

TO THE EDITOR.

I have been a silent watcher of the Theosophical movement in this country ever since its advent. I have long felt a doubt—an honest doubt—and I assure you that I am no caviller, as I have often been taken for by persons professing to know all about the Aryan religions and philosophies—as to how the system of caste in its rigid form as it is now—and I believe it has been so even in the days of Krishna—is to be reconciled with the altruistic teaching of the Bhagavadgita. I revere this book and have a great mind to follow its teachings. There is this thorn in my way, and I venture to hope that you will help me with a solution—or some one of the numerous readers of your valuable magazine.

B. K. NARAYANIAH, F. T. S.

Chittur.

THE PROVINCE OF THEOSOPHY.

TO THE EDITOR.

In the August issue of your much esteemed Journal appeared an article headed "The Province of Theosophy," which has engaged the attention of some of the earnest members of this branch.

The rule prohibiting Fellows to mix in politics *as such*, is so wholesome, and has hitherto worked so well, that we naturally look with apprehension to the writer's trying to twist its plain meaning into what is commonly called in this part of the country, a lawyer's interpretation.

Without disparaging the importance of one's concerning himself in politics in the higher sense of the term, we still believe that it would not be proper, safe or convenient, for Fellows to drag our Society into a political programme, and thereby to give some of its enemies a plausible plea for attacking it through its founders and leaders. We shall succeed to secure all that is good if we have fellow-feeling, humanity and good-will; otherwise to devote ourselves to the politics of the day would end in the dream of Alnaser.

Instead of politics, which are of the earth, let earnest members and leaders of the Society spread the Divine idea of Brotherly Love, Unselfishness and Charity, and a better day shall dawn for this world than has been witnessed since many a dynasty of kings have ruled over this earthly globe.

Most faithfully,

KALY PROSONNA MUKARJEE, F. T. S.

NAFAR DAS ROY, F. T. S.

Berhampore, Bengal.

[Our esteemed correspondents should remember that it is "Fellows, as such," and not *politics, as such*, that the old Rule speaks of; moreover they hardly seem to have caught the drift or sensed the spirit of the article in question. It distinctly disavowed the idea of "dragging the Society into a political programme," or the wish to "devote ourselves to the politics of the day." And it did not say a word against spreading "the divine idea of brotherly love, unselfishness and charity." It is easy enough to sit still, shut one's eyes, and glow all over with these highly commendable sentiments, and the whole drift and spirit of the article was the idea that these feelings should be actively utilized for the improvement of the world. If it were a case of alternatives,—if the Fellows had to choose between cultivating noble sentiments in themselves and introducing those sentiments into practical life,—there might be reason to pause; but it is not so. It is quite possible to raise one's personal ethical standard, and also that of the country to which one belongs; in fact, it is hard to see how the latter can help following the former as a legitimate and natural effect, unless "inhibited" by selfishness and cowardice.—Ed.]

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. XI. No. 122.—NOVEMBER 1889.

सत्यात् नस्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

"INFIDEL BOB."

EVERYONE has heard of Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll, the Apostle of religious liberty, and the *bête noire* of the Christian Clergy; but few people outside of America are aware of the wonderful work which he has done single-handed, in the interests of the cause which he champions. Everyone should know of this work, for not only is it unique, but so also is the man who has done it. There probably never was a great religious reformer—as Ingersoll certainly deserves to be reckoned—who stands out from his contemporaries and surroundings more strongly and individually than does "the great infidel" or one who has exercised so powerful an influence in the world of thought in so short a time. Ingersoll stands alone, a colossal personality. He is absolutely independent of any body, society or church. He stands at the head of his branch of the legal profession, and is generally accounted to be without a peer as a lecturer, orator and wit. The personal friend of almost all the leading men of all parties in the United States, the champion of the oppressed, of the women, of the children, the advocate of sunshine and purity, of honesty and kindness, in every department of life, Ingersoll could not but have a very large following, and an influence that extends far beyond his actual admirers and disciples. He may be said to be the founder of a kind of natural, undogmatic religion, with a kind of unwritten creed, chiefly of a negative character, but it is not his beliefs, but the man himself, who has the real influence with his generation.

Ingersoll is a man of powerful physique; he has passed the middle age, but is as active in body and as youthful in mind as a man of thirty. In private life he is the personification of kindness and good nature, and is ever bubbling over with wit and mirth. His happiness in his domestic relations has become proverbial in the

United States; as has also his unostentatious generosity, both in time and money, to those who are victims of bigotry and intolerance.

To understand Ingersoll personally is to understand his ideas of life, and of the things of life; and to enable our readers to get some idea of the man, we shall quote passages out of various "lectures" of his which are either descriptive or indicative of his character. They will then be able to perceive how it is that even when people do not agree with Colonel Ingersoll's religious or irreligious opinions, they cannot help admiring and respecting the great-hearted and large-minded sentiments he continually expresses. There are many who believe that it is to Colonel Ingersoll in a very large measure that the Spiritualists owe the immunity from social and religious persecution which they enjoy in the United States, for he has contributed more than any man since Voltaire to break the power of the clergy, and to make the masses tolerant of difference of opinion. How great service he has similarly rendered to Theosophy, it would be difficult to estimate at present, but probably we owe him as large a debt as do the Spiritualists. Ingersoll in the United States and Bradlaugh in England are like sturdy backwoodsmen, who, with their sharp axes and brawny arms, have cleared away the poisonous jungles of prejudice and felled the forests of error, leaving the country open to air and sky for others to cover with palaces. From the following quotations the reader will be able to form a better estimate of Colonel Ingersoll than from anything which a second party could indite.

Ingersoll states his position thus :—

For one, I expect to do my own thinking. And I will take my oath this minute that I will express what thoughts I have, honestly and sincerely. I am the slave of no man and of no organisation. I stand under the blue sky and the stars, under the infinite flag of nature, the peer of every human being. Standing as I do in the presence of the Unknown, I have the same right to guess as though I had been through five theological seminaries. I have as much interest in the great absorbing questions of origin and destiny as though I had D.D. or L.L.D. at the end of my name.^{1*}

He intends to help others to think :—

I have made up my mind to say my say, I shall do it kindly, distinctly, but I am going to it. I know there are thousands of men who substantially agree with me, but who are not in a condition to express their thoughts. They are poor: they are in business; and they know that should they tell their honest thought, persons will refuse to patronise them—to trade with them; they wish to get bread for their little children; they wish to take care of their wives; they wish to have homes and the comforts of life. Every such person is a certificate of the

*These numbers refer to the Lecture from which taken. See page 72.

meanness of the community in which he resides. And yet I do not blame these people for not expressing their thought. I say to them; "Keep your ideas to yourselves; feed and clothe the ones you love; I will do your talking for you. The church cannot touch; cannot crush; cannot starve; cannot stop or stay me; I will express your thoughts."²

He declares his independence in these words :—

So far as I am concerned, I have made up my mind that no organisation, secular or religious, shall own me. I have made up my mind that no necessity of bread, or roof, or raiment shall ever put a padlock on my lips. I have made up my mind that no hope, no preferment, no honor, no wealth, shall ever make me for one moment swerve from what I really believe, no matter whether it is to my immediate interest, as one would think, or not. And while I live, I am going to do what little I can to help my fellow-men who have not been as fortunate as I have been. I shall talk on their side, I shall vote on their side, and do what little I can to convince men that happiness does not lie in the direction of great wealth, but in the direction of achievement for the good of themselves and for the good of their fellow-men. I shall do what little I can to hasten the day when this earth shall be covered with homes, and when by the fireside of the world shall sit happy fathers and mothers and children.³

The following are his objects and aims :—

I am doing, in a very feeble way to be sure, but I am still endeavouring, according to my idea, to make this world just a little better; to give a little more liberty to men, a little more liberty to women. I believe in the government of kindness; I believe in truth, in investigation, in free thought. I do not believe that the hand of want will be eternally extended in the world; I do not believe that the prison will for ever scar the ground; I do not believe that the shadow of the gallows will for ever curse the earth; I do not believe that it will always be true that the men who do the most work will have the least to wear and the least to eat. I do believe that the time will come when liberty and morality and justice, like the rings of Saturn, will surround the world; that the world will be better, and every true man and every free man will do what he can to hasten the coming of the religion of human advancement.⁴

He advocates only those things which will do good :—

If I understand myself, I advocate only the doctrines that in my judgment will make this world happier and better. If I know myself, I advocate only those things that will make a man a better citizen, a better father, a kinder husband—that will make a woman a better wife, a better mother—doctrines that will fill every home with sunshine and with joy. And if I believed that anything I should say to-day would have any other possible tendency, I would stop.⁵

Dogmatism Ingersoll repudiates utterly:—

I do not pretend to tell what all the truth is. I do not pretend to have fathomed the abyss, nor to have floated on outstretched wings level with the dim heights of thought. I simply plead for freedom. I denounce the cruelties and horrors of slavery. I ask for light and air for the souls of men. I say: take off those chains—break those manacles—free those limbs—release that brain! I plead for the right to think—to reason—to investigate. I ask that the future may be enriched with the honest thoughts of men. I implore every human being to be a soldier in the army of progress.⁴

He gives us the sum-total of his doctrine:—

This is my doctrine. Give every other human being every right you claim for yourself. Keep your mind open to the influence of nature. Receive new thoughts with hospitality. Let us advance.⁵

What his religion is, and what his bible:—

Liberty is my religion. Everything that is true, every good thought, every beautiful thing, every self-denying action—all these make my Bible. Every bubble, every star, are passages in my Bible. A constellation is a chapter. Every shining world is a part of it. You cannot interpolate it; you cannot change it. It is the same for ever. My Bible is all that speaks to man. Every violet, every blade of grass, every tree, every mountain crowned with snow, every star that shines, every throb of love, every honest act, all that is good and true combined, make my Bible, and upon that book I stand.⁷

The church that Ingersoll belongs to:—

I belong to the great church that holds the world within its starlit aisles; that claims the great and good of every race and clime; that finds with joy the grain of gold in every creed, and floods with light and love the germs of good in every soul.⁹

He believes in "intellectual hospitality":—

I believe in intellectual hospitality. I love men that have a little horizon to their minds—a little sky, a little scope. I hate anything that is narrow and pinched and withered and mean and crawling, and that is willing to live on dust. I believe in creating such an atmosphere that things will burst into blossom. I believe in good will, good health, good fellowship, good feeling, and if there is any God on the earth, or in heaven, let us hope that he will be generous and grand. Do you not see what the effect will be? I am not cursing you because you are a Methodist, and not damning you because you are a Catholic, or because you are an Infidel; a good man is more than all of these. The grandest of all things is to be in the highest and noblest sense a man.⁵

He believes also in intellectual honesty:—

Let each one be true to himself. No matter what his class, no matter what his circumstances, let him tell his thought. Don't let his class bribe him. Don't let him talk like a banker because he is a banker. Don't let him talk like the rest of the merchants

because he is a merchant. Let him be true to the human race instead of to his little business—be true to the ideal in his heart and brain, instead of to his little present and apparent selfishness—let him have a larger and more intelligent selfishness, not a narrow and ignorant one.³

His sympathies are with the working men:—

My sympathies are with the poor. My sympathies are with the working men of the United States. Understand me distinctly. I am not an Anarchist. Anarchy is the reaction from tyranny. I am not a Socialist. I am not a Communist. I am an Individualist. I do not believe in tyranny of government, but I do believe in justice as between man and man.³

The working men make a nation great:—

What has made this country? I say again, liberty and labor. What would we be without labor? I want every farmer, when ploughing the rustling corn of June—while mowing in the perfumed fields—to feel that he is adding to the wealth and glory of the United States. I want every mechanic—every man of toil, to know and feel that he is keeping the cars running, the telegraph wires in the air; that he is making the statues and painting the pictures; that he is writing and printing the books; that he is helping to fill the world with honor, with happiness, with love and law.⁹

He thanks the benefactors of mankind:—

I thank the inventors, the discoverers, the thinkers. I thank Columbus and Magellan. I thank Galileo, and Copernicus, and Kepler, and Descartes, and Newton, and La Place. I thank Locke, and Hume, and Bacon, and Shakspeare, and Kant, and Fichte, and Liebnitz, and Goethe. I thank Fulton, and Watts, and Volta, and Galvani, and Franklin, and Morse, who made lighting the messenger of man. I thank Humboldt, the Shakspeare of science. I thank Crompton and Arkwright, from whose brains leaped the looms and spindles that clothe the world. I thank Luther for protesting against the abuses of the church, and I denounce him because he was the enemy of liberty. I thank Calvin for writing a book in favour of religious freedom, and I abhor him because he burned Servetus. I thank Knox for resisting episcopal persecution, and I hate him because he persecuted in his turn. I thank the Puritans for saying: "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God," and yet I am compelled to say that they were tyrants themselves. I thank Thomas Paine because he was a believer in liberty, and because he did as much to make my country free as any other human being. I thank Voltaire, that great man who, for half a century, was the intellectual emperor of Europe, and who, from his throne at the foot of the Alps, pointed the finger of scorn at every hypocrite in Christendom. I thank Darwin, Haeckel and Büchner, Spencer, Tyndall and Huxley, Draper, Lecky and Buckle. I thank the inventors, the discoverers, the thinkers, the scientists, the explorers. I thank the honest millions who have toiled.⁴

He states how men should search for truth :—

In the search for truth—that everything in nature seems to hide—man needs the assistance of all his faculties. All the senses should be awake. Humor should carry a torch, Wit should give its sudden light, Candor should hold the scales, Reason, the final arbiter, should put his royal stamp on every fact, and Memory, with a miser's care, should keep and guard the mental gold.¹⁰

He prefers activity to inaction :—

The religionist of to-day wants the ship of his soul to lie at the wharf of orthodoxy and rot in the sun. He delights to hear the sails of old opinions flap against the masts of old creeds. He loves to see the joints and sides open and gape in the sun, and it is a kind of bliss for him to repeat again and again: "Do not disturb my opinions. Do not unsettle my mind, I have it all made up, and I want no infidelity. Let me go backward rather than forward."⁶

He prefers the high seas to the wharf :—

As far as I am concerned I wish to be out on the high seas. I wish to take my chances with wind, and wave, and star. And I had rather go down in the glory and grandeur of the storm, than to rot in any orthodox harbour whatever.⁶

The storm of thought is better than the calm of ignorance :—

Give me the storm and tempest of thought and action, rather than the dead calm of ignorance and faith! Banish me from Eden when you will; but first let me eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge!⁷

