 P. Āshādhā R.
Śrāvāṇa	1 94 Punarvasu.	94 Punarvasu.
	15 105 Pushya.	43 Śrāvāṇa R.
Bhādra.	1 116 Āśleshā.	116 Āśleshā.
	15 3 P. Phalguni.	65 Śatabhishā.
Āśvina	1 14 U. Phalguni.	14 U. Phalguni.
	15 25 Hasta.	87 U. Bhādrapadā.
Kārttika	1 36 Chitrā.	36 Chitrā.
	15 47 Svāti.	109 Āsvini.
Mārga.	1 58 Viśākhā.	58 Viśākhā.
	15 69 Anurādhā.	7 Rohiṇi.
1 Pausha	1 80 Jyeshthā.	80 Jyeshthā.
	15 91 Mūla.	29 Ārdra.
11 Paush	1 102 P. Āshādhā.	102 P. Āshādhā.
	15 113 U. Āshādhā.	51 Pushya R.

It will be seen from the above table that in no year of the cycle was the Moon successively in those asterisms on the full-moon day, which gave the months their present names, and hence the months could not have received their present names at the time of the observation in 1181 B. C. The statement by Mr. Bentley with regard to the middle of Āśleshā as the limiting position of the solstitial line, drawn through the centre and the commencement of the solar month Śrāvāṇa, carries no weight whatever in support of his supposed date of the forming and naming of the months: for, even at present the Sun is generally in the middle of Āśleshā in the month of Śrāvāṇa as is well known to those who are conversant with the native calendar. It is only the adjustment of the solar-sidereal year with the lunar year by the introduction of about seven lunations in the course of 19 solar years, that has kept up the boundary lines of the solar months always within those of the fixed lunar months, and this agreement has nothing to do with the particular observation of 1181 B. C., as has been supposed by Mr. Bentley. On the other hand, we are in possession of certain observations referring to the existing nomenclature of lunar months, the date of the oldest of which is 20,000 B. C. (*vide* para 14). It is therefore, clear that the naming of the Hindu months did not take place so recently as 1181 B. C. as assumed by Mr. Bentley and some of the Oriental scholars, but that they were named at a time anterior to 20,000 B. C.

(To be Continued.)

### A PIOUS "FIASCO."

We would ask our friends of the *Light* how they would characterise the action of the Tinnevely Christians as herein described? Last year, as our readers will remember, a delegation of nine Theosophists, composed of Hindu, Parsee, English, American and Russian members, left Bombay for Ceylon to greet their Buddhist Brethren. How they were welcomed and received in the fair Island, will henceforth remain a matter of its history. This year the Sinhalese Theosophists, concluding to return the visit to their Indian brothers, accepted an invitation made to our President by the Tinnevely Branch Society. A delegation of Buddhist Theosophists, bearing a message of brotherly good-will to their Hindu friends who had just organized their local branch, accompanied Colonel H. S. Olcott from Colombo to Tinnevely (Madras Presidency) where they arrived October 23. This district of Southern India is a perfect bee-hive of Christians—with their bishops, big churches, armies of clergy and catechists, presses spewing tracts by thousands, &c. One should have thought that such a formidable force—having, moreover, as they boast, the one eternal truth and God himself in their cause—ought to have paid but little attention to a handful of Sinhalese "heathens" coming on a flying visit to a small number of Hindu "idolators," having none of them the slightest intention of interfering with, or having anything to say to the "regenerated" ones, around them? Conversion to Christianity, however, does not seem to run along with, or promote, Christian virtues otherwise but theoretically. Our pious friends resorted to the most unworthy as the meanest of stratagems. The coming of our President and the theosophical delegation was, for some mysterious reasons, dreaded by them; and so, as soon as it was positively known that he would arrive, the Christians, inspired by their holy *padris*, got out and circulated, from house to house, a pamphlet headed in big letters "THEOSOPHY." This, now celebrated pamphlet, contained a choice selection of slanderous, abusive articles against Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, beginning with the lying editorial with which the *Saturday Review*\* had disgraced its columns in its issue of September 3, and closing with an idiotic attack upon us from a New York paper. Lest the Hindus might not take the libellous tract, even *gratis*, the messengers were instructed by the Protestant Jesuits to tell every body to whom they took a copy that "Mr. Soondram Iyer, the Secretary of the Tinnevely Theosophical Society, had sent it with his compliments." The pious fib had a success worthy of a better cause—and the pamphlet was distributed by thousands. Colonel Olcott's first lecture at the Hindu College was on the day the pamphlet appeared. So showing a copy of it to the large audience, he paid his compliments to the brave enemy, and stated that the *Saturday Review* had, in its issue of September 17, retracted its offensive libel upon us, but this fact had been suppressed by the missionary editor of the pamphlet for *obvious reasons*. The sensation produced on the audience by this statement was remarkable, and helped considerably, we believe, to turn the tables upon the truthful ministers of the Gospel of Christ.

During the first centuries of DAWNING Christianity, the Apostles preaching the world of the "Man of Sorrows," preferred martyrdom, allowing themselves to be devoured alive by wild beasts to saving their lives at the cost of a lie involving even a nominal apostasy. In our age, the "Apostles" of Truth will utter any amount of lies to save their comfortable sinecures even before a nominal danger. That is, perhaps, why Christianity is DECLINING.

\* See Supplement, Mr. A. O. Hume's answer to *Saturday Review*.—Ed.

## WEIRD PHENOMENA.

BY DR. RAM DAS SEN,

*Member of the Oriental Academy of Florence.*

## I.

The following narrative was related in the presence of a large assemblage of friends and acquaintances by the late Babu Abhoy Charan Newgy, an assistant surgeon in the employ of the Government of Bengal.

He had not long been in charge of a hospital at a certain station in the North-Western Provinces. Accustomed to sleep out of doors during the warm weather, he often slept on an open terrace adjoining the dispensary building. Once, on rather a sultry night, he had retired to bed and was composing himself to sleep. There were a few chairs left standing close to his couch. Suddenly a sound as that of the rustling of a person's dress or something like it, startled him. Opening his eyes he saw before him, sitting calmly in one of his chairs, his predecessor, the late assistant surgeon, who had died a month previous in the premises of that dispensary. Babu Abhoy was a stoutly-built man, and of a frame of mind quite proof to superstitious fears or any thing like nervousness. As might be imagined, he was not in the least frightened. He simply ejaculated a low sound of surprise, when the apparition floating over a high wall gradually disappeared. The whole scene took place in a clear moonlight night.

## II.

Gobind Prasad Sukul was an inhabitant of Nattore, in the district of Rajshahy, Bengal. When we first saw him at Berhampore, in Murshedabad, he appeared to us a thin, wiry skeleton of a man, on the wrong side of 50, with sharp, angular features, a mysterious look about him, and who was constantly muttering something to himself. Admission into the house he resided in, was strictly denied by him to all visitors. He used to always dress, in scarlet cotton stuffs and was a frequent visitor of ours. When sitting in our presence, he would, if requested, take up a pinch of earth, and putting it into his left palm cover it with the other, and breathe into his joined hands; a minute or two after that, opening his palms just enough to let us have a glimpse, he would show us a gold coin, or a flower, the latter each time of a different colour and variety. It is said he held converse with "Spirits." Many a person is known to have won lawsuits, and many a one to recover his health,—though apparently hopelessly gone, through the mystic instrumentality of that strange personage.

*Editor's Note.*—We need not notice the subject of article II. as it is very clear that Gobind Prasad Sukul was a man, who had possessed himself by some means of considerable occult powers. But we will say a few brief words about the "ghost" of the assistant surgeon. The apparition was that of a man, who had died a month previous—*within the premises* of the dispensary he appeared in, and where he had lived and breathed his last. The "Astral Light," or, if our readers prefer a more scientific term—the *ether* of Space—preserves the images of all beings and things on its sensitised waves; and under certain atmospheric and electric conditions, more often furnished and determined by the vital magnetism of "mediums," pictures and scenes subjective, hence invisible under ordinary normal conditions, will be thrown out into objectivity. The figure of the apparition may have been but an accidental and meaningless reflection on that "sultry," *electric moon-light night*, of the image of one whose figure was, owing to a long residence and death of that person on the premises, strongly impressed upon the etheric waves; and it may also have been due to the roaming of the "animal soul," what the Hindus call *Kama* and *Mayava rupa* the "Illusionary Body" of the deceased person. At all events, it is but the Spiritualists who will insist that it was the *spirit* or the conscious '*Ego* of the dead Assistant Surgeon,' the Occultists maintaining that it was at best the "shell" or the astral form of the disembodied man; and giving it as usual the name of an "Earth-bound Elementary."

(Concluded from the last Number.) 41

## THE GRAND INQUISITOR.

..... "Decide then, Thyself,"—sternly went on the Inquisitor—"who of you two was right: is it Thou who rejected or He, who offered? Remember the subtle meaning of question the first, which means this:—'Wouldst Thou go into the world empty-handed? Wouldst Thou venture there with Thy vague and undefined promise of freedom, which men, with their innate dulness and unruliness are unable to even so much as understand, which they practically avoid and fear—for never was there anything more unbearable to human race and society than personal freedom! Dost Thou see these stones in that desolate and glaring wilderness? *Command that these stones be made bread*—and mankind will run after Thee, obedient and grateful like a herd of cattle. But even then it will be ever diffident and trembling, lest Thou shouldst take away Thy hand, and they lose thereby their bread! Thou refusedst to accept the offer, for fear of depriving men of their free choice. For where is there any freedom of choice once it is being bribed with bread? *Man shall not live by bread alone*—was Thine answer. Thou knewest not, as would appear, that it was precisely in the name of that *earthly* daily bread, that the Terrestrial Spirit would one day rise against, struggle with, and finally conquer Thee, followed as he would be by the hungry multitudes shouting! 'Who is like unto that Beast, who maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth?' Knowest Thou not that but a few centuries hence, and the whole of mankind will have proclaimed in its wisdom and through its mouth-piece Science that there is no more crime, hence—no more sin on earth, but only hungry people? 'Feed us first and then command us to be virtuous!' will be the words written upon the banner lifted against Thee, a banner which will destroy to its very foundations Thy Church, and in the place of Thy Temple will be raised once more the terrible Tower of Babel; and though its building may be left unfinished, as in the case of the first one, yet the fact will remain recorded, that Thou couldst, but wouldst not prevent the attempt of building that new Tower by accepting the offer made, and thus saving mankind a millennium, of useless suffering on earth. And it is to us that the people will return again. They will search for us everywhere; and they will find us under ground, in the catacombs—as we will once more be persecuted and martyred—and they shall begin crying unto us—'Feed us, for they who promised us the fire from heaven have deceived us!' It is then, that we will finish building their Tower for them. For it is but they who will feed them that will finish it, and feed them we alone will, in Thy name, and lying to them that it is in that name. Oh, never, never, will they learn to feed themselves without our help! No science will ever give them bread so long as they remain free, so long as they will refuse laying that freedom at our feet and say: 'enslave, but feed us!' That day must come when men will understand that freedom and daily bread enough of both to satisfy all—are unthinkable and can never go together, as men will never be able to fairly divide the two among themselves. And they will also learn that they can never be free, for they are weak, vicious, miserable nonentities born wicked and rebellious. Thou hast promised to them the bread of life, the bread of heaven; but I ask Thee again, can that bread ever equal in the sight of the weak and the vicious, the ever ungrateful human race, their daily bread on earth? And even supposing that thousands and tens of thousands follow Thee in the name of, and for the sake of Thy heavenly bread, what will become of the millions and hundreds of millions of human beings too weak to scorn the earthly for the sake of Thy heavenly bread? Or is it but those tens of thousands chosen among the great and the mighty, that are so dear to Thee, while the remaining millions, innumerable as the grains of sand in the seas, the weak and the loving, have to be used as material for the former? No, no! In our sight

and for our object the weak and the lowly are the more dear to us. True, they are vicious and rebellious, but we will force them into obedience, and it is they who will admire us the most. They will regard us as so many gods and feel grateful to those who have consented to lead the masses and bear their burden of freedom, by ruling over them—so terrible will at last that freedom appear to men!... Then we will tell them that it is in obedience to Thy will and in Thy name that we rule over them. We will deceive them once more and recommence lying to them,—for never, never more will we allow Thee to come among us. In this deception we will find our suffering, for we will have to lie eternally, and never cease to lie!.....

“Such is the secret meaning of ‘temptation’ the first, and that is what Thou hast rejected in the wilderness for the sake of that freedom which Thou hast prized above all. Meanwhile, Thy tempter’s offer contained another great world-mystery. By accepting the ‘bread,’ Thou wouldst have satisfied and answered a universal craving, a ceaseless longing alive in the heart of every individual human being, lurking in the breast of mankind taken collectively, namely, that most perplexing problem—‘whom or what shall we worship?’ There exists no greater nor more painful an anxiety for a man who has freed himself from all religious bias, than to find as soon as he can a new object or idea to worship. But man seeks to bow before that only, which is recognized as having a right to worship by the greater majority, if not by all his fellow-men; whose rights are so unquestionable that men agree unanimously to bow down to it. For, the chief concern of these miserable creatures is not to find and worship the idol of their own choice, but to discover that which all others will believe in, and consent to bow down to in a mass, and all together. It is that instinctive need of having a worship *in common* that is the chief suffering of every man individually, the chief concern of mankind from the beginning of times. It is for that universality of religious worship that people destroyed each other by sword. Creating gods unto themselves, they forthwith began appealing to each other: ‘Abandon *your* deities, come and bow down to *ours*, or else death to ye and to your idols?’ And so will they do till the end of this world; they will do so even then, when all the gods will themselves have disappeared, for then men will prostrate themselves before and worship some idea. Thou didst know, Thou couldst not be ignorant of that fundamental mysterious principle in human nature, and still Thou hast rejected the only absolute banner offered Thee, to which would remain true, and before which would have bowed, all the nations—the banner of the *earthly bread*, rejected in the name of freedom and of ‘bread in the kingdom of God!’ Behold then, what Thou hast done furthermore for that ‘freedom’s’ sake! I repeat to Thee, man has no greater anxiety in life than to find some one to whom he can make over that gift of freedom with which the unfortunate creature is born. But it is he alone who will prove capable of silencing and quieting their conscience that will succeed in possessing himself of the freedom of men. Together with ‘daily bread’ an irresistible power was offered Thee: show a man ‘bread,’ and he will follow Thee, for what can he resist less than the attraction of bread? but if, at the same time, some one else but Thee succeeds in possessing himself of his conscience,—oh, then, even Thy bread will be forgotten, and man will follow him who seduced his conscience. So far Thou wert right. For the mystery of human being does not solely rest in the desire to live, but in the problem—what should he live for at all! Without a clear perception of his reasons for living, man will never consent to live, and will rather destroy himself than tarry on earth, though he be surrounded with breads. That is so; but what happens: instead of getting hold of man’s freedom, Thou hast enlarged it still more! Hast Thou again forgotten that rest and even death are preferable to man to a free choice between the knowledge of GOOD and EVIL? Nothing seems more seductive in his eyes than freedom of con-

science, and nothing proves more painful. And behold! instead of laying a firm foundation to rest once for ever on it man’s conscience—Thou hast chosen to stir up in him all that is abnormal, mysterious, and indefinite, all that is beyond human strength, and hast acted, therefore, as if Thou never didst have any love for them—and yet, Thou wert He who came to ‘lay down his life for his friends!’ Thou hast burdened man’s soul with anxieties hitherto unknown to him. Thirsting for human love freely given, seeking to enable man seduced and charmed by Thee to follow Thy path of his own free-will; instead of the old and wise Law which held him in subjection, Thou hast given him the right to henceforth choose and freely decide what is good and bad for him, guided in that but by Thine image in his heart... But hast Thou never dreamt of the probability, nay—of the certainty of that same man rejecting finally one day, and controverting even Thine image and Thine Truth, once he would find himself laden with such a terrible burden as freedom of choice? That a time would surely come when men would exclaim that Truth and Light cannot be in Thee, for no one could have left them in a greater perplexity and mental suffering than Thou hast done, lading them with so many cares and insolvable problems. Thus, it is Thyself who hast laid the foundation to the destruction of Thine own kingdom and no one but Thee is to be blamed for it.....