He rejoices that man is advancing :—

After all I had rather belong to a race that started from the skull-less vertebrates in the dim Laurentian seas, vertebrates wiggling without knowing why they wiggled, swimming without knowing where they were going, but that in some way began to develop, and began to get a little higher and a little higher in the scale of existence; that came up by degrees through millions of ages, through all the animal world, through all that crawls and swims and floats and climbs and walks, and finally produced the gentleman in the dug-out; and then from this man, getting a little grander, and each one below calling every one who had made a little advance, an infidel or an atheist—for in the history of this world the man who is a-head has always been called a heretic.²

He accepts death as a condition of progress :—

For my part, I am glad there was death in this world, because that gave me a chance. Somebody had to die to give me room, and when my turn comes I'll be willing to let somebody else take my place. But whether there is another life or not, if there is any being who gave me this, I shall thank him from the bottom of my heart, because, upon the whole, my life has been joy.¹¹

He desires no future life without liberty :—

I want no heaven for which I must give my reason, and no happiness in exchange for my liberty, and no immortality that de-

mands the surrender of my individuality. Better rot in the windowless tomb, to which there is no door but the red mouth of the pallid worm, than wear the jewelled collar even of a god.¹²

He tells as the real object of his attacks :—

I attack the monsters, the phantoms of imagination that have ruled the whole world.⁸

He defends the honesty of his motives :—

Is it honest in Dr. Collyer to assail my motive? Let him answer my argument. Is it honest and fair in him to say I am doing a certain thing because it is popular? Has it got to this, that in this Christian country where they have preached every day hundreds and thousands of sermons,—has it got to this, that infidelity is so popular in the United States? If it has, I take courage. And I not only see the dawn of a brighter day, but the day is here. Think of it! A minister tells me in this year of grace, 1879, that a man is an infidel simply that he may be popular. I am glad of it.¹³

He gives us the reason of his popularity :—

What a commentary on the Christian religion! that, after they have been preaching it for 1,600 or 1,800 years, a man attacks it for the sake of popularity, a man attacks it for the purpose of winning applause; when I commenced to speak upon this subject, there was no appreciable applause; most of my fellow-citizens differed from me; and I was denounced as though I had been a wild beast. But I have lived to see the majority of the men and women of intellect in the United States on my side; I have lived to see THE CHURCH DENY HER CREED; I have lived to see ministers apologise in public for what they preached; and a great and glorious work is going on until, in a little while, you will not find one of them, unless it is some old petrification of the red-stone period, who will admit that he ever believed in the Trinity, in the Atonement, or in the doctrine of Eternal Agony. The religion preached in the pulpits does not satisfy the intellect of America, and if Dr. Thomas wishes to know why people go to hear infidelity, it is this: Because they are dissatisfied with the orthodox Christianity of the day. That is the reason. They are beginning to hold it in contempt.¹⁴

He belongs to the "republic of intellectual liberty" :—

I am in favor of absolute freedom of thought. In the realm of mind, every one is monarch; every one is robed, sceptred, and crowned, and every one wears the purple of authority. I belong to the republic of intellectual liberty, and only those are good citizens of that republic who depend upon reason and upon persuasion, and only those are traitors who resort to brute force.¹⁵

He sympathizes with all loving and tender souls :—

While utterly discarding all creeds, and denying the truth of all religions, there is neither in my heart nor upon my lips a sneer for the hopeful, loving and tender souls who believe that from all this discord will result a perfect harmony; that every evil will in some mysterious way become a good, and that above and over all there

is a being who, in some way, will reclaim and glorify every one of the children of men; but for those who heartlessly try to prove that salvation is almost impossible; that damnation is always certain; that the high way of the universe leads to hell; who fill life with fear and death with horror; who curse the cradle and mock the tomb, it is impossible to entertain other than feelings of pity, contempt, and scorn.¹⁶

He tells us why the clergy assail him:—

Now, my crime has been this: I have insisted that the Bible is not the word of God. I have insisted that we should not whip our children. I have insisted that we should treat our wives as loving equals. I have denied that God—if there is any God—ever upheld polygamy and slavery. I have denied that God ever told his generals to kill innocent babes and tear and rip open women with the sword of war. I have denied that, and for that, I have been assailed by the clergy of the United States.¹⁷

Another reason why the clergy dislike him:—

I emphatically deny that God ever signed or sealed a commission appointing His Satanic Majesty Governor-General over an extensive territory popularly styled Hell, with absolute power to torture, burn, maim, boil, or roast at his pleasure the victims of his master's displeasure! I deny these things, and for that I am assailed by the clergy throughout the United States!¹⁶

In a future paper we shall see how curiously Colonel Ingersoll's intuitions take him in the direction of Theosophy.

R. H.

* The numbers attached to the above quotations refer to the following lectures and pamphlets, some of which are now out of print:—1, Liberty of Man, Woman and Child. 2, Breaking the Fetters. 3, Social Salvation. 4, Ghosts. 5, Defence of Free Thought. 6, Religion of the Future. 7, Some Reasons Why. 8, God and Man. The Declaration of Independence (an oration). 10, Answer to Gladstone. 11, Divine Vivisection. 12, Take a road of your own. 13, Answer to Collyer (quoted in "Ingersoll at Home"). 14, Providence, a Reply to the Preachers. 15, What must we do to be saved? 16, Hereafter. 17, Skulls.

PAHALVI SELECTIONS.*

“THE Lord who is in all things and over every thing, and who is subject to none, is the omniscient, and omnipotent Maker—Ahuramazd—the Master of all. Uncreate, He createth all; without any relationship, He is Supreme; He subserveth not but is the Lord; He is not a disciple but is the Master. He wanteth nothing and is all-able; He requireth no help, but is the Protector of all; He is not mansion-less, but is a possessor of mansions; He is not a desirer of knowledge, but is himself the fountain of all knowledge; He requireth no improvement, but is the Improver of all; He taketh not gifts; but is the giver of all gifts; He searcheth not for happiness, but is the source of all happiness; He wanteth not associates for help, but worketh by himself; He is not to be judged, but is Judge of all. He is not to be moved, but moveth all; supreme over all is the maker Ahuramazd'. Who, through His all comprehending wisdom, maketh all things proceed according to Law.”

“All things come into existence from 'Non-being' for their own proper work. Everything at its proper time has a reason for its existence. There is nothing made at the wrong time. Things thus come into existence but not by themselves³ and time⁴ pertains to these things and nothing else. The self-existent is in want of nothing. The Lord is in everything, although he be not visible anywhere. He guideth everything, and without the wisdom of Ahuramazd no one could guide anything.”

“The good Law, Asnekhird⁵ or Pure Intention and the spiritual essence (Behman) whence Asnekhird proceeds were born together of Spenamino⁶. And Akoman (the evil mind) possessed of the blemish of Varun (perverse reason) was born of Ganamino⁷ who does not belong to the original Source.⁸ Evil thoughts come from Ganamino. The one that belongs to the good religion is known by his reason, the help of reason, ways according

* From the Pahalvi 'Dinkard', translated by Dastur Peshotan Sanjáná.

1. The idea of Ahuramazd corresponds to that of the Logos or Ishwar, the first manifestation in the universe. “He is the initial existence in the first twilight of the Mahamanvantara, and is a conscious spiritual essence spreading throughout infinity as an abstract entity. There is but one indivisible and absolute omniscience and intelligence in the universe and this thrills throughout every atom and infinitesimal point throughout the Kosmos.

2. 'Non being' only to our finite senses. In reality it is from the 'all Being' that all things proceed.

3. i. e., there is a cause behind them.

4. The succession of things and events marks the progress of time. The idea of time is relative. On the spiritual plane there is no Past, Present, or Future; all is.

5. The Avesta speaks of 'Asnya Khratu, the unborn intellect or intuition as contrasted with Gaosto sruta Khratu, the knowledge acquired by hearing and learning.

6. Spenamino or the Spento Mainyu of the Avesta is a ray or force that proceeds from Ahuramazd. It corresponds to the Light of the Logos. Behman or Vohu-Mano is a form of Spenamino on the moral plane. The Gathá speaks of the “Intellect of Vohu-Mano which is Asnyakhird.”

7. Ganamino or Angra Mainyu is the contracting spirit as opposed to Spento Mainyu, the expanding and all pervading spirit. Ganamino on the moral plane becomes Akomano the Evil mind as opposed to Vohrmano the Good mind.

8. Original source is Ahuramazd. Ganamino has no relationship with Ahuramazd. He is opposed to Spento Mainyu, whose opposite pole he becomes when differentiation comes into full play in the universe.

with reason, nature according with reason, and the light of reason that gives strength to the wise. The good and pure Amshaspends have their holy habitation in a person of the good religion, so long as there is in him the full sway of Asnekhird, and the weakening sway of destructive unreason is at an end."

"The way to remain in the presence of the holy self-existent is through the two things of high degree,—Wisdom and Faith. Men should keep off from themselves two kinds of maladies of the soul, viz., pride of ones-self and contempt for others."

"Two invisible powers having relations with him accompany every living person; and through them people mould their lives and hold two kinds of objects in view and perform two kinds of deeds. When mankind took its birth through the creator in the invisible world, it held no connection with objects and deeds of two kinds, but men having life (material) have to do so in this world. And the manifestation of those two kinds of objects and actions has happened necessarily in this way, that when by means of the senses the sights and actions of this world become manifest to man, the two invisible powers doing the work connected with the origin of life and having two kinds of objects and two kinds of actions enter into his personality. The source of improvement of all men through this world is the invisible power named Spento Mainyu."

"Everything in this world constantly tends to return to its own original source. The original source of fire is the essence of fire."

"Birth is a term applied to the first appearance of existences in the spiritual world, and the power of spiritual existences is manifested in this world by the action of force (invisible). *Creation* is a term employed to ascribe the advent of the heavenly soul into this wordly existence, the living body exists through the soul that supports it. In the human body there dwell spiritual faculties which through the guidance of the soul, impart good sense, strengthen virtue in him through moral perceptions, produce contentment through resignation, and promote truth through intuitive wisdom."

"The planting and pruning of a tree are not acts different from one another, they rather improve one another, for the tree that is planted is rendered suitable (for growth) by pruning it and acquires symmetry. So likewise to call death the cause of (renewed) life is (allowable) for this reason that through death, life is rendered fit (for the next world) or that death is the cause of the perfection of life (through progress)."

"The good religion is one that is in correspondence with (spiritual) intuition, which possesses all forms of wisdom, is the interpreter of superior knowledge ennobled by its communication

1. The six spiritual forces proceeding from Ahuramazd.
2. By mankind in the invisible world are meant the human monads that have yet to incarnate as men. The first races of men up to the 3rd race are again spiritual and the earth they inhabit is in an otherreal state.
3. Called Átar, the son of Ahuramazd in the *Avesta*.

with spiritual existences, which has the noblest system of morals, which propounds the nobility of liberality and (mutual) help with the felicity of the eternal life; whose object is to make its professor an extoller of the Deity and to keep himself in obedience and union with his original (source)."

N. D. K.

ELOHISTIC TEACHINGS.

(Continued from page 21.)

THE moon in passing round the earth always directs the same face towards its centre of revolution.

While so passing round the earth, as it moves through the zodiacal signs, these recede from it or appear to move in the opposite direction, so that—always showing the same surface to the earth, it turns its whole surface in succession to a given point on the zodiac.

These relations astronomers have agreed to regard as resulting from a combined axial and orbital revolution, under which each revolution on its axis exactly coincides with a single passage of the moon in its orbit round the earth.

To prevent any misunderstanding here, however, it is necessary to distinguish between axial revolution and rotation; for, though the moon necessarily revolves on its axis in describing its orbit, it does not rotate on that axis. This is self-evident and should not need demonstration, for were the moon rotating as well as revolving, it would progressively change its visible face—through the participation of its surface in the motion of rotation—or consecutively exhibit its whole surface once to the terrestrial observer during each complete rotation, instead of always directing the same face towards him: and then the zodiacal signs would make one entire recession round its equator more than the number of its axial rotations in each circuit of its orbit. (This can be experimentally tested by moving a circular body within and round the centre of a circle, when, if not rotated, it will revolve on its axis as computed from a given point of the circle of comparison, but not as computed from the centre thereof. But if the moving body now made to rotate in the direction of its plane of motion, and to wheel round the centre of the circle, its rotating motion will be computable as well from the centre as from the circumference or circle of comparison—but then one revolution more will be computed in regard to the circle than in regard to the centre each time that a full circuit of that centre is made.)

This additional revolution in recession is a witness to the fact that orbital motion is going on—for it results therefrom.

This is practically demonstrated in the current orbital and axial motion of the earth; for through its diurnal rotation on its axis the planet makes one more axial revolution with regard to a fixed point in space—say a definite position in a zodiacal sign—than with regard to the sun in its annual circuit; and the seg-

mentary division of this added revolution constitutes the difference between sidereal and solar time.

The fact thus demonstrated illustrates a fundamental principle in all revolving motion, and should guide the practical astronomer to the most important law of his science: for it shows that *each complete recession of the circle of comparison marks the completion of a single revolution of a revolving body.*

Hence each ascertained kosmical revolution may be held to demonstrate the motion of a revolving body—even when the existence of that body cannot be otherwise established. In verifying astronomical motion the zodiacal signs form the circle of comparison.

As the moon passes round the earth it appears to oscillate in its orbit. That is to say, in passing from perigee to apogee it shows a little more of one side of its visible back and a little less of the other, and in passing back from apogee to perigee reverses this manifestation—in either case permitting the observer to look a little beyond the otherwise ever unchanging face.

This is due to the moon revolving in an eccentric orbit, or round the centre of attraction of the terrestrial system, which is not the centre of the earth; as well as to the observer on the surface of the planet being at a point remote from that centre—for in consequence of this the centres of attraction of the moon and the earth reciprocally acting in equilibrium maintain a persistent systemic relation with each other, and it is this fixity of relation which gives an appearance of oscillation to the steadily revolving moon.

Another fundamental principle is thus suggested to the practical astronomer—*That a fixity of relation in a revolving body causes an apparent oscillation of the axis of fixity with regard to a determinate point outside the right line of that axis.*

Considering the moon's motions from another point of view, the points of the ecliptic which it consecutively crosses in its orbital course round the earth—the lunar nodes as they are termed—are in regular process of recession; and make a complete circle of recession in some 6,793 mean solar days or about 18.6 years, in which time the ascending node is carried round in a direction contrary to the moon's motion in its orbit, or from east to west, over a whole circumference of the ecliptic.