“Meantime, every chance of success was offered Thee., There are three Powers, three unique Forces upon earth, capable of conquering for ever by charming the conscience of these weak rebels—men,—for their own good; and these forces are: MIRACLE, MYSTERY and AUTHORITY. Thou hast rejected all the three, and thus wert the first to set them an example. When the terrible and All-Wise Spirit placed Thee on a pinnacle of the temple and saith unto Thee—‘If Thou be the son of God, cast thyself down’ for it is written,—‘He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in *their* hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone!’—for, thus, Thy faith in Thy father should be made evident, Thou didst refuse to accept his suggestion and didst not follow it. Oh, undoubtedly, Thou hast acted in this with all the magnificent pride of a god, but then men,—that weak and rebel race—are they also gods, to understand Thy refusal? Of course, Thou didst well know that by taking one single step forward, by making the slightest motion to throw Thyself down, Thou wouldst have tempted ‘the Lord, thy God,’ lost suddenly all faith in Him, and dashed Thyself to atoms against that same earth which Thou camest to save, and thus wouldst have allowed the Wise Spirit which tempted Thee to triumph and rejoice. But then, how many such as Thee are to be found on this globe, I ask Thee?... Couldst Thou ever for a moment imagine that men would have the same strength for resisting such a temptation? Is human nature calculated to reject miracle, and trust during the most terrible moments in life, when the most momentous, painful and perplexing problems struggle within man’s soul—to the free decisions of his heart for true solution? Oh, Thou knewest well that that action of Thine would remain recorded in books for ages to come, reaching to the confines of the globe, and Thy hope was, that following Thy example, man would remain true to his God, without needing any miracle to keep his faith alive! But Thou knewest not, it seems, that no sooner would man reject miracle than he would reject God likewise, for he seeketh less God than ‘a sign’ from Him. And, thus, as it is beyond the power of man to remain without miracles, then, rather than live without, he will create for himself new wonders, of his own making that once; and he will bow to and worship the soothsayer’s miracles, the old witch’s sorcery, were he a rebel, an heretic and an atheist hundred times over. Thy refusal to come down from the Cross when people mocking and wagging their heads were saying to Thee—‘Save thyself if thou be the son of God, and we will believe in Thee’,—was due to the same determination,—not to enslave man through

miracle, but to obtain faith in Thee freely and apart from any miraculous influence. Thou thirstest for free and uninfluenced love, and refusest the passionate adoration of the slave before a Potency which would have subjected his will once for ever. Thou judgest of men too highly here, again, for, though rebels they be, they are born slaves and nothing more. Behold, and judge of them once more, now that fifteen centuries have elapsed since that moment.... Look at them, whom Thou hadst tried to elevate unto Thee! I swear, man is weaker and lower than Thou hast ever imagined him to be! Can he ever do that, which Thou art said to have accomplished? By valuing him so highly, Thou hast acted as if there was no love for him in Thine heart, for Thou hast demanded of him more than he could ever give, Thou—who lovest him more than Thyself! Hadst Thou esteemed him less, less wouldst Thou have demanded of him, and that would be more like love, as his burden would have been made thereby lighter. Man is weak and cowardly. What matters it, if he now riots and rebels throughout the world against our will and power, and prides himself upon that rebellion? It is but the petty pride and vanity of a school-boy. It is the rioting of little children, getting up a mutiny in the class-room and driving out of it their school-master. But it will not last long, and when the day of their triumph is over, they will have to pay dearly for it. They will destroy the temples and rase them to the ground, flooding the earth with blood. But the foolish children will have to learn some day, that rebels, though they be, and riotous from nature, they are too weak to maintain the spirit of mutiny for any length of time. Suffused with idiotic tears, they will confess that He who created them rebellious had undoubtedly done so but to mock them. They will pronounce these words in despair, and such blasphemous utterances will but add to their misery, for human nature cannot endure blasphemy and takes her own revenge at the end....."

"And thus, after all Thou hast suffered for mankind and its freedom, the present fate of men may be summed up in three words: Unrest, Confusion, Misery! Thy great prophet John records in his vision, as having seen during the first resurrection, of the chosen servants of God—the number of them which were sealed' in their foreheads 'twelve thousand' of every tribe. But were they, indeed, as many? Then they must have been gods, not men. They had shared Thy Cross for long years, suffered scores of years' hunger and thirst in dreary wilderness and deserts, feeding upon locusts and roots—and of these children of free love for Thee, and self-sacrifice in Thy name, Thou mayest well feel proud. But remember that these are but a few thousands—of gods, not men,—and how about all others? And why should the weakest be held guilty for not being able to endure what the strongest have? Why should a soul incapable of containing such terrible gifts be punished for its weakness? Didst Thou really come but to, and for, the 'Elect' alone? If so, then the mystery will remain for ever one to our finite minds. And if a mystery, then were we right to proclaim it as one, and preach it, teaching them that neither their freely given love to Thee nor freedom of conscience were essential, but only that incomprehensible mystery which they have to blindly obey even *against* the dictates of their conscience. Thus did we do. We corrected and improved Thy teaching and based it upon 'MIRACLE, MYSTERY, and AUTHORITY.' And men rejoiced at finding themselves led once more like a herd of cattle, and to find their hearts at last delivered of the terrible burden laid upon them by Thee and which caused them so much suffering. Say, were we right in doing as we did? Did not we show our great love for humanity, by realizing in such a humble spirit its helplessness, by so mercifully lightening for it its great burden, and by permitting and remitting its weak nature, every sin provided it be committed with our authorization? What for hast Thou then come again to trouble us in our work? And why lookest Thou at me so penetratingly with Thy meek eyes,

and in such a silence? Rather, Thou shouldst feel wroth, for I need not Thy love, I reject it, and love Thee not, myself. Why should I conceal the truth from Thee? I know but too well, with whom I am now talking! What I had to say was known to Thee before, I read it in Thy eye. How should I conceal from Thee OUR SECRET? Perchance, Thou wouldst hear it from my own lips, then listen: WE ARE NOT WITH THEE, BUT WITH HIM, and that is our Secret! For centuries have we abandoned Thee to follow *Him*, yes—just eight centuries. Eight hundred years, now, since we accepted from *Him* the gift rejected by Thee with indignation; that last gift which he offered Thee from the high mountain, when showing all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them He saith unto Thee—'All these things will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me?' We took Rome from him and the glave of Caesar and declared ourselves alone the kings of this earth, its sole kings, though our work is not yet fully accomplished. But who is to blame for it? Our work is but in its incipient stage, but it is nevertheless started. We may have long to wait until its culmination, and mankind have to suffer much, but we will reach the goal some day, and become sole Casars, and then will be the time to think of universal happiness for men....

"Thou couldst accept the glave of Caesar Thyself, why didst Thou reject the offer? By accepting from the powerful Spirit his third offer Thou wouldst have realized every aspiration man seeketh for himself on earth; namely, man would have found a constant object for worship; one to deliver his conscience to, and the means to unite all together into, one common and harmonious ant-hill, as an instinctive necessity for universal unity constitutes a third and final suffering of mankind. Humanity, in its whole, has ever aspired to unite itself universally. Many were the great nations with great histories, but the greater they were, the more unhappy they felt, as they felt the necessity of a universal union among men—the stronger. Great conquerors—like Timoor and Tehengiskhan—passed like a cyclone upon the face of the earth in their efforts to conquer the universe, but even they, albeit unconsciously, expressed the same aspiration towards universal and common unity. In accepting the kingdom of the world, and Caesar's purple one will be founding a universal kingdom and securing to mankind eternal peace. And who can rule mankind better than those who have possessed themselves of man's conscience, and held in their hand man's daily bread? Having accepted Caesar's glave and purple, we had, of course, but to deny Thee, to henceforth follow *Him* alone. Oh! Centuries of intellectual riot and rebellious Free-Thought are yet before us, and their Science will end by anthropophagy, for having begun to build their Babylonian Tower without *our* help they will have to end by anthropophagy..... But it is precisely at that time, that the Beast will crawl up to us in full submission, and it will lick the soles of our feet, and sprinkle them with tears of blood. And we will sit upon the scarlet-coloured Beast, and lifting up high the *golden cup* 'full of abomination and filthiness' will show written upon it the word 'MYSTERY!' But it is only then, that men will see the beginning of a kingdom of peace and happiness. Thou art proud of Thine own Elect, but Thou hast none other but these Elect, and we—we will give rest to all. But that is not the end. Many are those among Thy elect and labourers of Thy Vineyard, who, tired of waiting for Thy coming—already have and will yet carry the great fervor of their hearts and their spiritual strength unto another field, and will end by lifting up against Thee Thy own Banner of *Freedom*. But it is Thyself Thou hast to thank for. Under our rule and sway every one will be happy and will neither rebel nor destroy each other everywhere, as they did while under Thy *free* Banner. Oh, we will take good care to prove to them that only then will they become absolutely free, when they will have abjured their freedom in our favour and submit to us as absolutely. Thinkest Thou we will be right or will be lying



still? They will convince themselves of this, for they will see what a depth of degrading slavery and strife that Liberty of Thine has led them into. Liberty, Freedom of Thought and Conscience, and Science will lead them into such impassable chasms, they will place them face to face before such wonders and insoluble mysteries that some of them—more rebellious and ferocious,—will destroy themselves; others—rebellious but weak—will destroy each other; while the remaining weak, helpless and miserable will crawl back to our feet, and cry: 'Yes; right were ye, oh Fathers, of Jesus; ye alone are in possession of His mystery, and we return to you, praying that you should save us from ourselves!' Receiving their bread from us, they will clearly see that we take the bread from them, the bread made by their own hands, but to give it back to them in equal shares and that without any miracle; and having ascertained that, if we have not changed stones into breads, yet bread they have, while every other bread, turned verily in their own hands into stones—they will be too glad to have it so. Until that day, they will never be happy. And who is it, who helped the most to blind them, tell me? Who separated the flock and scattered it over ways unknown if it be not Thee? But we will gather the sheep once more and subject them to our will for ever. We will prove to them their own weakness and make them humble again, whilst with Thee they have learnt but pride, for Thou hast made more of them than they ever were worth. We will give them that quiet, humble happiness, which alone benefits such weak, foolish creatures as they are, and having once proved to them their weakness, they will become timid and obedient, and gather around us as chickens around their hen. They will wonder at and feel a superstitious admiration for us, and feel proud to be led by such powerful and wise men that a handful of them could subject a flock—thousand millions headstrong. Gradually men will begin to fear us. They will nervously dread our slightest anger, their intellects will weaken, their eyes become as easily accessible to tears as those of children and women, but we will teach them an easy transition from grief and tears to laughter, childish joy, and joyous song. Yes; we will make them work like slaves, but during their recreation hours, they will have an innocent child-like life, full of play and merry laughter. We will even *permit them SIN*, for weak and helpless, they will feel the more love for us for permitting them to indulge in it. We will tell them that every kind of sin will be remitted to them, so long as it is done with our permission; that we take all these sins upon ourselves, for we so love the world, that we are even willing to sacrifice our souls for its satisfaction. And, appearing before them in the light of their scape-goats and redeemers, they will adore us the more for it. They will have no secrets from us. It will remain with us to permit them to live with their wives and concubines, or to forbid it to them, to have any children or remain fatherless—either way depending on the degree of their obedience to us,—and they will submit most joyfully to us. The most agonizing secrets of their souls—all, all will they lay down at our feet, and we will authorize and remit them all in Thy name, and they will believe us and accept our mediation with rapture as it will deliver them from their greatest anxiety and their present tortures of having to decide freely for themselves. And all will be happy, all except the one or two hundred thousands of their rulers. For it is but we, we the keepers of the great MYSTERY who will be miserable. There will be thousands of millions of happy infants, and one hundred thousands of martyrs who will have taken upon themselves the curse of knowledge of Good and Evil. Peaceable will be their end, and peacefully will they die, in Thy name, to find behind the portals of the grave—but DEATH. ...But we will keep the secret inviolate, and deceive them for their own good with the mirage of life eternal in Thy kingdom. For, were there really anything like life beyond the grave, surely it would never fall to the lot of such as they! People tell us and prophesy of Thy coming and

triumphing once more on earth; of thy appearing with the army of Thy elect, with Thy proud and mighty ones, but we will answer Thee, if so, that they have saved but themselves while we have saved all. We are also threatened with the great disgrace which awaits the Whore,—'BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS'—who sits upon the Beast, holding in her hands the MYSTERY, the word written upon her forehead; and we are told that the weak ones, the *lamb*s will rebel against her and shall make her desolate and naked. But then will I arise, and point to Thee the thousands of millions of happy infants free from any sin. And we who have taken their sins upon us, for their own good, we will stand before Thee and say: 'Judge us if Thou canst and darest!' Know then that I fear Thee not. Know that I too have lived in the dreary wilderness, where I fed upon locusts and roots, that I too have blessed the Freedom with which Thou hast blest men, and that I too have been once preparing to join the ranks of Thy elect, the proud and the mighty,...But I awoke from my delusion and refused since then to serve INSANITY. I returned to join the legion of those *who were correcting thy mistakes*. I left the Proud and returned to the really humble, and for their own happiness. What I now tell Thee will come to pass, and our kingdom will be built I tell Thee, not later than to-morrow. Thou wilt see that obedient flock which at one simple motion of my hand will rush to add burning coals to Thy stake, on which I will burn Thee for having dared to come and trouble us in our work. For, if there ever was one who deserved more than any of the others our Inquisitorial Fires—it is Thee!... *To-morrow I will burn Thee.*" *Divi.*

Ivan paused. He had entered into the situation and had spoken with great animation, but now he suddenly burst out laughing.

—"But...all that is absurd!" suddenly exclaimed Alysha, who had hitherto listened perplexed and agitated but in profound silence.—"Your poem is a praise to Christ, not an accusation...as you, perhaps, wanted it to be. And who will believe you when speaking of 'freedom' and... is it so, that we, Christians, have to understand it?...It is Rome, and not even all Rome, for it would be unjust,—but the worst of the Roman Catholics, the Inquisitors, and the Jesuits that you have been exposing!...Your Inquisitor is an impossible character. What are these sins they are taking upon themselves? Who are those keepers of mystery who took upon themselves a curse for the good of mankind? Who ever met them? We all know the Jesuits, and no one has a good word to say in their favour, but when were they as you depict them? Never...never!...The Jesuits are merely a Romish army making ready for their future temporal kingdom, with a mitred Emperor—a Roman High Priest at their head... that is their ideal, and object without any mystery or an elevated suffering...The most prosaic thirsting for power, for the sake of terrestrial and dirty pleasures of life, a desire for enslaving their fellow-men...something like our late system of serfs with themselves at their head as landed proprietors...that is all that they can be accused of. They may not believe in God...that is also possible, but your suffering Inquisitor is simply—a fancy!"

—"Hold, hold!" interrupted Ivan smiling. "Do not be so excited. A fancy, you say, be it so! Of course, it is a fancy. But stop. Do you really imagine that all that Catholic movement during the last centuries is naught but a desire of power for the only achievement of 'dirty pleasures'? Is this what your Father Païssiy taught you?..."

—"No, no, quite the reverse, for Father Païssiy once told me something very similar to what you yourself say.... though, of course, not that...Something quite different"... suddenly added Alexis, blushing.

—"A precious information, notwithstanding your 'not that.' I ask you, why should the inquisitors and the Jesuits of your imagination live but for the attainment of 'dirty' material pleasures? Why should there not be found among them one single genuine martyr, suffer-

ing under a great and holy idea and loving humanity with all his heart? Now, let us suppose that among all these Jesuits thirsting and hungering but after 'material dirty pleasures' there may be one, just one like my old Inquisitor, who had himself fed upon roots in the wilderness, suffered the tortures of damnation while trying to conquer flesh, all that in order to become free and perfect, but who had never ceased to love humanity, and who one day prophetically beheld the truth; who saw as plain as he could see that the bulk of humanity could never be happy under the old system, that it was not for them that the great Idealist had come and died and dreamt of his Universal Harmony. Having realized that truth, he returned into the world and joined—intelligent and practical people. Is this so impossible?"...

—"Joined whom, what intelligent and practical people?"—exclaimed Alyosha quite excited.—"Why should they be more intelligent than other men, and what secrets and mysteries *can* they have!...They have neither...Atheism and infidelity is all the secret they have. Your Inquisitor does not believe in God, and that is all the Mystery there is to it!"

—"May be. And you have guessed rightly there. And it is so, just so, and that is his whole secret; but is this not the acutest of sufferings for such a man as he is, who killed all his young life in asceticism in the desert, and yet could not cure himself of his love toward his fellow-men? Toward the end of his life he becomes convinced that it is only by following the advices of the Great and Terrible Spirit that the fate of these millions of weak rebels, these 'half-finished samples of humanity created in mockery' can be made tolerable. And once convinced of it, he sees as clearly that to achieve that object, one must follow blindly the guidance of the Wise Spirit, the fearful Spirit of Death and Destruction, hence—to accept a system of Lies and Deception and to lead humanity consciously this time toward Death and Destruction, and moreover, to be deceiving them all along the journey in order to prevent them from realizing where they are being led, and so force the miserable blind men to feel happy, at least while here on earth. And note this: a wholesale deception in the name of Him, in the ideal of whom, the old man had so passionately, so fervently believed during nearly his whole life! Is this no suffering? And were such one solitary exception found, amidst, and at the head of that army 'that thirsts for power but for the sake of 'dirty pleasures of life,' think you one such man would not suffice to bring on a tragedy? Moreover: one single man like my Inquisitor as a principal leader, would prove sufficient to discover the real guiding idea of the Romish system with all its armies of Jesuits, the greatest and chief agents of that system. And I tell you that it is my firm conviction that the solitary type described in my poem, has at no time ever disappeared from among the chief leaders of that movement. Who knows, but that terrible old man, loving so stubbornly and in such an original way humanity, exists even in our days in the shape of a whole host of such solitary exceptions, whose existence is not due to mere chance, but to a well-defined association born of mutual consent, to a secret league, organized several centuries back, in order to guard the MYSTERY from the indiscreet eyes of the miserable and weak people, and only in view of their own happiness. And so it is, and cannot be otherwise. I suspect that even Masons have some such MYSTERY underlying the basis of their organization, and that it is just the reason why the Roman Catholic clergy hate them so, dreading to find rivals in them, competition, the dismemberment of the unity of the idea, for the realization of which one flock and one Shepherd are needed... However, in defending my idea, I look like an author, whose production is unable to stand criticism. Enough of that.".....

—"You are, perhaps, a mason yourself!" exclaimed Alyosha. "You do not believe in God,"—he added with a note of profound sadness in his voice. But suddenly

remarking, that his brother was looking at him with mockery—"How do you mean then to bring your poem to a close?" he unexpectedly enquired casting his eyes downward,—“or does it break there?"

—My intention is to end it with the following scene:—“Having disburdened his heart, the Inquisitor waits for some time to hear his Prisoner speak in his turn. His silence weighs upon him. He saw that his captive had been attentively listening to him, all the time with his eyes fixed penetratingly and softly on the face of his Jailor and evidently bent upon not replying to him. The old man longs to hear His voice, to hear Him reply; better words of bitterness and scorn rather than His silence. Suddenly He rises; slowly and silently approaching the Inquisitor, He bends toward him and softly kisses the bloodless, four-score-and-ten—old lips. That is all the answer. The Grand Inquisitor shudders...There is a convulsive twitch in a corner of his mouth. He goes to the door, opens it and addressing Him—'Go' he says—'go and return no more...do not come at all...never, never!—and—lets Him out into the dark night...The Prisoner vanishes.'"

—"And the old man?"...

—"The kiss burns his heart, but the old man remains firm in his own ideas and unbelief."

—"And you, together with him?...You too!"...depressingly exclaimed Alyosha, while Ivan burst out into a still louder fit of laughter....

## IS CREATION POSSIBLE FOR MAN?

*The Editor of the Theosophist.*

MADAME,

Talking the other day to a friend, who, like me, without being a Theosophist, takes a very great interest in the movements of your Society, I incidentally happened to remark that the "Brothers of the first section" were credited with such large powers, that even *creation* was not at times impossible to them. In support of my assertion, I instanced their own cup and saucer phenomenon, as narrated by Mr. Sinnett in his "Occult World," which phenomenon appeared to me to be something more than the mere *reproduction, transference* or *unearthing* from its hiding-place of an article *lost* or *stolen*, like the brooch. My friend, however, warmly objected to my statement—remarking that creation was not possible to man, whatever else he may be able to accomplish.

Believing, as I then did, in Christianity as the most perfect heaven-descended code of ethics on earth, there was a time in the history of my chequered life, (chequered, I mean, as regards the vast sea of doubt and unbelief on which I have been tossing for over twenty years) when I would have myself as warmly, even indignantly, repelled the idea of creation as a possibility to man; but the regular reading of your journal, and a careful perusal of Mr. Sinnett's book and of that marvel of learning and industry your own "Isis Unveiled," have effected quite a revolution (whether for good or bad has yet to be seen) in my thoughts, and it is now some time since I have begun to believe in the possibility of phenomena beyond the range of my own narrow vision.

Will you kindly tell me which of us is right, my friend or I? Not having the honour of being personally known to you, I close this letter only with my initial.

H.

## OUR ANSWER.

The question to be dealt with is hardly whether our correspondent or his friend is right, for we understand him to take up the prudent attitude of a seeker after truth who shrinks from affirming dogmatically that creation *is* possible for man, even while unwilling to accept the dogmatic negative assertion of his friend that "it is impossible." Before coming to the gist of the question raised, we have, therefore, to notice the illustra-

tions which this letter affords of the ways in which such a question may be considered.

When our correspondent's friend denies that creation is possible for man, we can hardly assume that he does so from any conviction that he has sounded all the mysteries of Nature, and knowing all about the universe,—being able to account for all its phenomena—has ascertained that the process, whatever that may be, which he conceives of as creation does not go on anywhere in obedience to the will or influence of man, and has further ascertained that there is something in man which makes it impossible that such a process should be accomplished. And yet without having done all that, it is bold of him to say that creation is impossible. Assuming that he is not a student of occult science,—and the tone of the letter before us conveys the impression that he is not—our friend's friend when he makes his dogmatic statement, seems to be proceeding on the method but too commonly adopted by people of merely ordinary culture and even by a few men of science—the method which takes a large group of preconceived ideas as a standard to which any new idea must be applied. If the new idea fits in with, and seems to support the old ones, well and good; they smile upon it. If it clashes with some of these they frown at it, and ex-communicate it without further ceremony.

Now the attitude of mind exhibited by our correspondent, who finds many old beliefs, shattered by new ideas, the force of which he is constrained by moral honesty to recognize, and who, therefore, feels that in presence of the vast possibilities of Nature he must advance very cautiously and be ever on his guard against false lights held out by time-honoured prejudices and hasty conclusions,—seems to us an attitude of mind which is very much better entitled to respect than that of his over-confident friend. And we are the more anxious to recognize its superiority in the most emphatic language, because when we approach the actual question to be discussed the bearing of what we have to say will be rather in favour of the view which the "friend" takes of "creations," if indeed we are all attaching the same significance to that somewhat over-driven word.

It is needless after what we have just said to point out that if we are now going to make some statements as to what is, and what is not the fact, as regards some of the conditions of the universe we are not on that account infringing the rules of thought just laid down. We are simply giving an exposition of our little fragment of occult philosophy as taught by masters who are in a position to make positive statements on the subjects and the credibility of which will never be in danger from any of those apparently inexplicable occurrences related in the books to which our correspondent refers, and likely enough, as he justly conceives to disturb many of the orthodox beliefs which he has seen crumbling around him.

It would be a volume we should have to write and not a brief explanatory note, if we attempted to begin, by elucidating the conviction we entertain that the Masters of Occult Philosophy above referred to are entitled to say what is and what is not. Enough for the present to say what we believe would be said in answer to the question before us, by *those who know*.

But we must have a clear understanding as to what is meant by creation. Probably the common idea on the subject is that when the world was "created," the creator accorded himself or was somehow accorded a dispensation from the rule *ex nihilo nihil fit* and actually made the world out of nothing—if that is the idea of creation to be dealt with now, the reply of the philosophers would be not merely that such creation is impossible to man but that it is impossible to gods, or God; in short absolutely impossible. But a step in the direction of a philosophical conception is accomplished when people say the world was "created" (we say fashioned)—out of CHAOS. Perhaps, they have no very clear idea of what they mean by Chaos, but it is a better word to use in this case than "nothing." For, suppose we endeavour to conceive chaos as the matter of the universe in an unmanifested state it will be seen at once that though such matter is perfectly inappreciable to ordinary human senses, and to that extent equivalent to "nothing" creation from such materials is not the production of something which did not exist before, but a change of state imposed upon a portion of universal matter which in its previous state was invisible, intangible and imponderable, but

not on that account non-existent.\* Theosophists-Occultists do not, however, use the word "creation," at all, but replace it by that of EVOLUTION.

Here we approach a comprehension of what may have been the course of events as regards the production of the mysterious cup and saucer described in Mr. Sinnett's book. It is in no way inconceivable that if the production of manifestation in matter is the act accomplished by what is ordinarily called creation that the power of the human will in some of its transcendent developments may be enabled to impose on unmanifested matter or chaos, the change which brings it within the cognisance of the ordinary human senses.

## THE THEOSOPHISTS.

BY GERALD MASSEY.

I see from quotations made by "M. A. (Oxon)" in *Light* for September 17 that the THEOSOPHIST assigns such phenomena as the alleged stone-throwing by invisible agency, to the action of a "blind, though living force" belonging to the "invisible body of those we call blind Elementals or forces of nature," the "active forces and correlations of fire, water, earth, and air," whose shape is "like the hues of the chameleon which has no permanent colour of its own," and "it is only the trained eye of the proficient in Eastern occultism that can fix the fleeting shadows, and give them a shape and a name." A "shape and a name" is exactly what they and we want.

Do these living forces manifest what we term Mind? Or is Mind latent, incipient, among them? Science at present knows nothing whatever about the correlation of mental and elemental forces. Do these suggest a living link? What forms do they take? Because force, so-called, does not seem to cast even those fleeting shadows which can be fixed in form, and these must manifest in form for the adept to get them fixed. The remarks quoted by "M.A. (Oxon.\*)" are full of suggestion, but at present the vision is all visionary.

Elements are but *elements*, and cannot consciously *direct* anything. If there be *mind*, however less than human, engaged in these matters, we want the profound seer to fix the shadows and describe the shape. The language and traditions of the *Kabala* or *Gnosis*, no matter in what land, will not help us much, and are always suspiciously confused with certain mythical origins that we wot of. For instance, the four Spirits of the Four Elements in Egypt are from out of the Seven Great Spirits of the Great Bear. From the four corner stars of the Bear (the Coffin of Osiris which they guard) they can be traced to the four corners of the Mount (Meru or others) and the four quarters of the later Zodiac. These were four of a group (Great Bear and Dog-Star), who appear in the Ritual, both as the Seventh and the Eighth Elementaries or gods of the earliest time before the firmament of Râ was lifted.

They originated in verifiable physical phenomena and not in Spiritualism, yet they have passed into the *Kabala*, like the seven Princes or Angels of the Chariot, just as if they were Spirits in the modern sense. The whole body of lore or wisdom, in which the Oriental occult is trained, *originated* in the celestial phenomena and not in what is called Spiritualism, although that is mixed up with the early teachings. The Spirits of the Four Elements belong

\* It is one of the many reasons why Buddhist philosophy refuses to admit the existence and interference in the production of the universe of a direct creator or god. For once admit, for argument's sake, that the world was created by such a being, who, to have done so, must have been omnipotent, there remains the old difficulty to be dealt with—who then created that pre-existing matter, that eternal, invisible, intangible and imponderable something or chaos? If we are told that being "eternal" and imperishable it had no need of being "created," then our answer will be that in such a case there are two "Eternals" and two "Omnipotents," or if our opponents argue that it is the omnipotent No. 1 or God who created it, then we return from where we first started—to the creation of *something* out of *nothing*, which is such an absolute absurdity before science and logic that it does not even require the final unanswerable query resorted to by some precocious children "and who created God?" —Ed.

to mythology, not to Spiritualism. To this great gulf, fixed at starting, may be mainly traced the difference between Eastern occultism and Western Spiritualism. This I hope to make definite and help to bridge over ultimately. Seers have often described to me (I should say, a seer, with whom I dwelt for seventeen years) many fleeting forms of the chameleon kind, passing in currents and flowing rivers of force, but they did take forms in such wise that the Kabalist lingo of the Four Elements might be employed in describing them. Unfortunately at that time I was not an evolutionist. We want the seer that is trained, but for one thing he should know all that Western science has established, as well as the traditions of the East. "M.A. (Oxon.," says he had seen phenomena which might fairly represent the gambols of a monkey, and "what for no?"

I write on behalf of the *Asamanuk pa*. Perhaps the reader never heard of the *Asamanuk pa*. The word means "Head-Ghost" or "Spectre-Elder." The name is given to a chimpanzee or baboon that inhabits the islands of the Yolta river, where the *Sisai* (the souls or shades of the departed) have their Hades or Dead-world, called *Gbohialuse*. These apes are literally "devils to throw stones." It is a native saying, "Moko ke Asamanuk pa daa tetfa". "Nobody vies with the *Asamanuk pa* in stone-throwing."\* Now as an evolutionist, I hold that the *Asamanuk pa* has as good a right to his soul as I may claim for mine. And if his consciousness continues, so may his earthly tendency, and this may be his only mode of sending a message to demonstrate his continuity.

It would be of equal interest to the evolutionist to know that the spirit of a monkey persisted (habits and all) as if it had been the Spirit of a man, and it would give me just as much pleasure to learn that our "poor relations" do continue, as if I received a message from some far more highly-developed being; even though they had to smash all my front windows to let in that much light.

If the *Theosophist* were also an evolutionist, perhaps he would be able to fix the "fleeting forms" of his vision, and perceive some of the Spirits of man's predecessors on the earth, as his Spirits of the earth, or in Kabalish lingo "earth Spirits."—*Light*.

*Editor's Note.*—Summed up in a few words, this article asks for further information about "elementals"; suggests that they may be what Spiritualists would call "the spirits" of deceased animals; offers this as a new idea for the consideration of Eastern philosophers; and points out that if the adepts of occult science had been privileged to read Darwin they might, with their peculiar powers of clairvoyance, have been able to detect in the elementals, shapes which would identify these as *reliquie* of Man's imperfectly developed ancestors.

The comprehension of what occult science really is, has spread in Europe so very imperfectly as yet, that we must not be impatient even with this curiously entangled view of the subject. European mystics, when further advanced in the tedious study of unintelligible books, will often be hardest to persuade that they must go back some distance on the paths they have travelled, before they can strike into those which lead to the fully illuminated regions of Eastern knowledge. They are naturally loth to confess that much time has been wasted; they try to make the fragments of esoteric Eastern philosophy they may pick up here and there, fit into the vacant places in the scheme of things they have painfully constructed for themselves, and when the fragments will not fit, they are apt to think the corners want paring down here and there, and the hollows, filling up. The situation which the European mystic does not realise is this:—The Eastern occult philosophy is the great block of solid truth from which the quaint, exoteric mysticism of the outer world has been casually thrown off from time to time, in veiled and symbolical shapes. These hints and suggestions of mystic philosophy may be likened to the grains of gold in rivers, which early explorers used to think betokened somewhere in the mountains from which the rivers sprang, vast beds of the precious metal. The occult philosophy with which some people in India are privileged to be in contact, may be likened to the parent deposits. Students will be altogether on a wrong track as long as they check the statements of Eastern philosophy by reference to the teachings and conceptions of any other systems.

In saying this we are not imitating the various religionists who claim that salvation can only be had within the pale of their own small church. We are not saying that Eastern philosophy is right and everybody else is wrong, but that Eastern philosophy is the main stream of knowledge concerning things spiritual and eternal, which has come down in an unbroken flood through all the life of the world. That is the demonstrable position which we, occultists of the Theosophical Society, have firmly taken up, and all archaeological and literary research in matters connected with the earliest religions and philosophies of historical ages helps to fortify it. The casual growths of mystic knowledge in this or that country and period, may or may not be *faithful* reflections of the actual, central doctrines; but, whenever they seem to bear some resemblance to these, it may be safely conjectured that at least they are reflections, which owe what merit they possess to the original light from which they derive their own.

Now the tone of such articles as that we have reprinted above is quite out of harmony with this general estimate of the position. Mr. Massey's mental attitude is that of a power in treaty with a collateral power:—"Give us this and this bit of information which you perhaps possess; we offer you in return some valuable hints derived from Western science. Weld them into your own inquiries, and you will, perhaps, bring out some fresh conclusions." Such an attitude as this is absolutely ludicrous to any one who has had the means of realising, even in a small degree, what the range and depth of Eastern occult philosophy really are. To say that offering knowledge or discoveries of any sort to the Masters of Occult Philosophy is carrying coals to Newcastle, is to say nothing. There may be some small details of modern science which occult philosophy has not anticipated (centuries ago), but if so, that can only be because the genius of occult philosophy leads it to deal with the main lines of principle and to care as a rule very little for details—as little as for the material advantage or comfort they may be designed to subserve. Such broad conceptions as the theory of evolution, for example, have not only been long ago known to Eastern occultists, but as developed in Europe, are now recognised by them as the first faltering step of modern science in the direction of certain grand principles with which they have been familiar,—we will not venture to say since when... ..

"If the *Theosophist* were also an evolutionist," says Mr. Massey, "perhaps he would be able to fix the fleeting forms of his vision and perceive some of the spirits of Man's predecessors on the earth." If the European scientists whose fancy has for the first time been caught, within these last few years, by the crude outlines of an evolutionary theory, were less blankly ignorant of all that appertains to the mysteries of life, they would not be misled by some bits of knowledge concerning the evolution of the body, into entirely absurd conclusions concerning the other principles which enter into the constitution of Man.

But we are on the threshold of a far mightier subject than any reader in Europe who has not made considerable progress in real occult study, is likely to estimate in all its appalling magnitude. Will any one who has perused with only some of the attention it really deserves the article we published but two months ago under the title "Fragments of Occult Truth," make an effort to account, in his own mind, even in the most shadowy and indistinct way, for the history of the six higher principles in any human creature, during the time when his body was being gradually perfected, so to speak, in the matrix of evolution. Where, and what were his higher spiritual principles when the body had worked into no more dignified shape than that of a baboon? Of course, the question is put with a full recognition of the collateral errors implied in the treatment of a single human being as the apex of a series of forms, but even supposing that physical evolution were as simple a matter as that how to account for the final pre-existence in the perfected human body of a spiritual soul?—or to go a step back in the process, how to account for the presence of the animal soul in the first creature with independent volition that emerges from the half vegetable condition of the earlier forms? Is it not obvious, if the blind materialist is not to be accepted as a sufficient guide to the mysteries of the universe,—if there really are these higher principles in Man of which we speak, that there must be some vast process of spiritual evolution going on in the universe *pari passu* with the physical evolution?

For the present we merely throw out hints and endeavour to provoke thought and enquiry; to attempt in this casual manner, a complete exposition of the conclusions of Eastern philosophy

in this direction would be like starting on a journey to the South Pole *appropos* to a passing enquiry whether one thought there was land there or not.

But we have, perhaps, said enough to meet the somewhat imperfect suggestion in Mr. Gerald Massey's article to the effect that elementals may perhaps be the spirits of animals or of "missing links" belonging to a former epoch of the world's history. The notion that in some immaterial shape,—one may use an absurd expression to set forth an absurd conjecture,—the spirits of any living creature can lead a perpetual existence as the stereotyped duplicates of the transitory material forms they inhabited while passing through the earthly stage of their pilgrimage, is to reckon entirely without the very doctrine which Mr. Massey so kindly offers for the consideration of Eastern philosophers. No more than any given material form is destined to infinite perpetuation can the finer organisms which constitute the higher principles of living creatures be doomed to unchangeability. What has become of the particles of matter which composed the physical bodies of "man's predecessors on the earth." They have long ago been ground over in the laboratory of Nature, and have entered into the composition of other forms. And the idea or design of the earlier forms has risen into superior idea or design which has impressed itself on later forms. So also, though the analogy may give us no more than a cloudy conception of the course of events, it is manifest that the higher principles, once united with the earlier forms, must have developed in their turn also. Along what infinite spirals of gradual ascent the spiritual evolution has been accomplished, we will not stop now to consider. Enough to point out the direction in which thought should proceed, and some few considerations which may operate to check European thinkers from too readily regarding the realms of spirit as a mere phantasmagorical cemetery, where the shades of the Earth's buried inhabitants doze for ever in an aimless trance.