Simultaneously with this, the lunar apsides—the two extremities of a right line drawn between the moon's points of apogee and perigee—are continuously retreating, so as to make a complete circuit in retrogression (from conjunction to conjunction) in about nine years; or two such circuits in somewhat less than the period required for the recession of the lunar nodes. A possible relation is thus suggested between these motions, which becomes even more than probable when it is realized that though the line of the apsides makes two revolutions in retreat when computed from the sun, it makes only one such revolution during the same period, as computed on the zodiac.

Similarly and synchronously with the retreat of the lunar apsides, the plane of the moon's orbit oscillates, with a to and fro

movement like that of a balance, across the plane of the orbit of the earth, on the lunar nodes (or points where it intersects that orbit), and this in such wise that a single complete to and fro oscillation coincides with a double-conjunctional but single zodiacal retreat of the apsides.

This coincidence in period suggests the possibility of an associated relation between the two, while the character of the oscillation makes it probable that it depends upon some fixity of condition analogous to that already noticed as existing between the apparent oscillation of the surface of the moon with regard to its axis of fixity.

These several sets of concurrent motions have at least a periodic relation with each other. Is there a meaning in this association?

Possibly! More especially as the lesser nutation of the earth's polar axis completes its observed oscillation synchronously with the recession of the lunar nodes.

According to a law in orbital motion which I have already indicated, when the body, A, is revolving round a second, B, which is itself revolving round a third, C, each time that B completes a revolution round C, this completion will be accompanied by a complete recession of A.

But if the complete revolution of B in its orbit can be measured by a complete recession of A in its path, then obviously an inverse reading in extension of the law says, each complete recession of a given relation, or body in its path, denotes that the centre with reference to which this complete recession occurs has, itself, in the same period completed a full revolution in its orbit.

According to a law in eccentric systemic attraction. When one body, A, is revolving round a second, B, which itself revolves round a third, C, as A, passes round B, the direction of its plane of revolution will, apart from disturbing causes, be determined by the reciprocal attractions of B and C. (The eclipses are caused by such relations, and if no disturbing influences were present would recur once a fortnight, alternately as an eclipse of the sun and moon.)

Were a fourth body, D, to be introduced, round which C circulated, the attraction of this body would at once disturb these simple relations:—for

1. As A passed round B, the plane of its orbit would be drawn (by the attraction of D on A) towards D, so that, if C passed round D on a plane oblique to the equator of C, the orbit of A (as B described an oblique orbit round C), would oscillate once to and fro across the plane of the orbit of B during a complete revolution of C round D—(as does the orbit of the moon on the ecliptic).

2. Moreover the attraction of D would draw A towards itself as it (A) passed round B, and so give to its orbit the form of an ellipse, of which the longest radius would be always directed to D (are not these the relations of the retreating elliptic orbit of the moon?)

3. With this D would make one complete recession round the circle of comparison during each full revolution of C round itself, carrying the long radius of the elliptic orbit of A with it: thus

causing it to make a full circuit in retreat coincident with the revolution in advance of C. Such a retreat is that of the lunar apsides. (Thus, like every form of recession, is only an apparent and not an actual motion. It is caused by the actual motion of C, which, seemingly carrying the circle of comparison with it as the more distant object, makes D appear to fall back on though actually advancing in its course).

4. Simultaneously with this the points where A, in passing round that body, crossed the plane of the path of B, would recede on that path. (Such a recession is that of the lunar nodes).

If D were itself in motion an extension of these relations would take place; and they would be so far modified as to resolve themselves into two sets of movements.

5. Those following the advance of C in the circle of comparison—comprising the full cycle.

6. Those following the retreat of D along that circle—constituting a sub-cycle.

7. Of these the period of the latter would be shorter than that occupied by the former.

The difference in period here has a special significance of its own, for it is caused by the direct motion of D, and is therefore an evidence that this body is itself moving.

These fundamental principles of orbital motion, and guides to some of the interacting causes which influence the actual and produce the apparently retrograde movements of bodies revolving in systems, are of course subject to modification in detail, that obscure the simple action of each in the mean result of the collective action of the whole.

I have already spoken of, and need not recur to, the simple systemic motions of the terrestrial system.

If, following the precedent of the earth, the sun were itself revolving round a (not recognized) central body—an equatorial sun,—as for convenience I will term it—a recession would be observable in the terrestrial system, whose period would be that of the full revolution of the sun in its orbit.

Such a recession is that of the lunar nodes.

During that revolution and recession the attraction of the equatorial sun, acting eccentrically on the moon, would determine the direction of the plane of the lunar orbit, and, so doing, would cause an oscillation of that plane; and at the same time produce an eccentricity in the moon's orbit, by keeping the point of apogee between itself and the earth, or drawing the moon towards itself as it approached the apogee point of the right line of the apsides, while simultaneously causing that line to recede with it round the zodiacal circle of comparison.

But the plane of the moon's orbit does oscillate to and fro across the ecliptic; this oscillation is accompanied by a retreat of the lunar apsides; and the orbit of the moon is elliptical.

If the polar axis of the earth were directed to a very remote point of the heavens with the same fixity of relation that the moon's face bears to the earth, then as the earth was carried by the sun

round the equatorial sun, that axis would appear to nutate, as does the moon appear to oscillate in passing round the earth; and that nutation would occupy the period of, or would make a complete circle of nutation during the revolution of the sun, and so be associated with the lunar systemic motion.

But such a nutation does exist—the lesser nutation of the polar axis of the earth—whose period is that of the recession of the lunar nodes.

Four systemic motions are thus found in association in the terrestrial system, which combine in an approximately single period, or collectively form a cycle of revolution—a lunar cycle—just such a cycle as would exist were the sun revolving in an orbit under the conditions stated.

This being the case—*Is it possible to resist the conclusion that the sun does revolve in such an orbit?*

But the lesser nutation of the polar axis of the earth is so termed, because included in a nutation of a much more extended period—the greater nutation of that axis, in virtue of which by a conical motion it slowly describes a circle in the heavens, to which the lesser nutation gives an undulating or waved character.

This suggests that the equatorial sun is itself in motion.

Were the equatorial sun in motion, as is thus suggested, certain observable phenomena would be caused by and flow from this added motion.

In the first place, the cycle of concurrent motions depending on the revolution of the sun would be separated, as to its period, from the sub-cycle of concurrent motions caused by the attraction of the equatorial sun.

But this is precisely what the observed phenomena show, for while the circle of recession and nutation is accomplished in some 6,793 mean solar days, a full retreat of the apsides round the zodiac with a complete to and fro oscillation of the lunar orbit, to which should be added the period of regular return of eclipses, occupies only some 6,585 days.

Thus the lunar cycle includes a sub-cycle within its period; and the difference between the full periods of the cycle and sub-cycle suffices to show that the equatorial sun is in motion.

Then, the motion of the equatorial sun would be reflected in the heavens in more ways than this—for if the revolution of the sun produced a recession in the lunar systemic motion, so ought the revolution of the equatorial sun to produce a recession in the terrestrial systemic motion.

But such a recession exists, and is known as the precession of the equinoxes.

(The added centre of motion here causes this recession to be recognized in the heavens through the precession it produces. A few moments' consideration will suffice to account for this).

1. A full rotation of the earth on its polar axis (from W. to E.) is reflected in the heavens by a complete recession of the zodiac (from E. to W.)—which is the measure of the sidereal day. The sun and moon, though advancing with the earth, partake in this recession, to which their diurnal course is due.

2. A full revolution of the moon round the earth is reflected in the heavens as a complete recession of the zodiac—by which the lunar axial revolution is computed.

3. A full revolution of the earth round the sun is reflected in the heavens by a complete recession of the zodiac beyond the actual number of the diurnal rotations of the earth—which causes the difference between sidereal and solar time.

4. A full revolution of the sun round the equatorial sun is reflected in the heavens by a complete recession of the zodiac—recognized by the lunar node, regarded as a fixed point on the zodiac, receding on the ecliptic. And now—

5. A full revolution of the equatorial sun is reflected in the heavens by a complete recession of the zodiac, this time recognized as a recession of the ecliptic itself, (a given point of which—regarded as a fixed point on the zodiac—slowly recedes from the equinoctial point).

Moreover, if the equatorial sun were in motion, according to the analogies of the terrestrial and solar systems, it would be moving round another body—a polar sun.

While if such a central body existed, then just as the attraction of the equatorial sun caused an oscillation of the plane of the moon's orbit, gave an elliptic form to that orbit and produced a retreat of its apsides, so would the attraction of the polar sun cause an oscillation of the ecliptic, given an elliptic form to the orbit of the earth (whose longest radius would always point to the polar sun), and produce a retreat of the apsides round the circle of the zodiac.

But the ecliptic does oscillate to and fro across the plane of the equator just as the lunar orbit oscillates across the plan of the ecliptic; the orbit of the earth is elliptic; the longest radius of that ellipse is receding on the zodiac—as though following a receding body; and this recession is the retreat of the terrestrial apsides.

Four systemic motions are thus once more found in association in the terrestrial system, which combine to form a cycle of revolution—a terrestrial cycle—just such a cycle as would exist were the equatorial sun revolving in an orbit under the conditions stated.

This being the case—*Is it possible to resist the conclusion that the equatorial sun does revolve in such an orbit?*

But the terrestrial like the lunar cycle includes a sub-cycle within itself; for while the period of precession and polar nutation is some 25,868 years, that of oscillation of ecliptic and retreat of apsides is completed in from 22,000 to 23,000 years.

Hence if the difference in period between the lunar cycle and sub-cycle shows that the equatorial sun is in motion, similarly will the difference in period between the terrestrial cycle and sub-cycle prove that the polar sun is in motion.

The difference here is proportionately co-extensive with the vastness of the orbit of which it represents a segment, and if exactly determined would furnish a basis from which the period of that orbit might be computed.

No further evidence of the motion of the polar sun has, so far, been observed. Moreover the circle of nutation is an ultimate, a closed circle; and this seems opposed to the possibility of such a motion. And yet were the polar sun revolving on a plane transverse to the plane of motion of the equatorial system—on a polar plane, that is to say—round a far distant body occupying the N. celestial pole, and therefore situated on the spacial continuation, and by its attraction determining the direction of the polar axis of the earth, then would no further evidence of its motion be attainable—unless through a perspective grouping of the stars on its course.

These two classes of systemic motion are evidently inter-related, if only in their respective analogies. Hence if the lunar cycle is caused by, and is the measure of the period of, the revolution in space of the visible sun, and would suffice to prove the existence (as well as the motion) of that body—were such evidence needed; and if the lunar sub-cycle is caused by, and suffices to prove the existence of the equatorial sun, while the difference in period between this cycle and sub-cycle is adequate to show that the equatorial sun is itself in motion: then will the terrestrial cycle be similarly caused by and the measure of the period of the revolution in space of the equatorial sun; and therefore confirm the existence already advanced in this regard, and thus suffice to prove the existence, motion and period of revolution of the central body of the polar system; and then will the terrestrial sub-cycle be in like manner caused by and suffice to prove the existence of the polar sun, while the difference in period between this sub-cycle and the terrestrial cycle will similarly show that the polar sun is itself in motion.

How could it be otherwise? The Newtonian theory to the contrary notwithstanding. The phenomena here are analogous. The operating causes will therefore be similar. Their methods of working identical. Hence if the oscillation of the plane of the moon's orbit across the ecliptic, with the ellipticity of that orbit (under which its period of apogee is always situated between the earth and the equatorial sun) and the retreat of the lunar apsides are caused by the attraction of the equatorial sun and therefore prove the existence of that body: then will the oscillation of the plane of the ecliptic, the ellipticity of the orbit of the earth (under which its point of greatest distance from the sun is always placed between that body and its attracting cause) and the retreat of the terrestrial apsides prove the existence of a yet more remote central body—the polar sun—round which the equatorial sun revolves, on whose attraction these associated motions depend, and by which they are caused; while the greater nutation of the polar axis of the earth will be due to this revolution, combined with the persistent action of a far distant polar attraction.

Then if the difference between the recession of the lunar nodes and retreat of the lunar apsides (as computed on the zodiac) bears a like relation to the period of revolution of the equatorial sun

in its orbit, that the difference between sidereal and solar time does to the period of revolution of the earth round the visible sun, and is thus caused by and on indication of the motion of the equatorial sun: similarly will the difference between the precession of the equinoxes and retreat of the terrestrial apsides (as computed on the zodiac) be caused by and therefore an indication of the motion of the polar sun.

Had this motion been continued on the same plane, then a solar cycle would have borne witness to the fact. No such further cycle exists. Hence the polar sun must be moving on another—a polar plane; and it is for this reason that I have designated it the polar sun.

This sun, thus shown to be moving, will be itself revolving round another and very remote body—a body situated on the right line of its polar axis and due north of the earth.

This central body or celestial polar centre is the central sun of the Elohist.

Round this central sun the polar sun is slowly drawing its vast system—in regard to which the analogies of the solar system are very suggestive.

(A simple way of illustrating the seemingly complicated movements of this system is, to consider the knot at the end of the handle of an open umbrella as representing the central sun. The polar sun is to be imagined as passing round it along—or in the direction of—one of the ribs; while the members of its system revolve on the extended surface.)

It would be out of place to enter into further details of the evidence on which the theory rests, of which I have only attempted to give the bolder outlines. If I have succeeded in showing that scientific grounds can be advanced for belief in the existence of a central, a polar, and an equatorial, as well as the visible sun, as the Elohist has claimed, and therefore that there are equally good grounds for assuming that he was aware of the evidence on the due interpretation of which his claim must have been held to rest, and that his teaching on the subject was well founded and rightly entitled to be termed a science, I shall be satisfied.

HENRY PRATT, M. D.

A STUDY IN SYMBOLISM.

(Continued from p. 669, Vol. X).