#### THE PUPIL OF SWAMI DAYANUND AT THE CONGRESS OF ORIENTALISTS.

A Calcutta paper gives the following summary of the doings of the Congress of Orientalists:—

The Congress of Orientalists, an account of whose first meeting we published the other day, is rendered chiefly interesting to us this year in consequence of the presence of a young Indian who is taking an active part in it. In this issue we shall present our readers with a few extracts from the proceedings of two more meetings. On the 13th ultimo Professor Weber, the President of the Aryan Section, in the course of his opening speech, "dwelt on the indirect influence which the discovery of the Indo-European brotherhood had exercised on the Natives of India. It had raised them in their own estimation, and made them feel proud again of their ancient language, literature and religion. It had fostered a healthy national pride, without which no nation could achieve great things." Besides the scientific occupations of the Congress much was done, we are told, for their amusement and instruction. The Minister of Education, Von Gossler, received the principal members at a brilliant evening-party, at which, we are informed, the young Indian Pandit, Shyamaji Krishnavarman, appeared in the famous Parsi coal-scuttle and what the Americans would have called "a duster." Several Sanskrit scholars present attempted to converse with him in Sanskrit, but, to judge from the Pandit's laughter, without much success. The two Buddhist priests from Japan, who accompanied Professor Max Müller, came in the most correct evening costume and were most kindly received by the Minister. On the 14th Professor Jacobi read an essay on Kalidasa's epic poems, showing a most intimate acquaintance with the peculiarities of Kalidasa's style and of the intricacies of his metres, which seemed to surprise the Indian Pandit who was present at the meeting. On the 15th—

Professor M. Williams, as has been already stated, read an account "Of the Sandhya and Brahman Ceremonies and Prayers," which was rendered both interesting and amusing by the performances of Pandit Shyamaji Krishnavarman, who showed how these prayers had to be

recited, and exhibited, in fact, some of the most sacred rites of the Brahmans. The Pandit afterwards read a most valuable paper in English on "Sanskrit as a Living Language in India." Both papers were received with the loudest applause, and afforded to all present both instruction and entertainment.

The young Pandit was also present at a dinner. Being invited to speak, he rose, and—

Declared that he spoke in the name of 256 millions of human beings, though, after his public performance of the sacred rites of the Brahmans and the visitation of the Gayatri before Mlecchas, it is doubtful whether even the small sect to which he belongs would continue to recognize him as their representative. Though he declared that he never touched wine, he ended with drinking "The Health of the Minister of Education, and of all the great Masters of the World."

The above paragraph is, of course, republished from some English paper. We hope, however, for the glory of India as for the sake of our esteemed young Brother, Shyamaji Krishnavarman, that the report is exaggerated and incorrect. He may have only offered toasts, not actually "drunk." Anyhow, we seriously hope that the favourite pupil of one of "the great masters of the world" to whose health he is alleged to have drunk wine, could not have forgotten so soon the wise recommendations of his master Swami Dayanand Saraswati and fallen as easily as that into the snares of Western Civilization.

THE MANAGER HAS TO APOLOGISE TO THE SUBSCRIBERS of the THEOSOPHIST for the delay of one week in issuing the current Number. But a sufficient excuse will be found in the fact that, although in our new *Prospectus* we promise twenty-four pages of reading matter every month and thirty-two occasionally, the present Number consists of forty pages, twenty-four of which were made up this week since the return of the Editor, Madame Blavatsky, to Bombay on the 29th November.

#### PARAGRAPH FLASHES FROM THE FOUR QUARTERS.

SILVER IN SEA-WATER is the most recent discovery in science. Few persons have been aware that sea-water contains a considerable quantity of silver in solution, but a careful analysis of the deposits in the metallic bottoms of ships has demonstrated that it is so. It has been shown that such plates containing on trace of silver originally, after contact with sea-water for three or four years, were coated with a deposit of silver. The brass displaces the silver of the silver chloride, and the silver is deposited on the metallic plates of the vessel. It is calculated that in the course of the six years, during which the metallic plates on the bottoms of vessels are supposed to last, the Dutch fleet abstracts from the sea-water 198½ pounds of pure silver. It has further been calculated that the sea must contain at least two million tons of silver, representing a value of 350 *milliards* of German mares.

A NEW STEAMER.—"We have to be very careful how we accept news of various inventions coming to us from America," remarks a German paper;—"for, we must ever bear in mind that the world-famous *humbug* is also a Yankee invention." Having delivered itself of this charitable remark, the paper goes on to describe the vessel introduced to Europe as an alleged new invention by an American engineer.

The vessel is called the *Oceanic*, and represents a "marine velocipede." The body of the new ship does not at all touch the surface of the water; it hangs on three gigantic wheels, one of which is placed at the front part, and the two others behind. Each wheel is covered with shovels, and can rotate backwards and forwards, opposite motions being performed simultaneously by the various wheels for purposes of stopping or slackening the speed. There is no rudder, the new sea-vehicle moving so easily that there is no need of a distinct apparatus to guide its course. The length of the ship is 210 feet, and the diameter of

the wheels—60 feet. The inventor affirms that his vessel will be found extremely convenient for passengers, as it *cannot* sink, and is, moreover, so fast, that it will be able to make the voyage from New York to Liverpool in less than six days.

FABER'S TALKING AUTOMATON is the wonder of the day. A few weeks more, and if we can believe reports gathered from the scientific journals of France and Germany, which publications are not generally given to exaggeration, the world will witness a new "Man Demon," a marvel of mechanical art, created by the hand of the new Frankenstein from Vienna. Instead, however, of being hated by his creator as in the case of Mrs. Shelley's hero, the new "living" automaton will probably make his inventor's fortune.

As early as in 1761 the famous Berlin Mathematician and Professor Eüler wrote in the *Preface* of his great work on Physics the following:—"No doubt, it would prove of the utmost importance if we could construct a machine imitating the human voice with all its articulations. This does not seem to me impossible. It might be accomplished, for instance, by mechanical means, and the sounds produced upon touching concealed keys or by the means of air as in the organ. An automaton, made to utter a few words, might easily be improved to pronounce whole speeches."

Eüler's hint caused more than one mechanic to pass years in trying to discover the means of producing artificial registers of human voice. Kratzenstein, the German physicist, succeeded in constructing a machine on the model of the human throat and mouth, which articulated and modulated at will every vowel as distinctly as they are pronounced by a living person. Herr von Kemplen, another Vienna scientist went further still, having spent many years in studying the formation of the mouth and throat of those animals which produce sounds in which some specific consonant predominates, as the letter *B* in the sheep and *M* in the cow. He constructed a marvellous machine by which whole sentences were pronounced distinctly and in a very harmonious female voice, Latin and Italian words being pronounced by it better and more distinctly than any other. All previous automatons, however, are now considered baby's toys when compared to the wonderful invention of Faber. In his apparatus the whole mechanism is concealed within an extremely life-like human figure, which, as it stalks into the room, renders the spectator dumb with surprise, while conscious that a lifeless machine is before him. It can produce a distinct low whisper or words full of energy and expression. It can even sing. Instead of, as in Kemplen's machine, receiving air by means of bellows worked by something like the keys of a piano, the throat of Faber's machine is furnished with all the organs of the human throat, made of India-rubber on the exact model of the human throat and larynx. In the invention of the Vienna mechanic, an anatomist would find on examination in the automaton's chest a pair of fine bellows supplied to the minutest detail with all that is connected with, or necessary for, the production of the human voice in a human being's organism. The air from the bellows is directed along two guttapercha bunches, corresponding to the windpipe, the cartilaginous cavity of the throat &c., in the living organism. These bunches, when filled with air, form a number of longitudinal openings and fissures taking the place of lungs. The volume and tone of the sound to be produced are determined by, and increased in proportion to, the frequency of the periodical passages of the air, from the bellows to the bunches. To obtain from one and the same "voice fissure" sounds of various magnitude and duration, Faber arranged his India-rubber bunches at right angles, and by means of a very ingenious mechanism they contract at the narrowest point of the "voice-fissure." In consequence of this arrangement, a portion of the bunches made to vibrate, contract, and the tone can be modulated or increased at will. The sound on approaching the lips of the automaton is so regulated that syllables and words are distinctly and intelligibly uttered. In short, Faber seems to have completely solved the problem of the artificial production of the human voice and speech.

THE OLDEST MAN IN THE WORLD, is introduced to its readers by *The Lancet*. We are obliged to confess that the age of this venerable patriarch reduces to most common place the age of any of those antiquated specimens of humanity the THEOSOPHIST has been able to acquaint its subscribers with, and on whose account we have been severely taken to task by some of our "friendly" contemporaries. The Methuselah, excavated by the well-known London medical *Weekly*, is a citizen of

Bagota in San Salvador, and according to his own evidence he was 180 years of age on his last birth-day. His oldest neighbours, however, maintain that he is much older. He is a half-caste Spaniard called Miguel Solis, and the existence of this fossil is authenticated by Dr. Guernandes who was assured that when one of the oldest living citizens of Bagota was a mere baby, Miguel Solis was already regarded as a centenarian. The doctor was also assured that old Miguel's signature can be seen to this day on a deed drawn in 1712 in reference to a monastery then founded close to the town. Dr. Guernandes was accustomed to visit this wonderful old mortality, and on his first visit found him working in his garden. His skin looked like parchment, and his hair was snow-white. He explained his longevity by the care he always took of his health. He eats only once a day and fasts two days in the month, on the 1st and 15th, when he drinks as much water as he can possibly absorb. He has never eaten anything hot during his life, but has always been fond of rich food.

THE ALLEGED DISCOVERY OF THE AZTEC MYSTERIES has caused a stir in the New World.

A correspondent of the Boston *Herald*, writing from Fort Wingate, New Mexico, gives some interesting details of the work pursued in unveiling the mysteries attached to the Zuni tribes of New Mexico and Arizona by Mr. Frank H. Cushing, of Western New York, an official of the Smithsonian Institution of Washington. He was sent out about two years ago to investigate in the Pueblos of New Mexico the customs and history of the natives. Mr. Cushing finally selected Zuni as the seat of his researches. The Zuni Indians—a name probably derived by the Spaniards from Shi-ü-na, their name in their native tongue—are the lineal descendants of the Aztecs and live to-day, in all essential particulars, just as their ancestors have lived for centuries and centuries. Only a very few of them knew a word or two of broken Spanish, and they have preserved their native tongue in all its purity. Like about all the other Pueblos, they have been callous to all attempts to christianize them, whether by Catholics or Protestants, and they practise to-day their strange old religious rites.

"In the pursuit of his researches, Mr. Cushing joined the Zunis, was favorably received by them, learned their language, adopted their dress and modes of life, and has passed his time among them. Gradually gaining influence with some, he has obtained admission into their most secret councils, and has now been made one of their chiefs, the second man of influence in their city, standing next to their Governor in authority. Mr. Cushing has, in the study of the Zuni religion, found for certainty that the worship and traditions of Montezuma—so long accepted in all accounts of the Aztecs—have no foundation in fact, and that Montezuma was never heard of. But he has discovered a mine of mythological lore, beliefs and superstitions, gods and spirits, that throw the full light of day on the mysteries of the Aztec religion. Among other wonderful things is the existence of twelve sacred orders, with their priests, and their secret rites as carefully guarded as the secrets of Freemasonry, an institution to which these orders have a strange resemblance. Into several of these orders he has been initiated, and has penetrated to their inmost secrets, obtaining a knowledge of ceremonials, both beautiful, profound and grotesque in character. But the most marvellous thing which he has discovered in connection with their religion is the grand fact that their faith is the same thing as modern Spiritualism. The Zunis have their circles, their mediums, their communications from the spirit world, their materialization—precisely like those of the spirits of civilized life. Their séances are often so absorbing that they are kept up all night.

"Mr. Cushing will probably stay with the Zunis about a year longer."—*Philadelphia Record*.

The journal from which we extract the above is a serious and trust worthy paper. But either Mr. Cushing has not yet told the whole of his tale or the correspondent of the Boston *Herald* was not accurate in the information given. It is the fate of all the secret religions of people to be misunderstood, and more or less loosely handled. A few prominent features are seized upon, comparisons resorted to, and "bad report" launched into the world to settle permanently on the public mind, the first impressions proving generally indelible. As well say of the Tibetans that their religion is the same thing as modern Spiritualism on account of Buddha's *re-incarnation* in the Dalai Lamas. The same tale is told of the Chinese. Owing to "ancestor worship" they are regarded by the Spiritualists as co-religionists and—hailed as brothers in faith!

**A POSTHUMOUS CENSURE.**—The absence of any clergyman, priest, or rabbi at Lord Beaconsfield's death-bed seems to have seriously disturbed the Irish papers. One of them, the *Nation*, says: "Priest or parson, book or prayer, cross or crescent, symbol or sign of faith, there was nothing to tell whether the dying man thought of Moses, of Mohammed, or of Christ. Unless the published narratives omit some very important particulars, Lord Beaconsfield died as dies a horse." How sad!

**CURSING AND SWEARING.** is a lengthy article addressed to the Editor of the *Truth Seeker*. The writer, who seems to have studied the question *con amore*—holds that the habit has originated among the early Christians and "is essentially a Christian one." "We know"—he writes "that the ancient Greek was wont to embellish his discourse with now and then a "By Zeus," or "By Apollon;" and the Roman with a "By Jupiter;" and that the Athenian, in the way of cursing, wished the object of his malediction "to the ravens," which place seems to have been a swamp somewhere in the neighbourhood of the city frequented by these birds. Judging from specimens of the talks of these ancient peoples that have come down to us, their cursing and swearing was of a quite different nature of that of our modern Christians. It lacked force and earnestness. In its angriest moods, the Greek mind never conceived of sending its adversary to a place where we should be tortured eternally.

We have good authority for believing this habit to be essentially a Christian one. We read about Peter, he on whom the church was founded, how on a certain occasion he "immediately began to curse and swear." The conditions under which he did it, and the coupling of the two words, show that Peter's cursing and swearing was of the same species as now survives among his followers. Jesus also took a hand in the cursing business, as that fig-tree which got so effectually damned for not bearing figs in the wrong season bears witness. We may be permitted, then, to regard Jesus and Peter as the practical originators of the practice; and we need not wonder that the Christian world still curses and swears, seeing that it but faithfully treads in their footsteps."

"THE CRIMES OF PREACHERS in the United States"\* for the last five years—from May 1876 to May 1881, "translated out of the original newspapers and with previous translations diligently compared and revised," is the latest production of Mr. M. E. Billings, an attorney, of Waverly Town, and the author of "*Sinful Saints*." He gives the names of the criminal clergymen, their residence, the names of their parishes and the denominations to which they respectively belong as well as the crime they have been guilty of. "In the aggregate he reports 917 crimes of clergymen in the short space of five years" in the U. S. alone.

We will not give the detailed account of the disgusting crimes enumerated. We will simply copy from the *Truth Seeker* the following:—

Of these 917 crimes on the part of the Christian clergymen, 456 were against women in a sexual way, and 81 against women in other ways, or 544 against women especially.

Of this list of 477 criminal preachers the denomination of 208 has been preserved, leaving 269 not designated. Of the 208 the Methodists have 72, Baptists 42, Presbyterians 22, Catholics 19, Congregationalists 13, Church of England 10, Campbellites 6, Lutherans 6, Adventists 5, United Brethren 3, Hebrews 2, Dunkards 1, Universalists 1.

\* We have been repeatedly and unjustly accused of bearing ill-will to the Western Clergy, and while copying all the evil reports about them we can find, not to have taken notice of the good they do. We can copy but what we find in the news and—no more. We bear no ill-will to any creed especially, and are ready to publish reports of the remarkable doings of any class of men whatever. Hence, we do not see why we should be more particularly careful not to hurt the feelings of the class of men under notice, than those of any other class of men. The subject has a distinct bearing upon the cause we advocate and represent, and it is our special object to find out which of the four great world-religions is the more likely to promote morality among men.—*Ed.*

The percentage of the crimes of those whose denomination is preserved, as compared with the whole number, is as follows: Methodists 30 per cent., Baptists 20, Presbyterians 10, Catholics 10, Congregationalists 6, Lutherans 6, Episcopalians 5, Campbellites 3, Adventists 3, United Brethren 1.4, Hebrew 1, Dunkards  $\frac{1}{2}$ , Universalists  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

The definitions or names of crimes are chiefly those given by the several church courts where the reverend scoundrels were tried, sometimes probably given to partially hide the real offence. The compiler was enabled to ascertain that "unchaste conduct" meant a gross and beastly assault by the "divine messenger" upon a lady's chastity, and that "unministerial conduct" meant either "adultery, rape, or seduction of some susceptible sister."

**A NEW THAUMATURGIST.**—The Moulvi or Mahomedan priest, who created such a sensation in Calcutta, professed to work instantaneous and miraculous cures of diseases of every description. The *Indo-European Correspondence*, describing him, says that "he took up his position by the banks of the Hoogly and was soon surrounded by thousands of people; for, as usual, his fame spread like wild fire through the city; his method of proceeding was to breathe upon water brought him by the applicants from the sacred but very foul stream in the earthenware vessels commonly used by the people. That the Moulvi has not redeemed all his promises is pretty certain. A sais who drank of the water has had an attack of cholera, and an old woman, a Christian, discarded the medicine she had been taking with profit, for the Moulvi's water, and straightway died."

That's a sad beginning. But other papers speak of the many wonderful cures made by the man, who, for all we know, might have, under the pretext of breathing upon the water each time, mesmerized it. This would reduce the "miracles" to simple mesmeric phenomena.

The *Statesman*, however, in connection with the Mahomedan wonder-worker, gives us some additional and far more interesting information:—"The excitement caused among the masses in this city by the unexpected appearance of a stranger in it professing to be possessed of supernatural powers...has kept the mob of the city in commotion during the last fortnight, had not yet even partially subsided, when it was increased by the appearance on the stage of another individual, known in Calcutta for some time past as a man endowed with genius and capacities of an extraordinary and superhuman character. The object of the visit of the latter to the Commissioner of Police which, perhaps, is not generally known, will be pretty clearly perceived from the following copy of the petition presented to the Commissioner:—

Calcutta, 11th October, 1881.

To the Commissioner of Police, Calcutta.

The humble petition of Swami Brahmananda Saraswati Sankarachari Jagatguru, sheweth,—

"That your petitioner being by profession Jagatguru is generally looked up to as the sole protector of the Hindu religion, and as such is bound in duty to see that that religion is preserved intact.

"2. That, obedient to the call of this duty, he approaches you with this petition, setting forth certain events which have of late been and are even now occurring every day which he considers to be indirect encroachment upon the Hindu religion.

"3. That your Worship's petitioner has come to learn that a certain Mahomedan Moulvi Moulava (son of Karamut Ali) of Jaunpore, is now on a visit to the city, intent on making converts of the Hindus, and that this his intention he is carrying out by certain means which to your petitioner appear to be extremely foul.

"4. That the unlettered masses of this vast city are deluded into the belief that great sanctity is attached to his personality, and that a vessel of water containing a quantity of *jira* (a kind of spice) when blown over by him, becomes an infallible remedy for all sorts of diseases, however dangerous.

"5. That your petitioner is informed,....that this process of blowing over is accompanied by certain incantations peculiar to the Moslems, and your petitioner makes no hesitation to affirm that a person drinking this water unconsciously becomes a Mahomedan.

"6. That your petitioner further states that the educated members of the Hindu community may well take care of themselves and their religion, but he cannot say the same thing of the untutored mass who are likely to be led away by a designing person.....

"7. That your petitioner submits that if the Moulvi is really possessed of any supernatural power which he feigns, he may be asked to cross the river with wooden sandals, or he may be required to fly in the air, or to drink a quantity of molten lead, or in the event of his not undertaking to perform any of these feats, he may be asked to cure a blind man and a leper, that the public, the uneducated portion of the Hindu society specially, may be able to see through the veil and to judge of the truth or falsity of his pretensions.

"For these reasons your petitioner humbly prays that an order to this effect be issued under your seal, and your petitioner, as in duty bound shall ever pray."

"We are told," remarks the *Brahmo Public Opinion* "that Swami Brahma-nanda Saraswati Sankarachari is himself prepared to undertake the performance of the miracles he would have his antagonist exhibit before the public."

Were the two thaumaturgists allowed to give a public exhibition of their "supernatural" powers, both with the avowedly laudable object of proving the truth and efficacy of their respective faiths, India would become the scene of a rare spectacle indeed. What with the advent of Mr. Eglington, the first genuine medium in a country where hitherto Yogis and astrologers have reigned supreme, and the two "miracle"-working saints, what would become of the scientific Materialism of the young Hindu and Mahomedan graduates? The fatal year 1881 would end by witnessing a scene which would carry the public back to the first century of the Christian era, to those days when Simon Magus wrestled for supremacy of magic powers with the Apostle Peter. Which of the two—the Mahomedan Moulvi or the Hindu Jagatgura who, in the act of flying in the air would cause his rival to fall and "break his leg," as the Christian legend shows Peter to have done? The contest between them, might become one of absorbing interest to the believers in Allah and Trimurti and, no doubt, would give rise to most ingenious theories among our missionary friends.

A SAGACIOUS ANSWER was given by that school-boy, who when asked "who Martin Luther was" unhesitatingly replied: "Martha Luther was the other virgin who went with the Virgin Mary to the sepulchre with a *joy* of myrrh in her hands to pour into the tomb, but the one virgin outran the other,—I don't know which." (*Catholic Tablet*.)

THE PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH IN THE ISLAND, seem very bright, (the Church meaning the Roman Catholic, and the Island standing for Ceylon as we understand) while the future of the Church in Europe as represented black and gloomy, if we have to believe the *Tablet* an ultra-Catholic organ. It makes Bishop Boujean, of Jaffna, in his public pastoral, draw the attention of his faithful flock to the heart-rending condition of the religious feeling in the West, and to "the dismal work of destruction which saddens all honest hearts in many countries of Europe." "You may not fully realize the magnitude and extent of the evils" the Bishop is made to say, "which have drawn forth from the heart of the Supreme Pastor this cry of anguish. You have not before you the heart-rending sight of holy Bishops dragged from their sees and sent into exile, of innumerable religious houses violently broken into, and their pious inmates brutally expelled and thrown houseless, without resources upon the wide world, as if the spectacle of their spotless lives was too much for a wicked generation to bear. You have not seen the holy city of Rome invaded by lawless adventurers (*i. e.* the Royal family) its holy places desecrated, its convents

turned into barrack-rooms, its treasures of piety, of art and of science dilapidated, and the Father of us all a close prisoner in his own palace, in the midst of that city which, by so many imperishable titles, is his..... You may, perhaps, find it hard to convince yourselves that the Church is really in such peril as to call for exceptional exertions on the part of her children to help her. But the fact is nevertheless so; and the Holy Father proclaims it in words of no uncertain sound. The fact, the lamentable fact is, that Europe is entangled in a vast network of secret societies enlisted "against the Lord and against His Christ" (Psalm ii. 3); pledged not to rest until, by iniquitous laws and by lawless deeds, and by the use of force and by seduction—above all, by entrapping the youth in their Godless State or Government schools, where under the flimsy pretence of respecting the conscience of all they teach downright infidelity—to sweep off the face of the earth the holy religion of Christ."

This eloquent address was wound up with the usual epilogue. Reminded of the fact that the bright prospects for the future, the prosperity of the Catholics of Ceylon and Jaffna especially, depended upon the prosperity of the "Holy Associations of the Propagation of the Faith and of the Holy Childhood," and both these Associations depending in their turn upon "those Catholic nations among whom has hitherto been recruited that large army of *givers of half-pence* by which such an immense amount of good has been effected, not here only, but in all foreign missions,"—a collection of coppers was made among the faithful of Jaffna.

"SEE," SAID AN ECCLESIASTIC, holding out a bowl of money before Thomas Aquinas, "the Church has no longer to say, 'Silver and gold have I none.'" "True," replied the stern ascetic, "and no longer is she able to say to the lame man, 'Rise and walk.'"—(*Phrenological Journal*).

INFIDELITY IN GERMANY is described by Prof. Christlieb, a well-known Evangelical theologian—in his disquisitions upon the "Breach between modern Culture and Christianity" in the following terms:

"A look into our own town churches shows at once the estrangement of the great majority of our educated classes from the Christian faith. If in the towns, whether you visit the lecture-rooms of professors, the council chambers of the municipality, the barracks of the soldier or the shop of the artisan, everywhere you hear the same tale. The old faith is now obsolete and only ignoramuses and hypocrites pretend to adhere to it any longer. But alas! all the factors of our modern intellectual life are largely influenced by a prevailing spirit of unbelief—save first our universities and schools; whereas among our theologians the old spirit of rationalism is in a great measure overcome. It is quite otherwise among the teachers in our upper schools, and so also the semi-cultural teachers in our popular schools. Such being the condition of our grammar schools, who can wonder that few students at the universities, except those studying theology, should go to church? A large class of Government officials are for the most part indifferent or hostile to Christianity. A further glance at our modern literature will exhibit the almost abyssmal profundity of the chasm which divides our present culture from our Christianity. Our daily press, in far the largest number of instances, take up a perfectly indifferent, if not positively hostile, position. Are not all of these signs of the times which exhibit the present breach between culture and Christianity as most deplorably deep and wide? It may then, I fear, be affirmed with truth that the great mass of our educated, and yet more of our half-educated classes in this our fatherland is alienated from all positive Christianity. Our diplomatists, almost without exception, the great majority of officers in the army, our Government officials, lawyers, doctors, teachers of all kinds except professed theologians, artists, manufacturers, merchants and artisans, stand on the basis of a merely rationalistic and nominal Christianity; while the lower and middle classes excepting the agriculturists and peasantry assume a more or less hostile position towards it. The chasm is wider than most of us would allow."



This may be due to "human wickedness" as also—to the fitness of things for all we know. We believe it, however, to be the result of a cause summed up in a few words in the "Notes and Extracts" of the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*. "In view of the amazing discrepancies" it says "if the Bible is really the Word of God, we will ask our evangelical friends whether God contradicts God, or whether the second person of the trinity is at variance with the first?"..... and again "the Christian religion is a principle, and requires first the lowering of the human standard. It is asked that men consider themselves as beings diseased; that they are a mass of putrifying matter; that they are lepers; outcasts from God, living at enmity with him, and only through his indulgence are they permitted to walk over the plains of earth, or even to give expression to thought." Only this, and—nothing more.....

TWO REMARKABLE HILLS are described by Captain Heavyside, in his report on survey operations in Khandeish and the Bombay Native States, in the Mangya Tungya range, which separates Khandeish from Nassiek. These hills, which are about three-quarters of a mile apart, rise 2,500 feet above the valley. Their summits are huge basaltic columns, each 200 feet high, and Captain Heavyside says "it is difficult to imagine anything in nature more typical of the monolith rising from a pyramidal base, with which artists have made us familiar; but here the scale is colossal, and so much the more magnificently grand." Round the base of the western summit a terrace runs partly the work of nature, and partly artificial. On the north side the terrace is some 10 or 12 feet wide, and here there are five temples "built in the shadow of the rock," and also three cave temples which were probably begun by Buddhists, but have been finished and taken over by the Mahrattas. The face of the rock above the terrace is studded with figures of gods and goddesses.—*Tablet*.

DR. TANNER AND Co. are thrown in the shadow by a religious mendicant of the Jain caste who is reported to have just completed a ninety-one days' fast at Hahlanpur. An eyewitness describes in a Surat paper the appearance of the man "on the last day of the penance." The "saint," says the writer, "underwent a fast of 86 days last year, and has been more or less accustomed to this form of infliction. When seen on the ninety-first day of the recent fast, his abdomen had so much subsided as to form the shape of a pit; the veins were much swollen and he seemed to speak only with great effort. He was seated on a blanket in a corner, and had near him the sour water of curdled milk, which he sometimes drank. He seemed, however, to be capable of physical exertion and up to last day procured the curdled milk-water for himself. He was all along engrossed in prayer, and held no communication with other men, except on religious topics. The man has spent his life in strict asceticism, and has denied himself all food and luxury, save what might be got from the milk-water, bread, and yellow rice. His bedding consists of an ordinary blanket, and nothing more. Many Jains undergo penances, but it is said that this man's efforts in this direction are unapproached by even his most devoted co-religionists, and he has drawn to himself a large following of Shrawaks. He accepts, however, no presents and no fees."—(*Amrita Bazar Patrika*.)

Madame H. P. Blavatsky, Corresponding Secretary of the Parent Society, returned to Bombay, on the 29th of November. All private correspondence should, therefore, be now addressed to her at the Head-Quarters at Bombay,

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page.		Page
The "Banner of Light."	... 55	What is a "Fact"...	... 70
The Church Congress and Spiritualism.	... .. 56	Hazy Notions ... ..	... 71
The Five-pointed Star.	... 60	Antiquity of the Vedas ...	... 72
Superstition ... ..	... 60	A Pious "Fiasco" ... ..	... 74
The "Philosophy of Spirit"...	62	Weird Phenomena ... ..	... 75
The Theosophist and Hindu Pantheism...	... .. 64	The Grand Inquisitor...	... 75
Trance Mediums and "Historical" Visions.	... .. 65	Is Creation Possible for Man.	79
The War in Heaven ... ..	67	The Theosophists...	... 80
"We will not quarrel but simply argue" ... ..	70	The Pupil of Swami Dayanand at the Congress of Orientalists ... ..	82
		Paragraph Flashes from the Four Quarters...	... 82

## SPECIAL NOTICES.

It is evident that the THEOSOPHIST will offer to advertisers unusual advantages in circulation. We have already subscribers in every part of India, in Ceylon, Burmah, China, and on the Persian Gulf. Our paper also goes to Great Britain and Ireland, France, Spain, Holland, Germany, Norway, Hungary, Greece, Russia, Australasia, South Africa, the West Indies, and North and South America. The following very moderate rates have been adopted:

## ADVERTISING RATES.

First insertion.....16 lines and under.....1 Rupee.  
 For each additional line.....1 Anna.  
 Space is charged for at the rate of 12 lines to the inch. Special arrangements can be made for large advertisements, and for longer and fixed periods. For further information and contracts for advertising, apply to

MESSRS. COOPER & Co.,

Advertising Agents, Booksellers and Publishers, Meadow Street, Fort Bombay.

## TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The Subscription price at which the THEOSOPHIST is published barely covers cost—the design in establishing the journal having been rather to reach a very wide circle of readers, than to make a profit. We cannot afford, therefore to send specimen copies free, nor to supply libraries, societies, or individuals gratuitously. For the same reason we are obliged to adopt the plan now universal in America, of requiring subscribers to pay in advance, and of stopping the paper at the end of the term paid for. Many years of practical experience have convinced Western publishers that this system of cash payment is the best and most satisfactory to both parties; and all respectable journals are now conducted on this plan.

The THEOSOPHIST will appear each month. The rates, for twelve numbers of not less than 48 columns Royal 4to each of reading matter, or 576 columns in all, are as follows:—To Subscribers in any part of India, Ceylon, Straits Settlements, China, Japan, and Australia, Rs. 8; in Africa, Europe, and the United States, £ 1. Half-year (India, &c.) Rs. 5; Single copies Rupee 1. Remittances in postal stamp must be at the rate of annas 17 to the Rupee to cover discount. The above rates include postage. No name will be entered in the books or paper sent until the money is remitted; and invariably the paper will be discontinued at the expiration of the term subscribed for. Remittances should be made in Money-orders, Mandis, Bill cheques, (or Treasury bills if in registered letters), and made payable only to the PROPRIETORS OF THE THEOSOPHIST, Breach Candy, Bombay, India. Subscriptions commence with the Volume.

Subscribers wishing a printed receipt for their remittances must send stamps for return postage. Otherwise acknowledgments will be made through the journal.

THE NOVEMBER NUMBER OF VOL. I BEING AGAIN ENTIRELY OUT OF print, only eleven numbers of that Volume can be had on payment of Rs. 5-12. Subscribers for the Second Volume (Oct. 1880 to September 1881) pay Rs. 6 only in India; Rs. 7 in Ceylon; Rs. 8 in the Straits Settlements, China, Japan, and Australia; and £1 in Africa, Europe and the United States.

AGENTS: London (Eng.), Bernard Quaritch, 15 Piccadilly, W.; Franco, P.G. Leymarie, 5, Rue Neuve des Petits Champs, Paris; New York, Fowler and Wells, 753, Broadway; Boston, Mass, Colby and Rich, 9, Montgomery Place; Chicago, Ill. J. C. Budy, 92, La, Salle St. American subscribers may also order their papers through W. Q. Judge, Esq., 71, Broadway, New York. Melbourne W. H. Terry, Pub. *Harbinger of Light*. West Indies: C. E. Taylor, St. Thomas.

Ceylon: Isaac Weeresooriya, Deputy Coroner, Doldanduwa: John Robert de Silva, Surveyor General's Office, Colombo: Don Timothy Karunaratne, Kandy. China: Kelly and Walsh, Shanghai.

Printed at the Industrial Press by B. Cursotjee & Co., and published by the Theosophical Society at Breach Candy, Bombay.

# SUPPLEMENT TO THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. 3. No. 3.

BOMBAY, DECEMBER, 1881.

No. 27.

## OUR WORK IN THE N.-W. PROVINCES AND OUDH.

Our work in the N.-W. Provinces this season has been of an important nature. Madame Blavatsky initiated during the last month many gentlemen, European and native, at Dehra Dun, Saharunpore and Meerut on her way from Lahore, where, by the way, there is every probability of our having *two* Branches of the Theosophical Society. Mr. S. J. Padshah on his way from Bombay to Lucknow was present at Allahabad on the 6th ultimo, to assist at the formation of the Prayág Branch. From Allahabad, Mr. Padshah proceeded to Lucknow, where he was received by H. R. H. Prince Mirza Soliman Kadir Bahadur with great cordiality. The Prince, the most enlightened member of the family of the ex-King of Oudh, was initiated as a Fellow on the 11th. His Highness applied for and received a Charter, empowering him to form a Branch at Lucknow, and we have no doubt that we shall be able to soon announce that a powerful and active Lucknow Theosophical Society has been inaugurated. Arrangements have been made for hearing Mr. Padshah lecture twice in the historical Kaiser Bagh. Mr. Padshah has been cordially welcomed by the representatives of the Press in Lucknow.