I HAVE mentioned in my last article that there are seven mantapams and 3 prakarams in some of the biggest temples, but in some small ones there are only four mantapams and two prakarams, and the reason of this is clear. Of the seven principles in man, the 1st three die with the body and are of earthly and perishable nature, and only the remaining four principles engage our attention in the study of "man" and occultism as constituting the individuality that flits from womb to womb, and the four mantapams therefore mean the four higher principles. In the same way the Stula Sarira (the gross body) dies first, and the attempt to solve the mysteries really begins in the plane of Linga Sarira and proceeds afterwards in the Karna Sarira. People had an idea of expressing vital truths in a small compass, and that was the reason why the 1st three mantapams corresponding to the 1st three principles, and the one prakaram corresponding to the Sthula Sarira, are not symbolised in small temples. The rod that connects in a spiral manner the seven brass circular plates (vide my last article) is the unit of consciousness itself. In every Hindu ceremony the worship to god Ganapathy is the most obligatory and must be performed in the very beginning, and if this pooja is neglected, the whole ceremony becomes null and void. Why is this obligation? I have observed in my last paper that there are seven spiritual centres in man known in Sanscrit as "Atharams," and that of them "Mulatharam" is the first. The latent spiritual force must be "fanned" first in "Mulatharam," and therefrom be directed to all other centres, and all the Sanscrit and Tamil works on Occultism speak of Ganesha as the presiding deity over "Mulatharam," and he is therefore the first god that any Hindu has to worship in temples and ceremonies. Thus the god Ganesha is a symbol and personification of the spiritual force located in the first "Mulatharam," and the meaning of his worship being obligatory and preliminary to every ceremony and pooja (each ceremony being a symbol of the process of the working of the soul in the inner plane), is that at every time of every neophyte's attempt to rise up in spiritual sphere, or to invite Samadhi, the work begins in the first chamber of "Mulatharam" in the laboratory of spiritual science. I may in this connection elucidate the esoteric meaning of a Puranic narrative. Once upon a time there lived three Rakshasas who were doing greatest mischiefs by causing destruction to all the worlds and people by crushing them with the weight of their flying or aerial forts and empires over which they (the Rakshasas) were reigning. The whole world not being able to bear these sufferings applied to god Siva for help, and he promised to blot those Rakshasas out of existence. Accordingly he prepared himself for the ensuing battle by causing the "earth" as his car, "the sun and the moon" as the two wheels of the car, and "Vishnu" as his bow, and with these preparations he started for the battle-field. Siva found it impossible to vanquish the three foes, and when he consulted the minor gods why even his prowess failed, they all told him that he

(Siva) forgot to perform the preliminary pooja to Ganapathy, and hence his inability; and at hearing this sage counsel, Siva performed the pooja and started a second time for battle, and in this attempt the three Rakshasas were burnt to ashes at a single glance of Siva's "third eye," and thus ends the story. When even Siva failed in his attempt because he forgot and neglected the worship of Ganesha, much more is that worship obligatory on others. What does this story signify?

Siva represents "the spirit," and the earth car is the "human body;" the two wheels—the sun and the moon—are Ida and Pingala, and the bow "Vishnu" is an aspect of the Logos which has its "seat" in "Sushumna," nadi. All the occult works speak of the "right eye" as "the sun" and "the left eye" as "the moon," the one as "Purush" and the other as "Prakriti," the one as "positive" and the other as "negative," and the nadis "Ida and Pingala" terminate in the right and the left eyes respectively, and hence "the sun" and "the moon" are "Ida" and "Pingala" themselves; and the "3rd eye" is situated in the middle of the two eyes, but a little above, and this eye—"Rudra's eye"—is the psychic eye, wherein "Sushumna" terminates, and this "eye" is latent and blind in all average humanity, but opens its sight powers only in such people as "Siva," who represents a full blown Yogi.

The three Rakshas, with their flying cities and forts represent the three bodies and corresponding "Avasthas" or states with their illusive correlations and interlations, and the mischief they do means the woes and ills to which humanity is subject owing to the spirit being encased as if it were in the three upadhis or bodies which when even burnt to ashes sprout again in other places when the soul wakes into the objective world from its subjective Devachanic state, and hence its flying nature. As observed above, "Ida" and "Pingala" terminate in the right and the left eye respectively, and "Sushumna" in "Sahasram" through "Visudhi" or most properly in "Visudhi" itself where the "3rd eye" is located (vide "Sutha Samhitha" and Agasthya's Tamil works). The fact that "Vishnu" the protector, was selected as a bow to take away life is incongruous at first thought, but a little reflection will show that the destruction allegorically spoken of here is simply the transformation of the brute energies into spiritual ones, whereby humanity becomes more benefitted than discomfited.

The esoteric meaning of the story amounts to this: that man not being able to bear the miseries and woes to which he is subject by the material and phenomenal illusions, applies after all for help to the in-dwelling spirit who rides in this human body, and when once that application is earnestly and unselfishly made, man rouses up all his latent powers, and directing Pragna through Sushumna between Ida and Pingala opens his psychic eye, and through it thoroughly destroys Maya and its powers, and thus attains Nirvana or Moksha; and the failure to achieve this end at first, as mentioned in the story, signifies how the real work begins first in "Mulatharam," and is the stepping stone to the next; and how a sudden, impatient and unprepared rush into the spiritual realm without considering and studying the first and the preliminary process in

occultism ends in lamentable failure. Considered in this light the whole of manifested nature is a symbol of the non-dual, divine, and unmanifested principle, and so all the Puranic accounts are mostly the representations of natural truths under allegories and symbols. Eliphas Levi says "were it not an ingenious allegory, the story of the creation would be the most ridiculous imaginable * * * The ancient sages never wrote about these mysteries of the souls save in wise allegories." Jesus has spoken in parables to his "flock" lest he may "throw pearls before the swine," as those "pearls" were intended more for the "elect" than for the "sinners," and it is therefore a blessing to humanity that all the religions have preserved eternal and natural truths under guises and masks in the shape of parables and allegories, lest the chaste and virtuous maiden of Brahma Gnanam should be roughly handled by low castemen of lust and selfishness, and should be embraced by any other than the right one who woos her by merits and unites her with him at any cost, by a tie such as that which joined Adam and Eve even in their naked state so superbly described by Milton:

Of all things common else in Paradise,
Marriage was the sole propriety of man,

—, and which drove away "adulterous lust to bestial herds to range." The more absurd and childish the allegories in shape of symbols seem to be, the more precious occult meanings will be hidden underneath, and how many are explained in "The Secret Doctrine" to be such! All the Puranic narratives are mostly the descriptions of the nature of the battle between the higher and the lower principles, of the trials of initiation and of similar truths in symbolical language and images, and these symbols are as serviceable to humanity in recalling truths however remote, as the pictures of our ancestors do recall their physiognomy, whatever number of years may have elapsed since their death or rather disappearance or transformation.

Some have remarked to me that it is really shameful for a rational and animate being to have belief in being guided by inanimate objects, and this wrong idea will be removed if it will be perceived that guidance is expected entirely from the meaning which those objects as symbols are represented to convey, and not from the objects themselves, just as a traveller is guided, when 4 or 5 roads cross one another, to the place of destination by a sign-post made of an inanimate substance like wood. I have mentioned that the Puranic narratives are battles between the higher and the lower selves,—the Pandavas and Kouravas of the Mahabharata—and in this connection I may elucidate the meaning of one or two Puranic events for my readers, and then close the subject on this head. The Skanda Purana tells how the greatest Rakshasa Soora-Padma, who was reigning over 1,008 spheres, disturbed the peace and well-being of the higher, the middle, and the nether worlds, and how he was after all killed by the six headed god Skandha or Subramania, which all the other gods, such as Vishnu, Brahma, Rudra and others, were unable to accomplish, and the esoteric meaning is not far to seek. Soora-Padma is Maya and its powers, his domi-

nion over 1,008 spheres is Maya's Avarana Sakthi, which has enveloped in its illusory powers the whole of nature and even the "3 gods" themselves, and his causing disturbance means the production of human individual miseries and sorrows through Maya's Vikshepasakthi.

Just as Ganapathy is the presiding deity over the first spiritual centre "Mulatharam," so Brahma, Vishnu, Rudra and others are the presiding deities over the other spiritual centres (vide Sutha-samhitha and some of the Tamil works on occultism), and the failure of each in destroying Soora-Padma indicates how each spiritual centre of itself is quite useless for the thorough extirpation of Maya and its illusory powers, and hence the six-headed Skanda is a typification of a full blown Yogi in whom all the six spiritual centres are completely developed (the 7th centre is left out of consideration, as it is beyond human description and experience, or most probably as the effect produced by the conjoined efforts of the first six spiritual centres culminate in the 7th, where the knower, the knowledge and the known become blended into one)—and in summing up, the story is a most beautiful allegory symbolising how Maya envelopes the whole manifested nature, and thereby causes woes and pangs to humanity, and how, for a thorough extirpation of Maya's powers and for a complete redemption from its trammels, man has to rouse up all the spiritual centres (and not one only), and how when once they are roused, Maya with its correlations is entirely rooted out, and the individual secures Nirvana. In this story it is further mentioned that the Rakshasa Soora-Padma, after his destruction became the vehicle or vahana of the six-headed Skanda. Perversion and right use are simply the two states of one and the same position, and the story is intended to convey that the very same perverted functions of the mind, if directed by right discrimination for right ends, become the vehicle of higher principles, and this story corroborates the saying "that the mind of man is the cause both of his bondage and liberation, its attachment to objects of sense is the cause of bondage, and its separation from them is the cause of liberation." Again, notice how it is mentioned in the same Purana that Kala-Kuta-Visham (the deadly poison that issued forth from the mouth of 1,008 headed serpent at the time of the churning of the ocean) began to drive before it everybody in the whole universe, and how one and all prostrated at Siva's feet for protection, and how "the third-eyed Siva" swallowed the poison and saved the whole world. The 1,008 headed serpent Vasukhi is the mind (vide "The Twelve Signs of the Zodiac," where it is rightly said that "the Kundali of the Hindus is the serpent of the Bible," and also Soothasamhitha), and as "the mind of man is the cause both of bondage and liberation," a right use of it leads to the spiritual realm and a perverted one to the Mayavic realm wherein death, birth, and other miseries await. The Suras and the Asuras churned the ocean with the serpent as the rope, and in the act of churning "the universal poison" came forth with hissing sounds from the serpent's mouth, which part was handled by the Asuras, and this means that the universal Mayavic poison of Agnanam or ignorance

came, or proceeded from that part of the mind which was occupied by Asuras or passions, and Siva's swallowing it up with impunity typifies how even the basest natures are transmuted into divine powers by those in whom the psychic eye is entirely opened, and that how only such developed Yogis are secure against Maya and its forces (a sage calls this Maya deadlier poison than common arsenic), because the latter kills simply the material body, whereas the former, the soul; the effects of the latter cease with the destruction of the body, whereas those of the former accompany the soul) and that every one similarly affected must seek redemption in spiritual instruction in which alone he will find salvation.

I close this article by suggesting that my Hindu brothers will be considered to have benefited both the world and themselves only when they shall have turned the heads of the Orthodox Community, into reservoirs of esoteric truths, by expounding to them that the very same Puranas on which they base their orthodoxy contain neither orthodoxy nor superstition but veiled rational esoteric truths.

P. R. VENKATARAMA IYER.

A DISGRACE TO THEIR MASTER.

IT is often said that the Oxford Mission is the *crème de la crème* of the missionary movement in India. It is among its highly educated and refined members that Hindus are invited to behold the true fruit of Christianity. The love, tolerance, truthfulness, and other virtues which distinguish theoretical Christianity, are there to be found fully realized in practice;—if not to be found there, where, indeed, would one look for them? This noble band of devoted and highly developed Christian gentlemen have a little organ called *The Epiphany*, which is "Edited by Members of the Oxford Mission," as the heading or title thereof states. Now we Theosophists have no wish to interfere with these good Christians or their little journal, if they let us alone; we accord the right to live and be happy in their own way to even the meanest and most disagreeable of "God's creatures" on those conditions; but when we find that these little creatures are biting us, we have to pick them off and dispose of them. *The Epiphany* has been biting at Theosophists, and we have caught it. Its issue of October 3rd contains an article entitled "Theosophy and Secularism," which is such an admirable illustration of missionary methods and zeal, and is so full of the spirit that characterizes modern "Churchianity," commonly mis-called *Christianity*, that we cannot forbear quoting from it, in order to show our readers what that beautiful spirit is like. We ask them to say, when they have read it, whether in the blackest and most intolerant days of the Christian Church any set of villainous priests ever distilled a more delectable essence of barefaced lies, malicious slanders, venomous insinuations, blind prejudice, blatant ignorance and blank folly than this little Oxford-Mission-Epiphany gem? And we would like them, as an intel-

lectual exercise, to try to think, each one for himself, of any other possible way, manner or means by which the *Epiphany* could have so plainly, effectually and indelibly branded on its own low forehead and written across the brazen face of the Oxford Mission the following confession:—

“WE ARE A SCANDAL TO RELIGION, TRUTH AND JUSTICE; AND A STANDING DISGRACE TO THE MASTER WE IMPUDENTLY PROFESS TO SERVE.”

“No one probably ever doubted Mrs. Besant, in spite of her hideous doctrines, to be otherwise than an honest woman—revoltingly honest as they may have thought her. Madame Blavatsky, on the other hand, has been “unveiled” by a scathing exposure, as a thorough impostor, and the marvel is that she is still able to keep herself afloat as a reputed prophetess after the pronouncement of the (wholly unbiassed) Psychical Society, and the catastrophe at Adyar, which compelled her to leave India. We do not know whether Theosophy compels the abjuration of the immoral Secularist doctrines of free-love, etc.; from the outcry raised against Mrs. Besant upon her secession, we presume a recantation is included, and that the development of occult power by a code of austere morality has taken its place. But after all there is not much to choose between the seven devils of indecency and those of dishonesty. That women may become the instruments of either legion, is a fact recognised in Scripture, which, in its terrible portrait-gallery, presents us with the false prophetess as well as the seductress: and in the most terrible of all of them, combines the two, in the Jezebel of the Old and New Testaments.

“We hope these unhappy sisters in sin may at least be kept from contaminating each other, and effecting the union.

This plunge is one which we often find made. Gross immoral unbelief and gross superstition often cross over into each other's borders. We see it not unfrequently here in India, where the publication of both these ladies are largely circulated, and we find people permeated by the ideas of both.

“The Theosophists, we believe, are defenders of the whole Hindu system, idolatry included, and think it preferable to Christianity or even Theism. Mrs. Besant, we presume, having so long been the prophetess of immorality, will doubtless now have no objection to making the pilgrimage to Benares, and imbibing of the putrid Well of Knowledge, which we are told cured Mr. Sinnett of a passion for amateur Hinduism.”

Our readers are requested to remark the “*We believe*”, “*We presume*”, and “*We are told*”, which form the three paralytic legs on which the last lying paragraph stands. The writer, after all, is but a prentice hand at his trade, or else he would not have exposed so naïvely the real nature of the raw material out of which he manufactures his slanders. There are said to be some good men and true Christians among these Oxford Missionaries; this is possible, and if so, let them prove it by laying a heavy hand on those members of their band, who disgrace their Master, themselves and the body to which they belong, as does the writer of “*Theosophy and Secularism*”.

HEERMAN.

A SHIN-SHU CATECHISM.

(Continued from page 13.)

ABOUT THE TRUE ENLIGHTENMENT.

Q. What is the true enlightenment?

A. Attainment of Nirvâna.

Q. What is the meaning of the word Nirvana?

A. That means literally ‘blown out’ or extinction.

Q. But, what is meant by extinction? Extinction of body and soul?

A. No. It means the extinction of the great suffering of transmigration.

Q. In what state are we when we have reached Nirvâna?

A. The real state of Nirvâna is beyond the reach of the human idea, but it is explained in a certain Sûtra that those who have attained it are in the condition of eternity, happiness, omnipotence and purity. These are called the four attributes of Nirvâna.

Q. How can we attain to that Nirvâna?

A. Only by obtaining the true faith;—that has been stated in the last chapter.

Q. But, when can we attain it?

A. As soon as we are born in Paradise. This is the consequence of the 11th Prayer (Vow).

Q. Now, may I ask you here some questions about Paradise?

A. Yes, that is just in time.

Q. Then at first, what is the original name of Paradise?

A. Sukhâvatî.

Q. What is the literal meaning of it?

A. Sukhâ means happiness, pleasure, comfort, easiness, etc., and Vati is the nominative, singular, feminine form of Vat, with the possessive suffix, accordingly Sukhâvatî means the world which possesses happiness, etc.

Q. In what region and how far from here is Paradise?

A. In the western part over a hundred thousand Kotis (ten millions) of Buddha-countries.

Q. But, how can we point out the real region of it, as the earth is round and it turns on its axis once in 24 hours?

A. Indeed it *cannot* be pointed out by the finger, but the mind.

Q. How can it be pointed out with the mind, when it is impossible with the finger?

A. Because we can understand in our mind that Paradise is in the west from the earth, a globe; not the west on the surface of it.

Q. But, how can we say that it is the west or it is the east without regarding the surface of the earth?

A. Well, the name, the west or the east is originally the distinction of direction on the earth's surface, but by borrowing it, Sâkyamuni has pointed out Paradise for the sake of making us fix our wandering thoughts on one place. To speak freely, Paradise is extended in every direction just as the sky is, because the inside of Buddha's light that is boundless is Paradise—a place that has sprung from the 12th and the 13th prayers; the prayers for

boundless light and infinite life. But such a subject as this will not be understood easily, until the truth of Buddhism is studied enough. Let us still believe that Paradise is in the west and fix our mind there; that would naturally suit the truth, for it is the secret of Buddha about saving us.

ABOUT MORALITY AND OTHER AFFAIRS.

Q. Are there any reasons why true believers would be enabled to observe (keep) the worldly morality well?

A. Yes, several.

Q. Will you tell me some of them?

A. Yes, but it would be sufficient here to mention only two of them, thus:

1. By their being conscious of their own faults.
2. By the agency of the true faith that they have received from Buddha.

Q. How can they be conscious of their own faults?

A. Because they have been fully convinced that they are sinful themselves, when they have entered into the doctrine of the power of another (another power):

Q. How can that operate on morality?

A. By reason that a few words, "I am wrong," could put an end to nearly all quarrels. True believers have thrown away all the notions of self-conceit and self-esteem, that tend to despise others, and very often they are the causes of quarrels; because these notions are incompatible with the law of the power of another (another power). Moreover, to know one's own faults is the first step towards rectifying them and advancing to virtue.

Q. Why is the true faith the agency for keeping morality?

A. Because it is, you have seen, the mind of Buddha that is the source of all virtues.

Q. How does it act upon our moral conduct?

A. It commands our passion, when we happen to be angry. It admonishes us of the viciousness of telling a lie, when we are about to do so. It forbids us thinking or speaking or doing what is wrong, when we are about to do so.

Nay, it would inspire us to do good whenever we have opportunity. Therefore Ren-nio, the chief priest of the 8th generation from the founder, said:

"Regarding every affair, it is by the favour of Buddha that we would intend to do what is good, and we would give up our thought from what is evil; it is all of his favour to reject (evil) as well as adopt (good)."

As has been stated in the last chapter, we use frequently to repeat the name of Buddha to call to remembrance his mercy. And, who will revile others with those very lips?

We carry a kind of rosary called Nen-ju, which means remembering beads, and when we worship Buddha we wear it on our hands. And, who will beat another's head with the hand which holds the rosary?

In a certain Ken, recently, there was a devoted believer of our sect. He was then a member of the Ken assembly. He used

always to carry a rosary in his hand, and wherever he goes he will never take it off his hand.

One day, when he was attending the assembly, one of the members advised him that he had better take it off while he was proceeding with the deliberation.

"O no!" said he, "you do not know my secret. Since I was chosen as a representative of the people in this Ken, I must do my best for their convenience; I must be fully just, patient and unselfish.

"But, as I am a man, if I should trust to my own will, I would be perhaps prejudiced, passionate and selfish. Therefore I always carry this rosary to command my evil temper, because whenever I see this in my hand, I recollect the mercy of Buddha, and I return to right."

Q. How does your sect instruct those who follow it with respect to the family, society and government?

A. To behave toward them with sincerity, that is, through the agency of true faith.

Believers have to behave (serve) with more respect and tenderness toward their parents than others do, because they have been brought up by them to be able to listen to the most excellent doctrine. For the same reason they must be more obedient to the laws of the Government than others are, because under the protection of them they have heard the doctrine.

The state where they are born is a most important place to them, because it is the place where they have heard the doctrine, where they have put an end to their miserable transmigration and from whence they set out for Paradise.

Accordingly they must love the state most and they must do the best they can for its prosperity—they must be the best patriots.

Q. Does your sect employ any spells or supplications to Buddhas or gods, for avoiding misfortunes or getting blessings in the present life?

A. No, those things are all forbidden.

Q. Are there any reasons for forbidding them?

A. Yes. In general, Buddhism teaches that the laws of Karma (action) govern all beings. These laws are somewhat analogous to those of plants. As plants are produced from their seeds, so the misfortunes or happinesses of beings are effected from their previous good or bad actions. This is called "the cause and effect of good and evil."

But there are two kinds of these causes, namely, some happening in the present life; and others, in previous existences.

From misfortune, the cause of which is in the present life, any devoted believers may become free, because, following Buddha's instruction, they would sow those bad seeds no more. But to avoid those misfortunes, the causes of which are in far previous existences and already destined to issue in the present life, is just as impossible as that a grape-vine bears apples. Because Karmic results are inevitable by any means except on entering into the place where those laws do not operate. Therefore for our refuge from those misfortunes Amitâbha has provided Paradise. This

is the reason why anything like a spell is not at all used in our sect.

Q. Then, do you think that such methods as spells, prayers, or supplications have no efficacy?

A. I do not like to answer that question, but even if those things have some efficacy we need not use them.

Q. Why?

A. Because such misfortunes as can be avoided by them we can elude naturally through the efficacy of the true faith.

This reason is explained in one of the Sutras as follows:—

“It is for raising some crop of corn that farmers cultivate the fields and plant the seed, and not for the straw. But when the corn is ripened and they gather it, they get also some straw which they did not aim at. So disciples wish to obtain only the merits of the seed of the perfect knowledge and do not desire worldly happiness. Now, to desire the highest perfect knowledge is the desire for the corn, and the worldly happiness is the straw which is obtained without desire.”

Q. Does your sect say that there are any wonderful or miraculous things?

A. Yes, because those who have Abhijnana or supernatural faculty are able to work them. In our sect, however, we seldom say anything about them, for that *very often causes hearers to be superstitious*. We have to understand that the only thing most wonderful is that we can become Buddha. About this, there is an instruction given by Ren-nio, the chief priest, to a disciple. One day the disciple told the chief priest that when the appellation (Na-mo-a-mi-da-butsu) that he had written was burned in the fire, it turned to six Buddha's images, and said, “What a wonderful thing it was!”

“That is no wonderful thing,” replied the chief priest. “It is not strange that Buddha becomes Buddha. The only wonderful thing is that those who are so sinful can become Buddha by a single thought of relying upon Amitabha!”

The End.

CHRISTIANITY AND THEOSOPHY.

A PROTEST FROM SOME CHRISTIAN THEOSOPHISTS.

[The following anonymous “protest” has been forwarded for publication by a gentleman, who, we believe, is highly respected as a Theosophist by our brethren of the British Section. We publish it partly as a penance, and partly because it is a favourable specimen of the somewhat confused ideas of both Theosophy and Christianity that are entertained by many of the more liberal of professing Christians. The reader may be a little puzzled when he reaches the end of the “protest” to determine whether the writers are serious or not. To state solemnly that “many persons believe that Buddhist priests, caused the Indian mutiny and were the directors and spiritual guides of Nana Sahib,” is extremely suspicious, for it is something like saying that “many people believe that the Parsee Mobeds caused the French Revolution and were the spiritual advisers of the First Napoleon.” Again when it is a simple historical fact that millions of Christians have been butchered by the Christian Churches, on account of some point of doctrine, it does not sound very serious to say that Christ is still occultly guiding the steps of the Christian Church. We do not wish, however, to nip in the bud by too close scrutiny of their assertions the laudable wish of the writers of the “protest” to cultivate fraternal relations with our Society. They take the name “Christian Theosophists.” That title is very easily assumed! but the ladies of “Ladies Gard” may possibly have more right to it than would appear at first sight from their “protest.” We cordially recommend to them the study of Theosophy and of Christianity and the perusal of books that will open and enlarge their minds, for they have much to learn, and many prejudices to lose, as appears from their article; especially from the curious way they speak of the scholars and critics who have examined the claim of the Church to supernatural origin. The passage has got an exceedingly clerical ring, in fact it reminds one of the manner in which members of the Fraternity of Jesus frequently handle a subject. The passage in question runs thus:—

“The assertions that the divine origin of Christianity has been disproved, that all is known about its formation, &c., do not need reply. A single glance at the obscure names of those who have attempted to maintain such a theory is enough, most of them have perished already of well deserved contempt; but if this is not enough, the puerile weakness of argument, balanced by the strength of ignorant invective and only too apparent spite that is manifest in every page should be fully sufficient.”

It is something new to learn that the owners of the “obscure names” of Voltaire, Hume, Diderot, Gibbon, Mill, and a hundred others who contested the divine origin of Christianity, died of contempt; to say nothing of the “ignorant invective” of the Spencers and Huxleys, the Ingersolls and Bradlaughs, the Leckys and the Morleys of to-day. There are still some ribald pamphlets published, we believe attacking Christianity in a silly, clownish fashion, and we strongly suspect that these have been palmed off upon our sisters of Ladies' Gard by some wily spiritual adviser as the serious works of criticism which they may have heard spoken of.—Ed.]

Ladies' Gard, July 1889.

ALL whom it concerns to know will readily recognize the location in space of the “Castrum Puellarum” whence these lines are dated, and for all others it is desirable, for reasons that will be obvious as we proceed, that the precise place should not be publicly known at present. The purpose of this article is, if possible, to clear up and set right sundry misunderstandings and misconceptions which have arisen between Christians and Theosophists to the hurt and loss of both. For surely the central purpose of the Theosophical Society is the promotion of an Universal Brotherhood without distinction of race or creed, based on the great truths which underlie existing systems of religion, and surely in the promotion of this object all that tends to increase social or religious animosities should be discouraged as hostile to the aims of the Society. It is therefore with surprise and pain that we

find Theosophists writing and abetting these animosities and though fully admitting and indeed strongly asserting that the Society ought not to be held responsible for the vagaries of individual members, when we see attacks on Christianity in the authorized official publications of the Society,* apparently with the approval, at all events with no remonstrance from Headquarters, we cannot avoid the conclusion that, to some extent at all events, the Society endorses the action. In an article in the *Theosophist* for May, the statement is made that of all religions Christianity is the only one which has not welcomed Theosophy, but, on the other hand, has opposed and persecuted it. The truth of this assertion shall be discussed later, meantime let us remember that when Theosophy itself was a word barely known and not in the least comprehended in the West, the first book professing to give an authoritative key to the mysteries of the old Wisdom-religion was H. P. Blavatsky's "Isis Unveiled"—a work filled from first to last with scathing denunciations of what therein is termed Christianity. We cannot but think that had the gifted authoress been as familiar with Christianity as she undoubtedly is with the religions of the East, she would without any very great change of language have denounced not Christianity, but the acts and words of many who call themselves Christians, and yet hold doctrines and do actions in direct opposition to the precepts of their Founder and the laws of their Church. In this the Christian Church and every true member of it would have been with H. P. Blavatsky. We do not object to the most vigorous and unsparring exposure and denunciation of error and falsehood, but we do object to excrescences and corruptions which the Church deplures and would fain cast out of her midst being dubbed christianity. Surely this is "throwing away the child with the bath." What these errors are and what is the Church will appear presently. The same knowledge might also have saved the authoress from placing on her pages quotations from various obscure infidels, who have, without learning or talent, attained a pseudo notoriety, by saying or publishing things offensive to the taste and feelings of large masses of the community, and which, whether these masses be right or wrong, ordinary decency and refinement should restrain the utterance of. Retaliation of course is an evil thing and to be avoided, but when a new Society springs into life, with apparently a vehement attack as its *raison d'être*, it is hardly in human nature for the party attacked to welcome it with open arms. Individual fellows of the Theosophical Society have advocated Spiritualism, Hypnotism, Lodges of magic perilously near to black if not actually over the line, and other questionable matters. What has the Society to say to this? Clearly it says: these things are none of our teaching, we have no control over what individual members may say or do, to find our objects and our teachings, look at our programme. Our official utterances—ask Colonel Olcott or H. P. Blavatsky—the Founders of the Society—by then only can the Society be bound.

* What are the "authorized official publications of the Society"? We never heard of them.—*Ed.*

The answer would be perfectly conclusive, but the justice which the Society thus claims should, in common fairness, be extended to other bodies, to say nothing about the Universal Brotherhood. The Church has a programme, official utterances and documents, as well as a living voice to which to appeal, and should not be held responsible for the utterances of some individual who is hopelessly ignorant and wrong headed and in no case speaking with authority.