From Lucknow, Mr. Padshah proceeded to pay a flying visit to Bareilly, the capital of Rohilkund, where he met Madame Blavatsky by appointment. There they initiated several applicants into the Society. A Branch to be called "The Rohilkund Theosophical Society" was formed at Bareilly also. The erection of a Theosophical Hall for the Branch is seriously contemplated, and we are sure the Bareilly Branch will be the outcome of the immediate future.

## THE ADHI BHOUTIC BHRATRU THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

A charter for the formation of a Branch of the Theosophical Society, under the above name, at Berhampore (Bengal), was applied for and granted to Babu Nobin Krishna Banerjee, Deputy Collector and Magistrate of Berhampore, who had come down to the Head-Quarters specially for that purpose and for necessary instruction. He left Bombay on the 14th November to meet Madame Blavatsky at Allahabad on his way to Berhampore. We hope to give in our next the bye-laws of the Branch, as also the names of the officers elected.

## NATIVE LADIES' THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETIES.

The rules for the formation of these societies, carefully framed by one acquainted for long years with India and its various castes and observances, will be printed in the January Number. The first Zenana Branch that is about to be opened, will be at Berhampore, Bengal, where there are already a few native ladies who have joined the Theosophical movement.

## BOMBAY THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

At the regular monthly meeting of the Society held at the Parent Society's Head-Quarters at Breach Candy, on Sunday, the 6th November, at 4 P. M., Mr. Dánodar K. Mávalankar read a lecture on: "The Secret of Life." It lasted for a little over half an hour.

After a short discussion between the President Dr. Dudley and the lecturer on some of the points in the lecture and a vote of thanks to the young gentleman from the audience, the meeting was adjourned.

7th November 1881,

## RULES OF THE PUNJAB UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD AND THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY (LAHORE).

(President William Bull, Esq.)

I. To carry out its objects the Society has a body of officers, and a committee of management, who do all the work connected with the Society.

II. The body of officers consists of one President, two Joint-Secretaries and one Treasurer, and the Committee of Management of from seven to twelve Members, with officers acting as *ex-officio* members.

III. The officers and the members of the Managing Committee are elected for one year at the Society's annual general meetings from among the Society's members, and by them they may be re-elected any number of times.

IV. The President of the Society takes the chair at the meetings of the Managing Committee as well as at the ordinary meetings of the Society, and delivers an address at the beginning of the Society's year giving a review of the past year's actions of the Society, and offering suggestions for its future guidance.

V. The Joint-Secretaries keep records of the proceedings and actions of the Society, read reports of the last meeting, and of the past year at the Annual General Meeting, reply to all official letters, correspond with individuals and other Societies in sympathy with the objects of their own, and convene ordinary as well as extraordinary meetings of the Managing Committee as well as ordinary meetings of the Society. The Joint Secretaries work together.

VI. The Treasurer is in charge of all monies belonging to the Society, keeps accounts of receipts and disbursements, collects subscriptions and donations, makes payments under the sanction of the Secretaries, and renders a quarterly account of income and expenditure to the Managing Committee.

VII. The Managing Committee meets when occasion arises, considers all matters connected with the Society, takes necessary steps for the accomplishment of the objects of the Society, instructs the Secretaries to convene extraordinary general meetings, and appoints office-bearers and members of the M. C. when any vacancies occur.

VIII. Members only can vote at meetings of the Society, the members of the Managing Committee at meetings of that body, the general members of the Society at the general-meetings of the Society.

IX. All questions at all meetings of the Society are decided by a majority of votes. When the number of votes is equally balanced, the President has a casting vote, which decides the question.

X. Each member will have to pay a minimum subscription of annas four a month.

XI. The rules of the Society can be altered, modified or changed at the annual general meeting of the Society; also at extraordinary general meetings convened for the purpose by the Secretaries with the sanction of the Managing Committee, and at no other time.

XII. If a body of the Members of the Society larger than the Managing Committee with its *ex-officio* members send up a written requisition to the Secretaries, requesting them to call an extraordinary general meeting, they are bound to convene it; if they do not call such a meeting within a reasonable period, the applicants can themselves convene the same.

XIII. All notices concerning meetings of the Society are issued at reasonable periods before their date of meeting with the objects of the meetings stated therein,

XIV. Members can be expelled only at the General Meetings of the Society.

PROSONNO COOMAR DEY,  
Secretary.

### THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND ITS DETRACTORS.

In closing our accounts for the current year, we are happy to give some substantial proofs to our many societies and numerous Brethren, who have been lately deploring the insults to which the Founders of the Society have been so long subjected in India, that truth must triumph. There is a silver lining to every black cloud, and, as they will see, we have not remained without friends or defenders.

### THE "SATURDAY REVIEW" AND THE "THEOSOPHIST."

In the July number of the *THEOSOPHIST* appeared a paper upon astrology, kindly communicated to this journal by Sardar B. V. Shastree, of Poona. This gentleman, than whom few are more generally respected by Anglo-Indians as well as by the natives, committed the mistake of forwarding the number containing his article to the *London Saturday Review*. It might have been anticipated that the *Saturday Review* would see nothing but a subject for satire in an essay, seriously dealing with so unorthodox a topic as astrology; it was, therefore, useless to count the shallow and concealed criticism which was all that could be expected from a journal of that class. But the Sardar could not have foreseen, and is, therefore, wholly free from the moral responsibility of having provoked the results that actually ensued. As it fell out, the *Saturday Review* fastened on the *THEOSOPHIST* which contained the article, specially intended for its inspection as a whole, and as a text for a comprehensive diatribe, aimed at occult inquiries of every sort, at the Theosophical Society as connected with these, and at the founders of the Theosophical Society in particular, and by name as guilty of the heinous crime of recommending investigation into certain branches of knowledge which the *Saturday Review* does not deign to explore and, therefore, conceives to be unworthy of exploration. The intellectual attitude of that journal, in discussing the value of occult inquiries, is thus too foolish to excite any serious indignation; one can only suppose that an orthodoxy thus resting its claims to respect on its own indirect confessions of ignorance, must be unlikely to retain its hold on the intelligence of the world at large for very much longer. But the article in question, unfortunately, is something besides an appeal to the public to refrain from taking an interest in matters concerning which the *Saturday Review* chooses to shut its eyes; it is a very savage attack on the personal character of the founders of the Theosophical Society whom it pleases to designate as "unscrupulous adventurers." It would be useless to attempt to characterise the journal which can apply such terms to people of whom it knows no more than that they believe in the existence of various principles in Nature that the *Saturday Review* knows nothing about. Fortunately it is unnecessary for the *THEOSOPHIST* to argue the questions concerning the founders of our Society which have thus been raised, as this has been done on their behalf very kindly and very ably by Mr. A. O. Hume. That gentleman has addressed to the *Saturday Review* a letter which has meanwhile been very extensively published in India. Sent *en premier lieu* to the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, it is as follows:—

Sir,—In a recent issue you republished an article from the *Saturday Review* which, amongst other equally erroneous statements, designated Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky "unscrupulous adventurers."

I enclose a copy of a letter addressed by me to the Editor of the *Saturday Review*, in regard to this article.

As you have seen fit to publish these false accusations, you will, I am sure, see the propriety of similarly publishing my enclosed refutation of them.

I am, Sir,  
Yours obediently,  
A. O. HUME.

To the Editor of the "*Saturday Review*."

Sir,—In a recent issue (that of September 3, 1881) you noticed a copy of a journal, the *THEOSOPHIST*, which had been sent to you from India by some native gentleman; and in commenting on this publication and on the subjects with which it professes to deal, you took occasion to call Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott a couple of "unscrupulous adventurers," and you further expressed a doubt as to "whether Colonel Olcott's title was earned in the War of Secession or at the bar of a drinking saloon."

As regards Colonel Olcott's title the printed papers which I send by this same mail will prove to you that that gentleman is an officer of the American Army who rendered good service during the war (as will be seen from the letters of the Judge Advocate-General, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Assistant Secretaries of War and of the Treasury), and who was sufficiently well known and esteemed in his own country to induce the President of the United States to furnish him with an autograph letter of introduction and recommendation to all Ministers and Consuls of the United States on the occasion of his leaving America for the East, at the close of 1878.

Surely this is scarcely the kind of men to whom the epithet "unscrupulous adventurer" can be justly applied.

I may add, from my own knowledge, that a purer-minded, more noble, or more self-devoted gentleman than Colonel Olcott does not exist. He may be right or wrong in his belief, but to the cause of that belief he has devoted his fortune, energies, and the remainder of his life; and while I can quite understand many treating him as a fanatic, I confess that I am surprised at a paper, of the high class to which the *Saturday Review* belongs, denouncing such a man as an "unscrupulous adventurer."

As regards Madame Blavatsky (in Russia still

"Son Excellence  
Madame la Generale  
Helene P. Blavatsky")

though she dropped all titles on becoming a naturalized American citizen). She is the widow of General N. V. Blavatsky, Governor during the Crimean War, and for many years, of Erivan in Armenia. She is the eldest daughter of the late Colonel Hahn, of the Russian Horse Artillery, and grand daughter of Princess Dolgorouki of the elder branch which died with her. The present Princess Dolgorouki belongs to the younger branch. The Countess Ida V. Hahn-Hahn was Madame Blavatsky's father's first cousin. Her father's mother married, after her husband's death, Prince Vassiltchikoff, General Fadeyeff, well known even to English readers, is her mother's youngest brother. She is well known to Prince Loris Melikoff, and all who were on the staff, or in society, when Prince Michael S. Woronzoff was Viceroy of the Caucasus. Prince Emile V. Sayu Wittgenstein cousin of the late Empress of Russia, was an intimate friend of hers, and corresponded with her to the day of his death, as has done his brother Ferdinand, who lately commanded some Regiment (Cossacks of the Guard I think), in Turkestan. Her aunt Madame de Witte, who like the rest of her family corresponds regularly with her, and indeed her whole family, are well known to Prince Dondoukoff Korsakoff, at present Governor-General of Odessa.\*

I could add the names of scores of other Russian nobles who are well acquainted with her; for she is as well known and connected in Russia as Lady Hester Stanhope was in England; but I think I have said enough to convince any impartial person that she is scarcely the kind of woman likely to be an "unscrupulous adventurer."

Ladies are not generally prone to taking fancies to outside ladies; there is very commonly a little suppressed sex-jealousy of those especially who are cleverer than themselves; but Madame Blavatsky has lived for months at a time in my house, and is certainly one of the cleverest women I ever met, and yet all the ladies in my house have learnt to love dearly this energetic, crotchety, impulsive, self-devoted old woman. Any one may set her down as a mystic or a visionary, but no one who knows her can doubt her all-consuming faith in the mission to which she has sacrificed her life.

But, after all, can you rightly call people adventurers who not only make no money out of the cause they espouse, but, on the contrary, spend on it every farthing that they can spare from their private means? If not, then assuredly Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky are not adventurers, for to my certain knowledge they have spent on the Theosophical Society over £2,000 (two thousand pounds) more than its total receipts. The accounts have been regularly audited, printed and published, so that any one may satisfy themselves on this head.

But it will be asked what is this grand cause? It is the formation and development of the Theosophical Society, the objects of which, as stated in the published rules, are as follows:—

\* From whom, moreover, a fortnight ago, Mme. Blavatsky has unexpectedly received a most friendly and sympathetic private letter, the original of which has been seen by many friends whose testimony on the subject could easily be obtained, if necessary.—Ed.

*First.*—To form the nucleus of an Un'ersal Brotherhood of Humanity.

*Second.*—To study Aryan literature, religion, and science.

*Third.*—To vindicate the importance of this enquiry.

*Fourth.*—To explore the hidden mysteries of nature and the latent powers of man:

Now, these objects may be considered Utopian or visionary, but they seem to me innocent enough, and hardly the kind of objects that would satisfy unscrupulous adventurers.....

There are many other misconceptions involved in the article under reference, to which objection might reasonably be taken; but these are perhaps of less importance. All I desire now to make clear is that so far from being "unscrupulous adventurers," Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky are very worthy, unworldly, unselfish, pure-minded people, who are devoting their time, their property, and their lives to a cause which even, if Utopian, is unobjectionable, and may incidentally be productive (indeed, it already has been so) of much good.

I remain, yours obediently,

A. O. HUME,

*Late Secy. to the Govt. of India.*

Before this letter had time to get to London, the *Saturday Review* seems to have been addressed on the subject of its scandalous attack, by some champions of Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott in England. For, in the issue of September the 17th, it publishes the following explanation:—

"We have received a letter from a friend of Colonel Olcott objecting to some strictures which we lately made upon that gentleman and Madame Blavatsky as founders of the so-called Theosophical Society of India. Our remarks were based upon the published accounts of their doings, which struck us as bearing a suspicious resemblance to those of the 'spirit mediums' in Europe and America. We are quite willing to accept our correspondent's statement that Colonel Olcott occupied an honourable position in his own country and to believe that both he and Madame Blavatsky are credulous enthusiasts and not unscrupulous adventurers. When, however, people promulgate pernicious theories and adopt practices which, under another name, have been authoritatively pronounced illegal and mischievous, they must not be surprised if, in the absence of private information as to their biography, they lay themselves open to adverse criticism."

The passage above italicised shows the *Saturday Review* blundering in its facts again. But *apropos* to this unworthy onslaught it is unnecessary to go into the whole question. We will not discuss the point as to whether the theories which the *Saturday Review* erroneously conceives to be promulgated by us, would or would not be pernicious—if we did promulgate them, or as to whether the "practices" which are present to the cloudy understanding of our critics would be illegal, supposing us to recommend them. Eighteen centuries ago, Pliny and other magistrates have "authoritatively pronounced" the practices and theories promulgated by the early Christians "illegal and mischievous," and the followers of Christ were, no doubt, more than once accused of listening to, and believing in, the doctrines of an "unscrupulous adventurer." The *Saturday Review* has mixed up Theosophy and Spiritualism, two subjects in reference to the A B C of which in both cases it is absolutely in the dark, and has talked at them like a village scold in a passion. The blunders it makes on the questions it pretends to deal with, do not rise to the level of errors that can be refuted. Its remarks are all up in the air and mere idiotic nonsense.

Anyhow, the age of the Inquisition has gone by. Now, every man has a right, especially under the British constitution, to his or her belief,—whatever it may be—without fear of molestation by either Church or State. Journalism, however, seems to stand on neutral ground. The god of most editors being "Mrs. Grundy's" opinion, and his prophet—subscribers, whose hobbies and prejudices have to be humoured—many journalists will rather forget they are gentlemen than fail to satisfy their readers. The *Saturday Review*, great and honourable a reputation as it has, deservedly for many reasons, was guilty of such forgetfulness in its impression of Sept. 3, and descended to the level—one cannot say anything more cruel,—of the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, which paper, though it copied the disgraceful abuse of the *Saturday Review's* first article, shamelessly forebore to reprint its subsequent retraction.

We have, however, to tender our best thanks to the *Saturday Review*. Its attack upon us has called out another defence. This once, it is the *Lahore Tribune* which raises its friendly voice:—

The *Saturday Review*, on a recent occasion, took the opportunity when reviewing a number of the *Theosophist* to attack Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott in the most unseemly manner, branding them amongst other things as "unscrupulous adventurers."

Now, bad as this was, some excuse may be made for the *Saturday Review*, since with the chronic ignorance of all Indian subjects which characterizes the European Press, the Editor may possibly have written in good faith and believed what he said.

But the *Civil and Military Gazette* deliberately republished this tissue of falsehood and libel, and, for the credit of Indian journalism, we should be glad to believe that the Editor was in a hopeless state of ignorance as to the real facts of the case, which alone could relieve him from the charge of bad faith that the republication here without comment of such outrageous statements must *prima facie* involve.

However, this is a question that we do not care to discuss further. There are, we fear, dirty corners in most earthly things, even in Indian journalism, and the less certain unsightly heaps are stirred, the less their emanations offend refined tastes.

Mr. Hume had written to the *Saturday Review*, pointing out that whatever view might be taken of the practicability of Colonel Olcott's and Mme. Blavatsky's scheme, they could not at any rate possibly be classed as "unscrupulous adventurers," and he had added the expression of his conviction, founded on long and intimate personal intercourse, that whether wise or foolish, of sober judgment or fanatics, the founders of the Theosophical Society were at any rate, thoroughly honest, sincere and well-intentioned, living pure and blameless lives and devoting themselves entirely and unselfishly to their cause.

In this verdict, every body who has watched the Theosophical movement will, we believe, heartily concur. There may be Brothers or there may not—they may be a reality or the creations, in all good faith of Madame Blavatsky's enthusiasm; this is not a point that can be argued in a journal like ours. But we cannot but feel that the whole tendency of this movement is to raise us in our own esteem, to awake "the pride of former days," and to drag us out of our long lethargy to the perception that in our own ancient literature, science and religion, there yet lurk "gems of purest ray serene," gems as priceless as any that glitter in the flashing coronet of Western culture.

Nor can we fail to realize that to this work the founders of the Theosophical Society, braving the sneers and calumny of all the self-sufficient disciples of Western science, relinquishing all that to most mortals makes life sweet, good repute, position, fortune, ease and rest, are unselfishly and, we fear, for the most part, unthankedly devoting themselves. Differ, therefore, as we may on other points, there are none of us who can be other than indignant at vile attacks on the personal character of Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, such as those embodied in the *Saturday Review's* article above referred to; and none but must feel a certain pride and pleasure in a temperate refutation of the worst of those slanders, such as Mr. Hume has furnished in his letter to the *Saturday*, and which our erring contemporary has at last had the grace to publish."