It may be well here briefly to indicate what the sources of authority are. The Christian Church regards Christ, (that is to say, the historical Jesus of Nazareth) as its Founder. The nature of Christ, the precise meaning of the Incarnation and other problems are not relevant to this matter. Whether Christ was God or the Son of God, a Mahatma or an Adept matters not, so far as outsiders are concerned. He is regarded by the Church as a Master, and the Theosophical Society must needs admit the existence and the guidance of Masters, or it would stultify every utterance of its founders. As such Master then (whose nature is, let us say, a mystery) Christ founded a society, which occultly he has ever since continued to direct, and not that Society alone, but every individual member thereof who has so far purified himself in earth life and harmonized his principles as to be capable of receiving communications from the Master, dimly or clearly according to his development. The voice of the Church there is the voice of Christ, and the Church acquired an organic voice almost immediately after its foundation, by framing an organization and adapting the machinery of general councils, &c. All this is matter of history, and to be easily ascertained by uncontroversial evidence, and this is Christianity, not the utterances of any one man, however learned or pious. Has Christianity then opposed Theosophy? Absolutely, distinctly and decidedly not! Individual Christians may have done so, and it is open to any Theosophist to say that such conduct is un-Christian, wherein most true Christians would agree with him. But is Christianity the *only* religion which has opposed Theosophy? Surely we have read in native Indian papers and heard from other sources the most unsparring attacks on H. P. Blavatsky from Buddhist, Mahometan and Parsee sources. It is answered that these are exoteric materialists sunk in corruption and no true representatives of Buddhism;—that the real Buddhists are those who understand the esoteric mysteries of their faith. Granting this, apply the same to Christians: there are many Christian mystics who know and practice the most esoteric and spiritual mysteries of their faith. Have any of those opposed Theosophy? A point should here be noted as to persistent misuse of certain words, among other "orthodox" the meaning of this word is plain and obvious, the right opinion, the right or straight teaching, to use it in any other sense, tends to confusion of useful knowledge and looks uncomfortably like an intentional attempt to mislead the ignorant. If anything taught in a Christian Church can be shown to be an error it is an abuse of language to say the orthodox teaching is false—it should rather be said the teaching in question is unorthodox. Those who

thus misuse words must needs themselves be unorthodox, and they are welcome if they please to take on themselves the Karma of "False crooked teaching."

Another professed object of the Theosophical Society is to teach to every religion to look into its own truths and doctrines and go back to the original and uncorrupted precepts on which it was founded. This is precisely the very authority that every great writer of Christian doctrine, discipline or practice has always appealed to. Look at such writers as Salmon, Bishop, Forbes, Dr. Pusey, among the moderns. Hooper, Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Andrews, and hundreds of others, the appeal always is to what is primitive. The very words of Christ are the final appeal. If they seem obscure, the opinion of the apostles thereon as being nearest in time to the Master, and therefore more likely to know the true interpretation, then the decrees of councils and the opinions of the Fathers. It may be fearlessly asserted that if the Theosophical Society or any other body could prove any doctrine or practice of the Church to-day to be contrary to that of the primitive Church, the information would be welcomed and would probably be acted on.* Observe, however, that assertion is not proof, and that the principle of growth is not executed, for the Master, occultly as has been said, directs his Church, now it may be that matters intended merely for the transitory circumstance of the primitive Church would be out of place in modern times.

The statement that the corruptions or errors which have crept into the Church arose from ecclesiasticism or sacerdotalism, seems almost too trivial to notice. Whenever any attack is made on any religion it is always "those wicked priests." Many persons believe that Buddhist priests caused the Indian mutiny and were the directors and spiritual guides of Nana Sahib. The theory seems to be that the people having deliberately come to the conclusion that some sort of ministers are necessary to the organization of any religion, deliberately choose the vilest among themselves for this purpose and having done so give them powers almost divine, or that the supernatural beings, whoever they may be, Masters, Elohim, Angels, or what not who guide and watch over that particular faith inspire the foulest of motives into the chosen ministers whom the people are led to obey and reverence. Any sensible man will say at once that priests are much as other men, there are good and bad, from their training their associations, and the fierce light of criticism that beats upon them they are likely to be better on the average, and if we admit the guidance of a Master or Masters at all, such guidance is especially likely to be given to those to whom the mass of mankind instinctively look up. These remarks apply to the priests of every religion in the world, and when we find the evil or corrupt acts of a priest, it is not the system that is to blame, but the man who is false to his faith, and who throws away his powers of good and renounces his higher self.

It is then as much an abuse of language to denounce sacerdotalism as it is to make an onslaught on orthodoxy, but it is popular

* Oh sancta simplicitas!

especially with those ultra Protestants to whom the mention of a priest brings the savour of Roman Catholicism. The pity of it is that Theosophists should seek such spurious popularity.

The Christian Church has been spoken of throughout, and no account has been taken of the various branches; it has been said that the differences between these branches are so wide and deep that no single dogma can be formulated in which the whole Church believes. This assertion may be met simply by the counter assertion of its entire, absolute and wilful falsehood. But even assuming it were true, the doctrines and practise of the true Church of Christ are ascertainable as above shown, and all that an opponent can fairly claim is to say of an individual that by reason of not holding such he is not a Christian; and though by an exhaustive process this might be applied to every living individual, the only true conclusion would be that no true Christian existed on the earth, but Christianity as a religion, and the ideal Christian would not be affected thereby.

The assertions that the divine origin of Christianity has been disproved, that all is known about its formation, &c., do not need reply. A single glance at the obscure names of those who have attempted to maintain such a theory is enough, most of them have perished already of well deserved contempt; but if this is not enough the puerile weakness of argument and only too apparent spite that is manifest in every page should be fully sufficient. Once again the pity of it, that a Society aiming at Universal Brotherhood should condescend to such petty and unworthy attacks, which tend to render Brotherhood an impossibility. Harsh were the strictures on Sir Monier Williams for his picture of Buddhism, and deservedly so, for it was a false picture, but it was truth itself compared to the picture drawn of Christianity and allowed to go unrebuked in Theosophical organs. Is this brotherly? Even say that Christians began the quarrel, which they did not, is it not the purpose of Theosophy to teach them better, not to set evil example of quarrel and spite engendering worse retaliation.

To us here in Ladies' Gard the question is an important one, we are Theosophists according to the original constitution and programme of the Society which we have adopted, we are earnest students of Eastern Lore, and of the wisdom religion as laid down in the Secret Doctrine, and we sincerely hope and strive for union; but we are many of us Christians, not all, for we know no distinction of race or creed, and a Parsee, a Buddhist or Mahamedan would be welcome among us, but we do regret what seems to us the departure from the true principles of Theosophy, we mourn over the intolerance displayed towards our own form of faith, which we know to be not only consistent with, but actually identical with the highest truths of mysticism. And this intolerance keeps us at present from joining the Theosophical Society, a loss perhaps to us rather than to the Society, but it deprives us of these benefits which the Society by its constitution ought to be freely giving to Theosophists like ourselves, and *pro tanto* it hinders the work of the Society and prevents the realization of the dream of a Universal Brotherhood.

THE AGE OF SRÍ SANKARĀCHĀRYA.

OUR readers are no doubt aware of the important position assigned to Sri Sankarāchārya in the history of Indian Philosophy. If the name of Sākyamuni (Buddha) is known to all the civilized nations of the earth, the name of Sri Sankarāchārya stands second only to his. His system of philosophy is considered by several "Sanskritists" to be superior in every way to those of Berkeley, Kant, Schopenhaur, and Hartmann. The period when he lived is, therefore, of the utmost importance to the history of Indian Philosophy. His date is also useful for fixing those of several other Indian philosophers and writers. The discussions of several Orientalists, and their new theories based on untrustworthy records, have only tended to make confusion worse confounded, and has resulted in this historical problem remaining as remote from a solution as ever. Our present purpose is, therefore, to find out what date can possibly be fixed for him, with the aid of materials before us, although they are scanty, and some of them can hardly be trustworthy: to examine the nature of those materials and the soundness of the theories based thereon by several writers. For this purpose, we divide the subject of this paper into:—

Section I.—An examination of the traditions, oral and recorded, current in various times.

Section II.—An examination of the external evidence we possess, which goes to fix the period in which he lived.

Section III.—An examination of the internal evidence we have from his works; and

Section IV.—Summary and conclusion; and an attempt towards a brief biographical sketch of the great philosopher.

SECTION I.—TRADITIONS.

(a). The popular idea¹ is that there was a Brahmin called Góvindhhatta. He married four wives, one from each of the four Indian castes, viz., Bráhmín, Kshatriya, Vaisya, and Súdra. Through these wives he had respectively Achārya Vararuchi, Vikramāditya, King of Ujjain in Central India, Bhatti, and Bhartrihari. This Góvindhhatta subsequently became a *Sanyāsi* (ascetic) and went forth by the name of Góvindayógi. Sri Sankarāchārya, who was born in Malabar according to some accounts, and according to others at Chidambaram, became a disciple of his. Vikramāditya having been supposed to have lived about 56 B. C., Sri Sankarāchārya, too, must have lived about that time, being his father's disciple.

(b). In Kéralópaththi² it is said that he was born in the month of August under the constellation Ardra, in the year 3501 of Kaliyug (400 A. C.), in the town Kaipalle, in the tract called Káladi, south of Aluvóy, Kérala province, and that within 38 years he established the Smárta sect. It is also said that he was born

1. This tradition is current in Southern India, and is perhaps exclusively its own. The name of the father of Vikramāditya is given by some as Chandra-gupta!

2. This is a work in Malayálam language, and professes to be a history of the ancient province Kérala, comprising the modern divisions of Malabár, Cochin, and Trávancore.

during a war in the time of one King Chérumánu Perumál, who embraced the faith of Islam, and set out for Mecca.

(c). A tradition recorded in Kongudésarājakkal says that he lived in the time of one King Trivikramadéva I, whom he converted to Saivism.

(d). From Táránáthá's Tibetan History of Buddhism¹, we learn that he lived before Kumārila, a famous follower of the Mimámsa School, and who did a great deal to check the progress of Buddhism in India.

(e). A tradition recorded in a Sanskrit manuscript of three pages in the possession of one Góvindhhatta Yerlakara of Belgaum, which says that Sri Sankarāchārya was born in Kali Yug 3889 (or 788 A. C.) and attained Móksha in the year 3921 (820 A. C.)².

(f). A tradition in Nepaul that Sri Sankarāchārya went to that province from the south during the reign of King Vrishadéva-varma, a Buddhist, converted him into a Brahminist and subverted Buddhism³.

(g). The Dábistán⁴ brings his date down to the year 1349 after Christ; and lastly,

(h). The Sankaravijayas or the 'Victories of Sankara.' At present, three works bearing this title, and purporting to have been written by Anandagiri, Chidvilásayati, and Mádhavācharya, are in existence. None of them gives the year of his birth in terms of any of the Eras⁵.

To proceed to an examination of these traditions in the order they were mentioned.

(a) The tradition that Góvindhhatta was the father of Vikramāditya does not rest on any evidence. Further, Bhatti and Bhartrihari, who are said to be brothers, are really unrelated persons and lived in different times, as can be found from their own works⁶. Even if we suppose that one Góvindhhatta was the father of Vikramāditya, there is no evidence to show that he afterwards became an ascetic, and was called Góvindayógi. This tradition, I

1. Known to us through Schiefner's German translation.

2. Vide The Indian Antiquary, Vol. XI, p. 174-5.

3. First brought to the notice of the South Indian public by the late Pandit Bhagavánlál Indráji in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIII, p. 412.

4. Vol. II, p. 141.

5. Besides the above traditions there are others which are still less important: viz., (i) Kávali Rámasáwmy's Deccan Poets (p. 6), which places him in the 8th Century A. C.; (ii) Aryavidyásudhákara of Yágnésvarasástri, which also places him in the same period; (iii) Janárdan Rámachanderjee's 'Lives of Eminent Hindu Authors, which places him 2,500 years ago. All these are 19th century traditions, and hence cannot be relied upon. Kávali Rámasáwmy's book is condemned as 'worthless' by Dr. Burnell in his 'Elements of South Indian Palaeography' (p. 86).

6. The last verse of Bhatti Kāvya tells us that Bhatti lived at the Court of King Sridharaséna at Vallabhi, about the middle of the 4th century A. C. According to Dr. Rajendralal Mitra (Notices of Sanskrit MSS; Vol. VI, p. 148) Prof. Max Müller, however, places him in the 7th century A. C. (India, &c., pp. 348-353). Bhartrihari, the author of Vákyapadiya, a commentary on the Mahábháshya of Patanjali, and other works, was a disciple of one Vasuráta, as he himself says in Vákyapadiya. This Vasuráta was a contemporary of, if not identical with, the famous Chandra-chārya, who introduced the study of the Mahábháshya into Cashmere, and who lived in the Court of Abhimanyu, who is found on numismatic evidence to have reigned about A. C. 40. Bhartrihari therefore lived in the 1st century A. C.; Max Müller erroneously places him in the 7th century A. C. (India, &c., p. 348.)

think, prevails exclusively in Southern India, and its followers have sometimes made certain additions and modifications, viz., (i) that Sri Sankarāchārya argued with, and defeated Bhattapāda, one of the 'nine gems' at the Court of Vikramāditya, hence a contemporary of that king, and flourished therefore about 56 B. C.; (ii) that Vignānésvara, author of Mitākshara, a Commentary on Yāgnavalkya Smṛiti, was an Advaita (Idealist), and a follower of Sri Sankarāchārya's School. This Vignānésvara dedicated his work to one Vikramāditya and therefore lived at his Court. Hence Sri Sankarāchārya lived before Vikramāditya.

With reference to the former modification it must be said that the tradition of 'Nine gems' is mentioned in the Jyōtirvidābharana. This work—the authorship of which is generally attributed to Kālidāsa, the famous poet—is found from its style and internal evidence to be written in the 16th century, and has therefore nothing to do with the famous Kālidāsa who lived several centuries before that time¹. The 'Nine gems,' a name given to nine authors and poets who are supposed to have lived at the Court of Vikramāditya, are nowhere else mentioned except in an inscription translated by Charles Wilkins and published in the First Volume of the Asiatic Researches². Also Bhattapāda, i. e., Kumārila, is now found to have lived in the 3rd or 4th century A. C.; and there is no evidence to show that he was a contemporary of Sri Sankarāchārya; but, on the other hand, the frequent references to Kumārila by him in his Védānta Sūtra Bhāshya are enough to show that he lived after him³. In reference to the latter modification there can be no doubt that Vignānésvara was a follower of the School of Sri-sankarāchārya⁴. But he mentions Bhōja, king of Dhār, Asahāya, Aparārka, and Bhāruchi⁵ as having lived before him. This Bhōja was also called Dhāresvara and reigned about 862 A. C.⁶ Vignānésvara in the last verse of his Mitākshara tells us that Kalyānapura was the capital of Vikramāditya, at whose Court he lived.