It appears, however, that defence notwithstanding, the *Civil and Military Gazette* has once more eased its vindictive feelings by an indirect attack upon us. This once, it comes under the safe guise of a letter written by a "European officer," and recently answered by Mr. Ross Scott, F.T.S., in the same paper. "*Spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas*" seems to be that un-Civil Gazette's motto, and it is with beat of drum that it spreads such news. Meanwhile the *Lahore Tribune* vents its indignation in the words that follow—"In its correspondence columns it published a letter the other day from, it says, a European officer, charging the above Society with disloyal motives. The wise correspondent even goes so far as to say that *Theosophists* were probably at the bottom of the riots at Multan (!!!) The *C. & M. Gazette* is a standing disgrace to the world of Indian Journalism."

AMEN! Could some of our Punjabee Brothers inform us by the way—(1) whether there is a lunatic asylum at Lahore and if the answer is in the affirmative, (2) whether that mad-house is furnished with cells and straight-jackets strong enough to hold "European officers" afflicted with such hallucinations, and editors capable of giving them room on their columns?

Again, the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* of 27th October contains a most friendly editorial in our defence, which we reprint further on. When the *Saturday Review* published its libellous and ungentlemanly attack on

the Theosophists, it must have little thought what service it was rendering us in turning attention to Theosophy. We ought really to feel grateful to the *English Review*. Instead of the hundreds of persons who were before aware of the existence of our society, thousands will now be filled with curiosity to know what, in reality, is this much abused body and what are the crimes which could have brought such a torrent of vituperation upon it...Interest will be aroused, and the society will grow in proportion to the violence of the abuse. In reference to the editorial we may remark that if not a little surprised to find one of the best London journals disgracing its columns with such a slanderous attack as that published in the *Saturday*, we were not at all astonished to see it reproduced in full in the *Civil and Military Gazette*. The action of the latter can only be regarded as natural and consistent with its usual policy. The *Saturday Review* can, the *Civil and Military* (as now conducted) cannot disgrace itself. Even after being forced to publish Mr. Hume's letter, protesting against the uncalled-for and libellous assertions, a few days later, the Lahore daily appeared again with an editorial which, under the mask of pretentious, heavy and as clumsy witticisms, was full of insinuations directed against Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky—every one of them being either a malicious innuendo, or an impudent untruth. In such attacks it plays a dangerous game, as aimed at us its sarcasms rebound and fall on itself. It pounces on Mr. Hume's kind and friendly remarks in defence of Colonel Olcott, and trying to be satirical asks, why to the epithets "pure-minded," "noble" and "self-devoted", Mr. Hume does not add "high-toned" when speaking of the American Colonel. Now, to hear the Lahore *Gazette* speak of "high-toned" suggests very strongly a Nicobar islander asking a European sailor why he does not eat with a silver knife and fork instead of using his fingers. The Punjab *Gazette* talking of what it has hitherto been as ignorant as a newborn babe of the elements of Euclid! It is truly too ridiculous. We have never known or heard even of a poorest Hindu editor of a third-class native paper who has been guilty in a whole year of such a number of gross vulgarities, and of such bad taste as the *Civil and Military Gazette* displays in any one of its numbers selected at random. It is this spirit of rampant sycophancy, of loathsome flattery and flunkeyism before every Anglo-Indian power, and at the same time its vulgar and brutal abuse of every thing and of all it thinks unable to defend themselves, that has given it the reputation it now enjoys throughout the Punjab and the N.-W. Provinces. Its sneers against the THEOSOPHIST are, to say the least, absurd. That our journal which has been little more than two years in existence and is devoted mostly to philosophical and mystical subjects, has contained at times, in Mr. A. O. Hume's words, "paragraphs utterly indefensible both in taste and tone" owing, for the most part, to our absence, is a fact which we sincerely regret. It was due to the desire of the managers to enliven its columns, full of very abstruse—hence, for some, rather too dry metaphysics—by reprinting scraps from American and even provincial English newspapers. This, however, only leaves the journal guilty of reprinting occasionally other people's vulgarities, not of filling its columns with original abuse and clumsy witticisms worthy, for the most part, of a mountebank at a country fair as is the case almost daily with the *Civil and Military*. We have never hesitated to admit the defects of our paper, and to gratefully thank every well-meaning, respectable critic who with courtesy points them out to us; but surely it is not the editor or editors—Heaven save the mark!—of the *Civil and Military Gazette* who can be considered capable of what educated people are accustomed to call fair and gentlemanly criticism. There are men to whom the instincts of a born gentleman are as foreign as the smell of a violet is to a negro's skin and as well expect kindness and decent language from a hackney carriage driver who believes himself cheated out of his full fare and knows there is a mile between him and the nearest policeman. Hence neither Colonel Olcott

nor Madame Blavatsky can be in any way the worse, either as private individuals or as editors of the THEOSOPHIST for being called "quacks," "impostors" and what not by the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore. Colonel Olcott, regarded in America and elsewhere as a gentleman by all those who know him, cannot feel hurt at any thing such a rabid, ill-conditioned paper can say of him; nor as one of the late editors of the *New York Tribune*, for years the well-known organ of Horace Greeley, can he feel dismayed by any opinion the editor of the said paper may express regarding him and his "tone." The conductor of the *Civil Gazette*, unaware that any thing he might say of the Colonel and of Madame Blavatsky, would only amuse them with a gallantry and courage for which he is so pre-eminently distinguished—goes on attacking a woman and a foreigner, whose peculiar and unpopular views seem to ensure him, as he thinks, perfect impunity. The too sanguine editor may, perhaps, at some time discover his mistake. Meanwhile, having, we are afraid, disfigured our columns too much already,—we do hope for the last time—with the mention of that very uncivil person, we close our remarks to give place to the editorial mentioned at the beginning of this article.

(From the *Anrita Bazar Patrika*.)

#### THE RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN FRIENDS.

It is all very well to talk of *Magna est veritas et prevalebit*, and so it doubtless does in the end, but most truths seem to take a very long time in establishing themselves, and there is probably no truth which will have to wait longer before it does prevail, at any rate with our European Aryan brethren, than this, that all wisdom and learning, science and truth, are not absolutely their exclusive birth-right. As matters stand, the placid self-complacency with which almost all Western minds contemplate their own attainments and the supposed folly, ignorance, and superstition of their Eastern representatives, would be really delightful, were it not indirectly productive of so much evil. So ingrained is this self-exultation, that it is only necessary for any European, rending the fetters of hereditary prejudice, to discover and proclaim that there is something good, something of value, something desirable of attainment in our Eastern literature, science or religion for his fellows at once to brand him as fool, madman or rogue.

Let it not be supposed that we attribute to them in such cases any want of good faith—it is in all sincerity that like the Jews of old they ask "can any good come out of Nazareth?" Their self-esteem is so overwhelming, their satisfaction with their own limited materialistic knowledge so intense, that honestly and truly they cannot conceive any sane, sensible and upright man discovering anything good and still less anything better than what they already know—in either our literature, our science, or our religion.

It is well known that for some years past Col. Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, the founders of the Theosophical Society, have been zealously labouring to revivify our indigenous learning and to convince an age, oblivious of past glories, that good as might be in its way of modern Western physical science, there was a higher good, lying forgotten in our ancient Eastern psychical science.

These good friends of ours and of India actually persisted that there were things in our old Eastern philosophies not dreamt of by Western science, that there were truths, spiritual and scientific still extant, though almost forgotten amongst us, higher than any to which the materialistic West has ever attained, that it behoved us, the lineal descendants of the sages of old, the successors to their priceless lore, to neglect no longer their precious legacy, but rather by earnest study and patient investigations, to qualify ourselves to teach our Western masters, lessons higher, deeper, sterner than anything they have ever taught us.

Can it be wondered at that at such audacity the European community stood aghast, or that they heaped upon the propounders of such a theory every injurious epithet of which their meagre vocabulary was master?

Spies, knaves, fools, impostors, cheats and what not, were amongst the titles so generously bestowed on them; an European police officer dogged their footsteps from Bombay to Meerut and back again; there was a general consensus that Government really ought to deport them; there was no language too severe in which to denounce them; but, as in the case of that "terrible curse" which has made the Archbishop of Rheims so famous,

"What gave rise, to no little surprise

Was that nobody seemed one penny the worse."

The fact was that as time went on, the pure, unselfish and self-denying lives led by the founders of the Society, gradually caused a change in even that bluntest of all evolutes, Anglo-Indian Public Opinion. It began to be realized, that though these people might be fanatics, and enthusiasts, no moral delinquencies could be laid to their charge, and, for some time past, except in a very few ill-conditioned second-rate prints, we have seen no unseemly abuse of either Col. Olcott or Madame Blavatsky.

People laughed at them and ridiculed their pretensions, but they had come round to feel that whatever the founders' qualifications for their self-imposed and vast task, they were at any rate honestly labouring and at their own cost, day and night, to achieve it.

Suddenly some scoundrel, we use the term advisedly, for the man who insults and maligns an innocent woman, from what he thinks is a safe asylum, is a scoundrel; some scoundrel, we repeat, obtains admission for an article in the *Saturday Review* abusing and vilifying both Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, asserting that both were unscrupulous adventurers, fit subjects to be dealt with by the Police, &c. &c. As soon as this article was noticed in India, a letter was addressed to the editor of the *Saturday Review* (which, despite the accidental appearance in its columns of this discreditable article, is a respectable paper), pointing out the erroneous and unwarrantable character of the assertions made. This will doubtless appear in due course in England, as the editor of the *Saturday Review* is presumably a gentleman, and the article is distinctly libellous, and with this refutation at home, the matter might have ended.

But as there is always some wretched dog that runs across the race course just when it "didn't ought," so there is always some journal found to republish any article conspicuous for bad taste or malignity, or, as in the present case, both, as no one else rushed forward to secure the plume fallen from the wings of the loathly vulture scandal, the *Civil and Military Gazette* boldly came to the front and reproduced the objectionable article in full.

It does not surprise us to perceive that on this the editor was called on to reproduce also the refutation of the original article that had been sent to the *Saturday Review*, nor, indeed, the article being clearly actionable, that he complied with the demand. In our next we hope to reprint this refutation (we will not disgrace our pages with the article that gave rise to it) which is well worth perusal, and perfectly conclusive.

Conclusive that is to say so far as it goes, for Mr. Hume, the writer of the reply in the *Review* only professes to show that Col. Olcott and Mme. Blavatsky are not "unscrupulous adventurers" but, on the contrary, love-worthy, and honest people, and this, no native of India, who has watched the gradual development of their scheme, will question.

But there are many other points in the article in the *Saturday Review* that we should like to see touched on, and many other gross misconceptions that we could have wished refuted.

Thus, the *Saturday* remarks that Madame Blavatsky's chief claim to attention, is the invention of a certain mystic brotherhood, which with the customary western assumption of omniscience, it sets down, being entirely ignorant on the subject, as a pure fiction.

Can anything be more absurd when there are hundreds and thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of us in India, who know that this mystic brotherhood exists, aye, and, have existed for thousands of years, who know the paths

by which men like ourselves rose to join that sacred fellowship, and who have more or less knowledge of the spiritual truths to which they have attained?

But the West can conceive nothing to be possible of which it is ignorant. It is unable to realize that Western intellect working along one line, the physical, has indeed in this made marvellous progress, but is yet grossly ignorant of the even more marvellous results at which Eastern minds, working for thousands of years along another line, have arrived. The blatant West has ever paraded every scrap of its so-called knowledge which deals only with phenomena, to which it has attained, but the silent East that deals only with noumena, that has grasped the only true knowledge, what we are, whence we come, whither we go, has ever veiled her attainments in sacred secrecy.

The men of the West are brave, energetic, practical and deeply skilled in physical science, but they are materialistic, ignorant of psychical science and the higher spiritual truths, and so steeped in self-conceit that they deem everything unknown or inexplicable to *them*, false or impossible.

It has been good for us that they have brought us peace, fairly good Government and their Western culture; but it is bad for us that they have in their blind contempt for all they do not know, trampled out or nearly so our national pride in that religion, science, and literature which we have inherited from a thousand generations and that by their materialistic Western system of education they have almost blotted out from our cognizance the higher and eternal spiritual truths that lie veiled in our ancient literature.

Be it so. All things in their appointed cycle. The sun is still there, though the earth turns away from him.

But are better times never to return? The night has been long and weary; will the dawn never come?

It may be but the dream of some few tired watchers, but to us it seems as if even now there were a glimmer in the East.....

#### MADAME BLAVATSKY AND COLONEL OLCOTT.

TO THE EDITOR "CEYLON TIMES."

SIR,—In taking over the paragraph from the *Bombay Gazette* about Madame Blavatsky and myself, you have taken over at the same time that paper's remark "surely the status of both these notable Theosophists is capable of verification, and it is for the interests of both that it should be placed beyond all doubt or cavil by the production of 'papers' which would set the matter at rest for ever." And as your attitude towards ourselves has always been, so far as I know, one of self-respectful impartiality, I will do for you, what I have scorned and ever will scorn to do, for the bigoted editors who have been abusing us so shamelessly and without cause. I send you herewith for inspection a packet of original official documents, emanating from highly placed officers of the American War, Navy, Treasury, and State Departments to and about myself, which show that my personal, and official character at home, is without spot or blemish. They show that since my arrival in India, and down to a very recent date—only a few weeks, in fact—I have been doing favours for the State Department, the Quarter-Master-General, U.S.A., and the Smithsonian Institution, by the collection of information about commerce, Army Tentage, and Ethnology. I invite you to subject these documents to the closest scrutiny of Inspector-General of Police, the Queen's Advocate, the Bishop of Colombo, or any other public officer, or private analyst, who is supposed to be capable of selecting an "adventurer" at sight. Through the American Consul, the American Minister at London, or any other channel, you are at liberty to inquire into my 'status' and my services to my country during, before, and since the war. These papers show that I have been associated on public committees and on terms of perfect equality, with the most eminent of American Statesmen (includ-

ing the late President Garfield), merchants and bankers. If you will take the trouble to have enquiry made, you will also find that as a lawyer I have had such great clients as the Corporation of New York City, the N. Y. Stock Exchange, the Mutual and Equitable Life and Continental Life Insurance companies, and the Gold Exchange Bank, and Panama Railway Co.; and that in the year 1870 I was retained by the New York representatives of the United steel-manufacturers of Sheffield to proceed to England and adjust a very large customs revenue claim laid against them by the U. S. Government. But I will not enter into a catalogue of the easily-found proofs that go to show that the vile and libellous epithet of "unscrupulous adventurer," flung at me by the *Saturday Review*, is as little applicable to me as to any man living. The last thing desired by the enemies of the Theosophical Society is—I most sadly affirm—that the status of its founders "should be placed beyond all doubt or cavil." The sole weapon they can use against us is slander and ridicule, and they neither want our characters cleared, nor will publish the facts. Take, as an example, this very libel of the *Saturday Review*. The editor printed it on the 3rd of September, without a scintilla of evidence before him that was prejudicial to our good name. On the 17th of the same month he published a retraction confessing that the remarks "were based upon the published accounts of their doings, which struck us as bearing a suspicious resemblance to those of the 'spirit mediums' in Europe and America." Upon such warranty as this one of the first journals of England did not hesitate to brand an innocent lady and gentleman with the most opprobrious of epithets! I have just made a flying visit to the Madras Presidency to organize a new branch of our Society. On the day of my arrival at Tinnevely, the Missionary presses at Palamcottah issued a pamphlet entitled "Theosophy," without imprint or any other sign of its origin, which was simply a republication of the *Saturday's* libel, and an equally discreditable one by the *N. Y. Times*, based upon a letter I was falsely alleged to have written to a gentleman at New York. The Missionaries had not the honesty to print the *Saturday's* retraction after the libel, for that would have defeated their object. And rightly suspecting that their indecent pamphlet would be flung in the face of their colporteurs, the latter were ordered to say at every Hindu residence where a copy was left, that it was "sent with the compliments of Mr. Soondram Iyer"—the Secretary of our new branch. I need not comment upon such conduct, for I am addressing a British audience....

Pardon, I pray you, the length of this letter. I have for months, in silence and disgust, allowed the poor creatures who delight in slander, to send broadcast their wretched seed, for I have always been taught by the lessons of history that such seed, being steeped in the acrid juices of falsehood and malice, will rot in the ground, enrich the soil for its reception as you may. I firmly believe that a pure and honest life is its own best shield; and that as time wears on and the results of our labours in India and Ceylon show themselves, the eternal law of compensation will vindicate the reputations of Madame Blavatsky and your obedient servant,

H. S. OLCOTT.

Colombo, 31st October, 1881.

At the same time that our President—who, for a period of nearly three years had abstained from answering his calumniators, wisely treating the anonymous, cowardly slanders with the contempt they merit—was penning the above; and while numerous letters of congratulations from Hindu correspondents and messages full of enthusiasm and gratitude from our Tinnevely Theosophists were pouring into our office, there appeared a new proof of the insatiable malice of our opponents. That malice and the bitterness of their hatred of the Theosophists have finally reached that degree of blind fury that vitiates the most ordinary perceptions. To lie

openly and in the most impudent, shameless manner has become their last expediency. When our readers will have noticed the Official Report of Tinnevely Branch which follows the present, and a few articles from other correspondents, they will be able to judge for themselves. In a letter from an unknown Tinnevely correspondent of the *Madras Standard* the following truthful statement is given:—"The natives of this place" writes the informer, "are very sorry for all the hubbub and commotion caused by the arrival of Colonel Olcott, the Theosophist, among them. *The Branch Society—the members of which invited him here—were very disappointed in their expectations. They now call him 'IMPOSTOR AND PRETENDER'*—to use their own words".....!!

By this time our "Branch Society" will have read the above statement. We all sincerely hope our Tinnevely Brothers will not refuse themselves the satisfaction of pointing out publicly to the "Tinnevely correspondent of the *Madras Standard*" that the greatest "impostor" is that man who, taking advantage of the voice of the press, imposes upon the public bare-faced LIES under the guise of news; "that the term 'pretender,' is to be applied only to individuals of his stamp, who *pretending* to the name of a "correspondent" have a right but to that of a "penny-a-line" slanderer, whose lies would disgrace any respectable paper. A very reliable organ—as a source of information—is the *Madras Standard*—we see!

DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR,  
Joint Recording Secretary,  
Parent Theosophical Society.

## TINNEVELLY THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

### THE SECRETARY'S REPORT.

Having invited Colonel H. S. Olcott, President Founder of the parent Theosophical Society to visit and lecture at Tinnevely, and he having kindly consented to our request, the Colonel, accompanied by a delegation of several Buddhist members of the Colombo Theosophical Branch Society, left Ceylon on the 21st ultimo and landed at Tuticorin on the following day. The whole Hindu community of that seaport was assembled to receive the Theosophists. Staying there the whole of that day, the President lectured in the A. V. School on "The Civilization that India needs." Both Natives and Europeans crowded the hall to suffocation. The Theosophists left Tuticorin on the next day by the morning train for Tinnevely, where they found the platform and the railway grounds as well as the roads near it, thronged by people eager to see and welcome our President. In the crowd, 5,000 men strong, appeared the most educated and intelligent of the native community to greet him. It was a rare and grand spectacle, indeed. "The American Pundit" delivered three most interesting and instructive lectures, two in the Hindu College and one in the large temple of our town. Numerous audiences, comprising the most learned and influential Hindus, gathered each time to hear him, cheering and applauding the Colonel throughout. Unfortunately for the Tinnevellians, his stay with them was limited to only four days. Owing to his numerous engagements at Ceylon and much to the regret of all the Hindus, he sailed back for that Island, promising us to return in January or February—with Madame Blavatsky that time.

During the Colonel's stay at Tinnevely, the Apostles of Christianity—true to their traditional customs—made themselves unusually busy in crying down Theosophy, and preaching to us "poor heathens" the logical and highly scientific doctrines of their Bible. At the same time, appeared a publication by the Padre under the shape of a small pamphlet containing two scurrilous libels about the Chiefs of the Theosophical Society—Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott,—one from the *Saturday Review*, and the other from the *New York Times*. I must not omit a very remarkable incident in connection with this publication, namely, that the Christian catechists liberally distributed the pamphlets among the people. *in my*

name, and with my best compliments to the people! Shame! Shame to them who resort to such dishonest and cowardly measures! Beyond this dastardly act of anonymous calumny no missionary of our place ventured to boldly come out and challenge the Colonel to a free discussion upon the authenticity of their facts, the characters of their prophets, the nature and fulfilment of their prophecies, or the divinity of their Christ. Nay worse. Not one of them had the moral courage to appear at his lectures though they were all invited to them! Is it their past experiences at Ceylon that, teaching them a sad lesson, has made them so wiser? Our Society has now decided to publish—with a Tamil translation appended to it, and in a pamphlet form—the letter addressed to the Editor of the *Saturday Review* by A. O. Hume, Esq., C. B., late Secretary to the Government of India, in vindication of the spotless characters of Madame Blavatsky and the Colonel, and his testimony showing the dignity and usefulness of the Society founded by them. We will also translate into Tamil the three lectures delivered here by Colonel Olcott. Fraternal greetings to all the Bombay Brethren.

S. SUNDRAM IYER, Secretary,

Tinnevelly Theosophical Society.

Tinnevelly, October 1881.

### COLONEL OLCOTT AND THE TINNEVELLY THEOSOPHISTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MADRAS MAIL.

#### I.

SIR,—The letters in your columns regarding Colonel Olcott's visit to Tinnevelly have attracted my attention. The following no doubt will be edifying to some of your readers:—

1. Colonel Olcott did not declare himself to be a Hindoo.
2. Colonel Olcott never said Buddhism was superior to Hindooism.
3. Colonel Olcott said not a word such as could betray even an inclination on his part to persuade the audience to embrace Buddhism.
4. A great deal, if not the whole, of what he said while addressing the public, was that Hindooism was a very ancient religion, and that his advice was "Dive and search deep—and you will find all that is wanted to convince you of the truth of that religion," or something to this effect.
5. Lastly, and not the least of all, the cocoanut planted by the Buddhists in the compound of the Tinnevelly temple (not in the heart of the temple as alleged by some of your correspondents) is still in existence, and in the same spot it was first planted, it has as good a thriving appearance as could be wished by the best of Colonel Olcott's friends. This is a stubborn **FACT.**

#### II.

SIR,—The account of Colonel Olcott's visit to Tinnevelly, given by your Tinnevelly "Native Christian Correspondent," is one tissue of misconceptions and misrepresentations. For, the Christian gentleman reports that the Hindus of this place feel disappointed and imposed upon by the Colonel! But, Sir, the truth is just the opposite. The Tinnevellians, who heard before so much of Colonel Olcott, and loved him so much, have now learned to respect and love him the more upon their personal observations of his deep erudition, extraordinarily instructive and impressive orations, soldierly and venerable appearance, and pleasing deportment. The educated Hindus are only in deep grief that he did not stay here longer. Your correspondent next proceeds to remark that some Native of Tinnevelly who translated into Tamil Colonel Olcott's lecture on "India; Past, Present, and Future," has, in his introduction to that translation, paid the founders of the Theosophical Society "unblushing adulation with flourish of trumpets!" Sir, I send you by this mail a printed copy of Colonel Olcott's testimonials. Please to peruse it through and see if the vernacular translator with all his "unblushing adulation," and with all his "flourish of trumpets," has yet done the American gentleman full justice. No; he has done but a part of his work; he has not wholly removed the veil from over the name of the Theosophist leader. These documents will testify to you that he is even something more

than a "Barrister," "a Colonel," "Special Commissioner of the War Department," "Chief Commissioner of Agriculture," and "Secretary to the National Insurance Convention." These certificates were printed in the form of a "supplement to the THEOSOPHIST" in January last; and circulated along with the theosophical organ throughout the whole world. And Madame Blavatsky is too well known now throughout the entire globe to require any notice being made by me. As regards the comparative merits of the religion, science, and philosophy renounced by Colonel and Madame, and those embraced by them, it suffices to say that those, who study Oriental and Western philosophies, &c., for truth's own sake, unbiassed by any race or creed, or party predilections, become ardent admirers and advocates of the former. The presentation of Koombham is simply a mark of esteem and salutation; and the receipt of it with respect is also simply a sign of returning the salutation. It is simple ignorance and absurdity, therefore, to suppose that this one of the Aryan ways of exchanging greetings, is an indication predictive of the coming rain. If any one deems it to be such, it is his own mistake; and he should lose no time to correct himself.

Your correspondent next asks "what right the Theosophists in this town had to use their influence as Government officials to prevail on the temple authorities to receive Colonel Olcott as they did, &c.?" He knows not, poor friend, that Government officials are after all only men; and as men they have souls; and their souls, true to their intrinsic nature, do, like those of the other people who are not Government officials, aspire to progress, and thirst for salvation. It is no wonder then that those Government Officials joined a society as its members, which professes, among other things, "to explore the hidden mysteries of nature, and to develop the latent powers of man." The chiefs of the Theosophical Society being Europeans by nationality, and having renounced their religion &c., and Orientalized themselves, the Asiatics conceive great sympathy, love, and esteem for them. The authorities of the pagoda of Tinnevelly are Hindus, and, therefore, have joined of their own accord, but were not compelled to do so, others who are also Hindus like themselves, in giving the Colonel that enthusiastic reception he so richly deserves at the hands of all the sons of India. Besides, it is a custom continued from a long time since with the authorities of the Siva pagoda of Tinnevelly, and I suppose the same is the case also with those of all other Hindu temples, to receive every European visitor, officially or otherwise noted, with Thattumali Prasatham, and the elephants, paraphernalia &c., belonging to the temple. Why, then, is it necessary that they should be prevailed upon to do so by the official theosophists?

The correspondent next says that the cocoanut-tree planted in the pagoda yard "has been plucked up!" I really wonder at my Christian brother, for the tree does still, at this moment as I write this sentence, stand and thrive luxuriantly where it was planted; and is sheltered with two fences, one (the inner) of bamboo sticks, and the other (the outer) of prickly bushes. There grows, Sir, in the temple yard, that proud young tree. Further on, your informant observes that "the cocoanut-tree was planted by him, the Theosophist leader." It was not Colonel Olcott who planted it; but it was the Buddhists who did it, simply as a mark of respect to the Hindu community, and as a memorial of their advent to Tinnevelly. Colonel Olcott and the Sinhalese gentlemen told in plain language the immense crowd of more than five thousand people that thronged to hear the Colonel that evening, the object of planting it. Colonel Olcott visited, and will also visit, numerous towns and cities in America, Europe, and Asia; but surely he did not, and also will not, take along with him young cocoanut-trees to plant them in those places.

Your correspondent continues that the Tinnevelly Siva temple was purified after Colonel Olcott had lectured in it. This is true. But the ceremony of purification in this case must not be understood as having been performed out of disrespect or dislike to the Colonel, whom nearly all the Hindus of this place love as the very apple of their own eyes, but only as a mammoal, or customary work of the



priests attached to the temple. It is one of the duties of the temple-priests to make *punniyojanam* (purification ceremony) to the pagoda whenever Europeans visit it; and this they do quite automatically and indiscriminately in all cases, whether or no they are directed to do so by their authorities, and whether it is necessary or not necessary to do so in any particular case. Contingent charges are allowed on such occasions and the priests get money from the temple-cashier, and make expense of it at once.

Your correspondent concludes by saying that Colonel Olcott did not go to Madura from Tinnevely as he once intended, because he feared the American Missionaries at the former place would involve him in the 'tug of war.' Does he then mean that Colonel Olcott founded, for the first time, the Theosophical Society in Tinnevely in the month of October 1881, and had never been before abroad into the world in the propagation of theosophy? Does he not know that the Parent Society was organized in the year 1875 in New York, the metropolis of that very same country, from which the American Missionaries of Madura have come, in the midst of so many millions of Americans? Does he not also know that he bravely faced the enemies of Theosophy in various parts of the globe, and gloriously succeeded in organizing branch theosophical societies in many countries both in Christendom and heathendom? How many Americans, your correspondent thinks, are there in all in Madura? Ten thousand at the most. But these ten thousand Americans are nothing to one, who fought with success with ten millions of Americans, all enemies of theosophy, in America itself. Let your correspondent first read the history of the progress of theosophy, and then speak about the Theosophical Society and its founders. And I tell him now that Colonel Olcott went to Ceylon, not because he feared the Americans at Madura, but because he had so many engagements already made by him in Ceylon that he could not stay in Tinnevely for more than four days without prejudice to his promise to the Ceylonese. Yours, &c.,

SECRETARY, THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,  
TINNEVELLY.

#### COLONEL OLCOTT'S BUDDHIST CATECHISM.

This little book is calling out many a valuable suggestion in the papers in connection with Buddhist philosophy. A correspondent writes in the *Ceylon Times* that he has received an English copy of "A Buddhist Catechism" by Colonel Olcott regarding which he wishes to make some remarks. "It appears," he says, "that it has been translated into Sinhalese, and that it has received the *'imprimatur'*, or rather sanction of no less a personage than the Venerable H. Sumangala, High Priest of Adam's Peak, and Principal of the Vidyodaya College. The expense of publication has been generously borne by a Sinhalese lady of rank, Mrs. Fredrika Cecilia Dias Ilangakoon of Matara, who, as the initials at the end of her name denote, is a fellow of the Theosophical Society. In this respect the Buddhist Theosophists of Ceylon may be congratulated on the rapid success of their propaganda, and it is said that the encouragement the leaders of the Society have hitherto received in this country has decided them in making Ceylon their Head-Quarters.\* Be that as it may, there is no doubt that great efforts are being made by the energetic President in advancing the cause of Ceylon Buddhism, A Sinhalese journal called the "Sarasavisandaresa" has been started and is flourishing, and a "Sinhalese National Buddhist Fund" largely subscribed to by Buddhists of all classes and denominations throughout the country, is being formed for the purpose of establishing Buddhist schools and of promoting the cause of Buddhism in every practicable way.

This "brochure" is one of the first efforts of the President in this direction. It is, I presume, principally intended for the use of Buddhist schools and beginners in the study of Buddhist philosophy, although some portions of it, such as the questions included between Nos. 68 and 75, afford interesting subjects of thought for the philosopher and the Scientist. Whether the main doctrines of Buddhism are in accord with the results of the Modern Science or not, there is one salient feature in that system which must naturally attract the attention of the student, *viz.*, that its range of thought is so wide and comprehensive as to be capable of including within it and har-

monizing with it other schools of thought, divergent in some respects, but all converging towards the grand keystone of Buddhism—the universal law of nature. Viewed in this light, the Materialist and the Spiritualist, the Positivist and the Rationalist can all take their stand within the precincts of Buddhism; and while each is at liberty to pursue his own course of thought he has the pleasing satisfaction of knowing that the tolerant hand of good-will, fellow-ship and assistance, is extended to every one of them. I am myself inclined to believe with the Author of this little work, that "the signs abound that of all the world's great creeds, that one is destined to be the much talked-of Religion of the Future which shall be found in least antagonism with nature and with law," and am tempted to ask "Who dare predict that Buddhism will not be the one chosen?"

The Author modestly disclaims originality in the composition or matter of this small volume; although, in my opinion, the catechetical form in which the information is conveyed and the attempt at reconciling the main principles of Buddhism with the discoveries of Modern Science are new and striking features in a work on Buddhism. I do not wish to be hypercritical in looking over a work the object of which is in the highest degree praise-worthy; but as the Author himself has courted friendly criticism with a view to benefit thereby when preparing a second edition, I will make a few brief remarks in the hope that they may prove useful to the Author in a subsequent edition.

The answer to the 4th question.—"Was Buddha a man?" does not in my opinion convey a definite idea "in form a man; but internally not like other men." Now, what does 'internally' signify here? Does it refer to the mental and moral calibre of the great sage? If so, why not say so? The reference by footnote to the definition of "Bodisat" Question 72 does not elucidate the point. I would rather prefer an answer like the following:—"He was a man, but of the highest type and perfection among men."

Q. 7. It is doubtful whether Buddha's real name was Sidhartha Gautama. There are many grounds for supposing that his 'princely' name was Siddhartha\* and that subsequent to his renunciation of the world he assumed the ascetic name of Gautama.

Q. 8. 'Maya,' and not 'Maia' was his mother's name.

Q. 35. *et sequor.* An important omission is made about this part of the narrative. Buddha's first ascetic teachers were two Brahmins, Atara Katama and Uddaka Ramaputta, who were followers of the Yoga philosophy and initiated Buddha in the mystic trances which the course of meditation prescribed in that system, was intended to produce. This incident in his ascetic life is especially mentioned by Buddha himself in the discourses wherein he narrates his ascetic career.

I cannot here refrain from quoting Questions 90 and 91 as the example of the racy and forcible manner in which the writer expresses his ideas:—

Q. 90. If you were to try to represent the whole spirit of Buddha's doctrine by one word, which word would you choose?

A. Justice.

Q. 91. Why?

A. Because it teaches that every man gets under the operations of universal law, exactly that reward or punishment which he has deserved; no more and no less. No good deed or bad deed, however trifling and however secretly committed, escapes the evenly "balanced, scales of karma."

Q. 98. I entertain a great regard for the wonderful learning and research of the High Priest Sumangala in all that pertains to Oriental literature, and especially for his deep insight into the contents of the 'Tripitiks,' but I must, with all due deference, beg to differ from him in his translation of the title of Buddha's first celebrated discourse—"Dhammacakka-ppavattana Sutra." The learned High Priest renders it—"The Definition of the Rule of Doctrine." Mr. Olcott must have felt some misgiving in adopting this rendering, as he is careful to inform his readers by a footnote that it is the translation of his friend the Reverend Prelate aforesaid. Now, neither the words of the title, nor the subject-matter of the Sutra will warrant the interpretation put upon it. Alabaster translates it as "The wheel of the Law." But this is not strictly correct either; for although 'cakka' may mean a wheel or discus, it is frequently the idea of Dominion or Authority which that symbol represents, so that "The Reign of Law" is the proper translation of the title, and one which fully harmonizes with the grand and solemn subject of which it treats,—the immutable, the inexorable Laws of Nature. I have no doubt that this small book will find thousands and thousands of eager readers, both in Europe and America.

Matara, August 1881.

A NATIVE.

\* At Ceylon is one of our Head-Quarters, as it is proposed that we should have one, for every season of the year, at Bombay, Calcutta, Ceylon, and the N. W. Provinces.—Ed.

\* Such is the claim of the Tibetan Buddhists. Savartha-Siddha was the Lord Buddha's name abbreviated to Siddhartha by his father, whose wish (artha) was fulfilled (Siddha).—Ed.