1. This tradition has been put forward and relied upon as correct, by G. Ramamurti Pantulu, author of a pamphlet entitled 'Notes on Antiquities,' recently published in the Godavari District.

2. The nine gems mentioned by Rama Murthi Pantulu are.—Dhanvantari, Kshapanaka, Amarasimha, Sanka, Vétala, Bhattapāda, Karpara, Kālidāsa, Varāhamihira. Varāhamihira is found from the Brihat Samhita to have written it at the end of the 6th century A. C. It is not, however, known whence Ramamurti Pantulu got this verse. The verse which certain Orientalists take from Jyōtirvidābharana, to enumerate the 'Nine gems' mentions one Vétalabhata, and not Bhattapāda, who is mentioned in Pantulu's pamphlet.

3. P. 284, 1st London Edition. It mentions "Amaradēva and the 'Nine gems' at the Court of Vikramāditya." The date of the inscription is Samvat 1015 or 869 A. C.

4. Vide, for example, his Védānta Sūtra Bhāshya I. Adhyāya, 1st Pāda, 3rd Sūtra. Kumārila was a famous follower of the Mimāmsa School; and from the fact that he mentions Kālidāsa in his Tantravārtika (Ślōkavārtika), we should infer that he lived after the poet.

5. In the last page of Mitākshara (Madras ed.) he calls himself a disciple of Uttamātma, who was one in the long line of the disciples of Sri Sankarāchārya. His description of 'Atma' in the chapter on Expiations will convince the reader that he lived subsequent to the time of the philosopher.

6. Vide pp. 127 and 129 for Dhāresvara and p. 117 for others.

7. Archaeological Survey Reports, Vol. X., p. 101.

Kalyānapura, which is identified with Kalyān, was the capital of the Chālūkyā dynasty, in which several Vikramādityas reigned.

Excepting the tradition handed down to the present day that one king Vikramārka or Vikramāditya reigned about 56 B. C., no king of that name seems to have actually reigned before the 6th century A. C., and this conclusion gains additional strength from the fact that no inscription before the 11th century A. C. adopted the Samvat (Vikramāditya) era¹. In addition to this the question of identification of Vikramāditya has not yet been settled. Certain scholars, as Mr. Fergusson and Prof. Max Müller, argue that Vikramāditya Harsha of Ujjain, who reigned about 550 A. C., and who is found by inscriptions to have defeated the Sakas and Mlèchhas in 544 A. C. in the battle of Korur, must be identical with that Vikramāditya, and that the year 56 B. C. was obtained by jumping back to 600 years before the event². But this argument is not approved of by other Oriental scholars³. Another significant fact is that in none of the Purānas is Vikramāditya mentioned among the kings of the 'future dynasties' in Kaliyug. Thus in all probability the tradition is entirely based on a misconception.

(b.) The tradition recorded in Kéralōtpaththi is also an improbable one, for it says that Sri Sankarāchārya subdivided the four castes into seventy-two, and effected certain reforms in that part of the country—for which no evidence is forthcoming either from the natives of Malabar, in the shape of tradition, or from other writings. This work also represents Bhattapāda as having argued with the Buddhists in that country. This is absurd, for it is well known that he lived and died in Northern India⁴.

The date of Sri Sankarāchārya's birth, viz., 400 A. C., and the length of his life (38 years) are exclusively its own. No other work or tradition gives it. The story that he was born during the time of Chéruman Perumāl cannot belong to the 5th century A. C.; for⁵ on Chéruman Perumāl's tomb in Mecca the date of his death is given as Hijari 216 or 838 A. C. That this date is too modern for Sri Sankarāchārya we shall be able to show further on. This Kéralōtpaththi also contains the fable that our philosopher was the son of a widow: and to crown all these untruths it says that he

1. Dr. Bhandāji in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. VIII, p. 242. General Cunningham, however, thinks (Arch. Survey Reports, Vol. II, p. 266, Note) that the era was adopted in the 9th century, and hence reads an inscription dated Samvat 747 as 825 A. C. Vide also Burnell's South Indian Palæography, p. 55. This question of Samvat and other Indian Eras have recently been discussed by me in *The Hindu* of 10th April 1889 to which the reader may be referred.

2. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1880, p. 273; Max Müller's India, What can it teach us, p. 282.

3. Dr. Buhler among others (vide Max Müller's India, &c. p. 285). I may also mention Dr. E. Hultzsch, Epigraphist, Archaeological Department, who in one of his letters to me calls it 'a baseless theory.'

4. Vide, for example, the Sankaravijayas of Chidvilāsayati and Mādhavāchārya which say that he lived in Northern India and died in a town called Kutthā.

5. Mr. W. Logan in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XVI, p. 160. We also learn here that the name given to Chéruman Perumāl after his conversion was Abdul Rahiman Sameri. Vide also Ind. Ant. Vol. XI, p. 116.

wrote a history of Kéraladésa in 24,000 *grandhas* of 32 syllables each, in obedience to the orders of his guru Góvindayógi!¹

(c.) Trivikramadéva I., is stated to have been king of Skandapura and to have lived about 173 A. C. Professor Dowson found in 1848 that there were two kings of that name, the first of whom lived in the 6th and the second in the 8th century A. C. Prof. Bhándarkar has found out from certain inscriptions that the first king of that name reigned in the 4th, and the second in the 6th century A. C.² Mr. Fleet, however, considers them forgeries.³ Altogether this tradition carries with it a degree of uncertainty.

(d.) Táránátha's History of Buddhism was completed in 1608 A. C. when the author was hardly aged 30, and the inevitable errors, owing to want of a proper study on his part, are (i) that Sri Sankarácárya lived before Kumáрила, and (ii) distinguishes the latter from Bhatta, who is called a disciple of Sri Sankarácárya. We have already shown that Kumáрила lived before the great Védántic doctor. Kumáрила and Bhatta are not only identical, but Kumáрила is also called Bhattapáda and Tutáta. The Mimámsá philosophy is called after this great man Bhatta Tantra, and his work 'Tantra-Vártika' is also called Bhatta-Vártika.

It is on such a work as Táránátha's that Dr. Burnell had great faith, and fixed the date of Sri Sankarácárya as 650—700 A. C. Prof. Max Müller's opinion of this work is also valuable.⁵

(e.) Prof. Max Müller tells us that it is finally settled by Mr. K. B. Pathak, that Sri Sankarácárya was born in 788 A. C. and refers us to his contribution in pp. 174-5 of the XIth volume of the Indian Antiquary. The authority on which Mr. Pathak bases his conclusion is a Sanskrit MS. of three pages written in Bálábódh characters, and containing about 24 lines in all? It says, as we stated before, that Sri Sankarácárya was born in the year Vibhava (Kali 3889) on the full moon day in Visákha month (May—June). This corresponds to 788 A. C. But it carries a fiction along with it, viz., that Sri Madhvácárya was the son of a demon called Madhu! This clearly shows that the MS. in question was written in the 12th century A. C., and that the writer was an

1. This work is condemned by Mr. Kásináth Trimbak Telang (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIII, p. 95, *et seq*); Mr. Sewell (Sketch of the Dynasties of Southern India, p. 57); and Mr. Subba Row (*Theosophist*, Vol. IV, p. 308, or Five Years of Theosophy, pp. 295-6).

2. Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. X, p. 89.

3. Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII, p. 111.

4. Elements of South Indian Palaeography, p. 37. In p. 111, however, we are told that his date is 700 A. C. In his preface to his edition of Sámavidhána Bráhmaṇa, p. VI, we read:—"Taranatha states that Kumárilila (Kumáрила) lived at the same time as Dharmakirti, the great Buddhistic writer on Nyaya * * *. Now Dharmakirti is stated by the Tibetans to have lived in the time of Srontsangampo, King of Yarlang, who was born 617 A. D. and reigned from 629—693 A. D. About this date there can be no doubt, for the king married a Chinese princess, whose date is certain. As Hioun Tshang left India in 645 A. D. and there is mention in his work of the great and dangerous Brahmin enemy of the Buddhists, Kumáрила cannot have lived before that date and for many reasons he cannot have been later than 700 A. D." Thus he makes Kumáрила and Sri Sankarácárya contemporaries, which is absurd; and the date is too modern as will be seen further on.

5. 'India, what can it teach us,' p. 303; "This is no doubt a very modern compilation and in many cases quite untrustworthy. Still it may come in as confirmatory evidence."

enemy of Dwaitees, the followers of Sri Madhvácárya. If a work of only three pages and 24 lines, two of which contain a fiction and the rest uncertainty, is to be seriously considered as an authority, we cannot see any reason why Manimanjari¹ of the Dwaitees, which speaks of Sri Sankarácárya as a Rákshasa (or demon) of Kaliyug, should not be considered so too. Yet that worthless MS. is seriously considered, and the date of Sri Sankarácárya deduced from it, by Professor Max Müller,² Dr. C. P. Tiele,³ and M. Barth.⁴

(f.) The tradition in Nepaul is that one Súrýavamsi (Surya or Solar dynasty) began to rule in Nepaul at a period corresponding to 1712 B. C. Twenty three kings in all reigned for 1409 years. In the reign of the 18th king Vrishadévavarma, a Buddhist, son of Rudradévavarma, the 17th king, *viháras* (Buddhist convents) were built, and Buddhism greatly favored. This king, who is said to have reigned from 614 to 553 B. C., was converted into a Brahminist by Sri Sankarácárya, who came from the south, and subverted Buddhism; and it is also said that the son of this king was called Sankaradéva in honor of the conversions. Pandit Bhagavánlal Indráji says that the date of Vrishadévavarma is about 260 A. C., and would therefore place the philosopher in the 3rd century A. C. Mr. Fleet, however, goes over those inscriptions on which Pandit Bhagavánlal Indráji bases his conclusions, and finds that Vrishadévavarma reigned from 630 to 655 A. C.⁶

This would place Sri Sankarácárya in the 7th century A. C. The uncertainty of these dates, and want of a final conclusion, prevents us at present from accepting any of them as authority. But it is on the dates suggested by the foregoing traditions that the Western scholars depend, and they accept them as final.⁷

1. A work of the 15th century, A. C.
2. India, what can it teach us, p. 360.
3. Outlines of History of Religions; translated from the Dutch by E. Carpenter.
4. The Religions of India, p. 89. He says (p. 88) that Sri Sankarácárya was an incarnation of Vishnu (fresh news indeed!), whereas there is no tradition current in India to that effect; on the contrary all the traditions invariably make him an incarnation of Siva.
5. Indian Antiquary, Vol. XIII, p. 412.
6. Ibid, Vol. XIV, p. 350.
7. Cowell, 8th century A. C. (Translation of Sarvadarsanasangraha, Preface, p. viii); the same date is accepted by Gough (Philosophy of the Upanishads, Preface, p. viii); by Jacob (Translation of Védántasára, p. 28) he is placed in latter part of the 8th century. Monier Williams gives 650—740 A. C. (Indian Wisdom, p. 48); Wilson (Sanskrit Dictionary, Preface, p. xvii; Essays Vol. I., p. 194) 8th or 9th century. According to Rice (Mysore Gazetteer, Vol. I, p. 377, *et seq*) he 'was born in 677 or 737 A. D. in Cranganore (Kodangalur), Malabar,' and 'died in his 40th year.' Dr. Rájéndralala Mitra also thinks that the date assigned by Western writers is 'fairly correct' (Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Vol. VII, p. 17). Mr. T. Foulkes places him about 650—670 A. C. ('On the Pallavas,' p. 196 of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XVII, New Series). Dr. Burnell's, Prof. Max Müller's, and M. Barth's dates have already been given. Prof. Weber, like others, places him in the 8th century, but adds that 'his date is not more accurately determined' (History of Indian Literature, p. 51, note 38.)

Let us now speak of Sankaravijayas. By our examination we shall be able, by quoting certain important passages, to show their untrustworthy nature, and that they merely contain certain traditions current in the times of their composition; also that at best we can accept only those general statements in these works that are consistent with each other.

Anandagiri's Sankaravijaya.—From this work we learn that it was written by one Anandagiri, who calls himself a disciple of Sri Sankarácárya, and it describes the life of the philosopher. The narrative goes to say that one Sarvagna lived in Chidambaram, a sacred place in South Arcot District, who had a daughter called Visishtá by his wife Kámákshi. Visishta was given in marriage to one Visvajit, who, after living with his wife for some time, went away to the forest to perform *tapas* (austerity). Visishtá then became devoted to Chidambarésvara (the name of the idol¹ in the temple at Chidambaram), and through his favor obtained a son, afterwards known as Sri Sankarácárya.² This author has not given us the year of his birth, either according to the era of Kaliyug, Samvat, Saka (era of Sáliváhana) or of Prabhavádígathábdá (cycle of sixty years beginning with Prabhava), or at least the day, month or Nakshatra (constellation) under which he was born. It is very much to be doubted whether this was written by Anandagiri, the famous disciple of Sri Sankarácárya, for the work is partly in poetry and partly in prose, and the nature of the style, and too many grammatical errors, show that the author must have been only a beginner of the Sanskrit language. It is stated therein³ that he refuted certain systems, philosophical and sectarian, such as those of Indra, Kubéra, Yama, or Chandra, which do not seem to have been mentioned in any Sanskrit work, and therefore had no existence save in the imagination of the writer. It is also stated⁴ that he had two disciples named Lakshmana and Hastámalaka; the former of whom was afterwards called Sri Rámánujáchárya, and who preached the Vaishnava religion and wrote a *Bháshya* (commentary) on the *Védánta Sútras*; while the latter went to Udipi and preached the *Dwaita* philosophy. There cannot be a sillier statement. For, it is quite certain that Sri Rámánujáchárya was born in 1017 A. C.,⁵ and Sri Madváchárya in 1119 A. C., and that they have disputed in their *Bháshyas* the system advocated by Sri Sankarácárya. By mentioning these two reformers it is pretty certain

1. An object of either wood or stone fashioned generally after the form of a human being, and in which certain spiritual force or forces are focussed by the will of Adepts or Highest Initiates for the purpose of facilitating, and, serving as a means of attaining that stability of mind, required for the contemplation of the ONE-ALL as enjoined by the Upanishads. Thus is 'idol' defined by the *Ágamás*, which consider it as a means to an end.

2. 2nd Chapter.

3. Chaps. 33, 32, 34 and 44.

4. Chap. 68.

5. As can abundantly be shown by inscriptions, various poems, and other writings of his disciples; all of which mention one and the same date, viz., 1017 A. C., (Pingala year according to the Cycle of 60 years).

that the writer of this Sankaravijaya lived after their times, and the work thus bears the stamp of its having been written only lately, and not during or immediately after the time of Sri Sankarácárya, as we may be led to think, from the writer's statement that he was his disciple¹.

Chidvilásayati's Sankaravijaya.—According to this work we have it that Sri Sankarácárya was the son of Sivaguru by his wife Aryámba, and was born in Káladi in Kéraladésa in the spring season (Vasantartu) in the noon of an auspicious day, in the Abhijit Muhúrta (an auspicious time, at about 12 noon) and under the constellation Árthra. It is also added that at the time of his birth five planets were in *uchcha* (ascending position). What these planets are we are not told; nothing either astronomically or astrologically can be done to find out the particular day on which the planets assumed such a position. His Upanayana (initiation or thread ceremony) was performed in his 5th year. One day he went to bathe in a river but was caught by a crocodile; but somehow he escaped. Afterwards he became a nominal Sanyási and went to Badarikásrama² (or Badrináth in the Himálayas). There³ he found Góvindapáda engaged in *tapas* (austerity) and by him he was made a regular Sanyási, and learned all philosophical 'secrets' from him. Further on⁴ we are told that he met Bhattapáda (Kumárla) and then went to Cashmere to discuss with Mandanamisra. This is a mistake, for it is pretty clear that Kumárla lived before Sri Sankarácárya as already shown.

Then he established Mutts at Sringéri and Jagannáth, and placed Surésvarácharya and Padmapáda respectively in their charge. We are told that he afterwards established a Mutt (monastery) in Dwáráká in Guzerat, and placed Hastámalaka in its charge⁵. Then went again to Badarikásrama, founded a Mutt there and placed Thótakácharya in its charge. Lastly, in Badarikásrama, Dattátréya (an incarnation of Vishnu supposed to be living even now) took him by the hand, entered into a cave, and from thence 'he went to Kailás to unite himself with Siva'⁶. Not one of the authors, when the philosopher is said to have defeated in argument, was actually his contemporary; and Chidvilásayati further exhibits his dogmatism by saying that those who transgress the orders of Sringeri Mutt should be punished.

1. Mr. Telang, however, thinks (Indian Antiquary, Vol. V, p. 287) that the work was written by Anandagiri himself (a disciple of Sri Sankarácárya): and also that 'the author of Sankaravijaya is only the author of that work.' He could not be a disciple of Sri Sankarácárya in the light of the arguments above adduced, although perhaps he might be 'only the author of that work.'

2. This statement is at variance with that of Mádhaváchárya's work, in which we read that our philosopher met Góvindayógi on the banks of the Nerbudda.

3. Chap. IX.

4. Chap. XVI.

5. Chap. 31. In the previous Sankaravijaya we are informed that he sent Hastámalaka to preach the *Dwaita* system of philosophy.

6. In the Sankaravijaya of Anandagiri (Chap. 74) it is said that he left his mortal body in Conjeveram, and attained Móksha: that his body was buried in that town, by his disciples, and the place of interment worshipped.

Mádhaváchárya's Sankaravijaya.—Here we are told that Sri Sankaráchárya was the son of Sivaguru, and was born in Káladi, Malabar, 'on an auspicious day,' when the positions of the planets were thus:—

	(Aries) The Sun.		
(Capri- cornis.) Mars.			
		(Libra.) Saturn.	

[Jupiter is said to be in *Kéndra*: it may mean either that he is in the *lagna* (the sign under which Sri Sankaráchárya was born) or the 4th, 7th, or the 10th house from that sign. The position occupied by the other planets, or the constellation under which he was born, is not given.]

Further on² we are told that he went to Northern India, met Góvindayógi on the banks of the Nerbudda and addressed him thus:—You were Adisésha (the great serpent) at first, then you incarnated yourself as Patanjali (the author of the Mahábháshya and the Yóga Sútras), and now you are Góvindayógi³. Afterwards⁴ he saw Nilakanta,⁵ Haradatta,⁶ and then Bhattabháskara,⁷ whom he defeated in argument, and whose Bháshya on the Védánta Sútras he condemned.

He then⁸ met Bána, Dandi, and Mayúra⁹, and taught them his philosophy¹⁰; defeated in argument Harsha, author of Khan-danakhandakádyá¹¹, Abhinavagupta¹², Murárimisra¹³, Udayaná-

1. 2nd Cantò, v. 71.
2. 5th Canto.
3. 5th Canto, v. 95. Mr. T. Subba Row (*Theosophist*, Vol. IV, p. 309, or *Five Years of Theosophy*, p. 302) makes him *identical* with Patanjali, and says that Sri Sankaráchárya was a disciple of Patanjali. We believe he said so on the authority of this verse. In that case, the verse itself and the commentary thereon are quite sufficient to show that he is wrong and that Patanjali himself lived long before the time of Góvindayógi.
4. 15th Canto, vv. 33, 49, 90.
5. Nilakanta or Srikantasiváchárya was the author of a Saiva Visishtádwaita commentary on the Brahma Sútras (Védánta Sútras), and as he quotes Sri Rámánujáchárya must have lived after him, say the 12th century A. C., at the earliest—and hence long after the time of Sri Sankaráchárya.
6. Haradatta was a commentator on Ápastamba, and Goutama, Dharma Sútras, and of Padamanjari, a commentary on Kásikávriddi. Haradatta must have lived in the 10th century A. C.
7. Bhattabháskara was the author of a commentary called Gnána Yagna, on the Black Yajurveda, from which we infer that he lived in the 10th century A. C. He also wrote a commentary on the Brahma Sútras, in which he disputed the arguments used by Sri Sankaráchárya in his Bháshya.
8. 15th Canto, v. 141.
9. Bána and Mayúra lived at the Court of Sriharsha as may be seen from Sárnghadharapadhati. Bána himself says in Sriharsha Charita (2nd Usvása) that he visited Sriharsha at his Court. Mayúra lived about the beginning and Bána in the middle of the 6th century A. C. Dandi lived about the 8th century A. C.
10. 15th Canto, v. 156.
11. *Ibid.*, v. 157. This Sri Harsha is different from the one mentioned in note No. 9, and lived about the end of the 9th century A. C.
12. *Ibid.*, v. 158. Abhinavagupta lived about 1000 A. C. (Buhler's Report of a Journey in Cashmere, in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1877, Extra No. p. 80).
13. *Ibid.*, v. 16. Murári Misra was a follower of the Mimámsá school and is a different man from his namesake, a famous poet.

chárya¹ and Dharmagupta; and he is also said to have seen and defeated in argument Kumáрила², Mandanamisra³ and Prábhákara⁴; and at last left the mortal body, and this world for Kailása.

This work is said to have been written by Mádhaváchárya. It cannot be the famous Mádhaváchárya, for it is usual for him to give out, at the beginning or the end of every one of his works, the name of his guru and his genealogy, or some other description regarding himself. Such is not the case with the present writer; and further there is a great difference between the two as regards style. The writer of this work must evidently be some modern author of that name: and he must, we think, have belonged to the Sringeri Mutt, from the fact that he gives undue prominence to that Mutt, and extols its importance, while Anandagiri's does not to such an extent. The writer says⁵ that he compiled the work from some previously existing Sankaravijaya, but does not give its name and nothing is known about it⁶. We even doubt the existence of such a work, for had it really existed nothing would have prevented this writer from quoting from it the date of birth of the philosopher.

ADYAR ORIENTAL LIBRARY, } PANDIT N. BHASHYA CHARYA.
31st September 1889.

(To be continued.)

1. Author of Kusumánjali (on Nyáya philosophy) and other works; also of a commentary on Nyáyatátparyatiká of Váchaspatimisra, who was the author of Bhámati, a commentary on Sri-Sankaráchárya's Bháshya on the Brahma Sútras. Dharmagupta may be placed not later than about the 10th century A. C.
2. 7th Canto. The date of Kumáрила was already shown as the 3rd or the 4th century A. C.
3. 10th Canto. Mandanamisra may be placed not later than about the 10th century A. C.
4. 12th Canto, v. 43. He is quoted by Sri Sankaráchárya in his Védánta Súra Bháshya, p. 77, Calcutta Edition (Bibliotheca Indica Series), and therefore lived probably before the philosopher; but see further on (Sect. III.) The dates of the several authors mentioned in these Sankaravijayas, have been determined with special reference to the existing records and are given in these notes to show that they were no contemporaries of Sri Sankaráchárya.
5. 16th Canto.
6. The commentator (Dhanapatisùri), however, quotes many verses illustrative of the philosopher's life; but it does not appear quite conclusively whence he quoted them, although the narrative disclosed by them agrees in the main with Anandagiri's version.

A CHAT ON THE ROOF.

II.

SCENE: *The large flat roof of the Head-quarters Building.*

TIME: *After tea.*

MR. GLOBE TROTTER.—(*A stranger introduced by Major Tamarind.*) Well, you know, it seems to me that Universal Brotherhood is a utopian idea; I beg pardon if my saying so is offensive.

EASTUN.—Offensive! Quite the contrary; we like every one to speak his mind here. But don't you think, Mr. Trotter, that the utopianism you speak of depends upon what you mean by "Universal Brotherhood"? Most people seem to fancy Brotherhood to be an aggravated form of Nepotism, and that to practise it involves a paradox, for to do so effectually it would seem as if everyone must favour everybody else more than all the others. What meaning do you attach to the expression yourself?

MR. G. TROTTER.—Since you ask my opinion, I think that Universal Brotherhood is—is—a brotherhood which is—which is—one might say, universal. The fact is, however, that I have not given the subject very deep attention.

HERMAN.—A nephew is not so near and dear as a brother, and if Universal Brotherhood be too utopian for a cold and selfish world, how would it do to form the "Nucleus of Universal Nephewhood"? As to the paradox that Eastun mentions, Theosophy bristles with worse ones already; besides, if you know how to split open a paradox, you always find a truth inside.

A. K.—The point seems to me to be: How a person whom you would recognize as your brother ought to be treated; for that question certainly remains an open one in the premises. Should he be more privileged than anyone else? If *No*,—as seems inevitable if the injunction against favouritism be observed,—it is evident there is only a nominal advantage in being a brother.

MAJOR TAMARIND.—My brother Tom borrowed a hundred pounds of me once, and never paid me back. I think if I had caught the young scamp then, he would not have found his brotherhood much to his advantage! When I heard afterwards that the poor fellow had died miserably of fever in South Africa, I only wished that I had lent him two hundred instead of one; the extra hundred might have made all the difference with him.

ONE OF THE STAFF.—The Major puts an equal weight in each scale and therefore only feeds the paradox. A. K. has told us that there is no advantage in being a brother if no favouritism be shown. I should like to ask him what he thinks would be the result if favouritism were shown.

A. K.—I was going on to say: If *Yes*, the advantage only lasts as long as there is some one worse treated than those who are brothers, and it would vanish altogether when brotherhood became universal. If everyone were ten feet tall there would be no giants, just because everyone would be a giant.

WESTUN.—I don't see how you can help showing favouritism so long as you have any such division as the term brotherhood implies,

The Trade Unions are "brotherhoods" in the now generally or conventionally accepted meaning of that word, and look how all Union men hate a non-Union one! Theosophists are not yet strong enough to show, or perhaps even feel, dislike of those who will not join them, but who knows that the fervent wish to make everyone belong to their Theosophical Union may not, by and by, operate with them as it has done in all religions, and is doing in the Trade Unions, whose sole desire is to make their brotherhoods "universal" in their respective spheres, and which are willing to use pressure, not always gentle, for that purpose.

A. K.—At that rate, Brotherhood, like everything else, has a good and a bad side, *necessarily*. The very term connotes the making of a distinction between those in the brotherhood and those outside of it.

ONE OF THE STAFF.—And the very fact of their joining the brotherhood is the thing that proves they are worthy of being treated like brothers. If you made no distinction you would destroy the value and very meaning of brotherhood. The weak point, practically, of the rule to "love our neighbours," is that it seems to necessitate the obliteration of the distinction one now instinctively observes in one's treatment of good neighbours and bad ones. Confucius said, "Love the good man and be just to the bad one," why not say "Love the good brother and be just to the bad one?"

HERMAN.—Justice to a bad man invariably means hanging him or otherwise harming him with malice aforethought. So long as you could expel a brother for misconduct your "sense of justice" might be satisfied by doing him that injury; but what would you do with him if the Brotherhood became Universal? Would you have a super-universal class of outcasts like the wretched Kurumbers? Or would you have recourse to the good old method of expulsion—showing him politely the door into the next world?

EASTUN.—Real Brotherhood is only possible for those who have become more than ordinary men. So long as people behave unlike brothers, brotherhood cannot be universal. There will always be such persons; therefore Universal Brotherhood is an ideal that will always be in the process, more and more approximate, of realization, and still never be actually realized.

HERMAN.—We have wandered away from our original question: What kind of conduct or treatment is implied by the name "brother"? Is there not a saying in some countries, when two men quarrel more furiously than usual, that they "fight like brothers"? And watch a family of children in a nursery,—how the little darlings scratch and thump and bite each other, and pull each others hair, when the nurse's back is turned; and,—"of such is the kingdom of heaven!"

MR. G. TROTTER.—Let me tell you this: The other day in London I saw two half-drunken fellows fighting in front of a low public house, and I wanted to separate them, but the crowd would not let me. They positively told me that I had no right to interfere, *because the men were brothers*. Pretty kind of brotherhood that!

HERMAN.—The Brotherhood of the Rosy Nose, I should say; a very ancient and honorable fraternity, my dear sir, which has had its

poets and minstrels in all ages, and even a "Jolly God" of its own; a god, moreover, who, when he was sober, stood very high indeed in the Pantheon.

MISS PANNIKIN.—Well, I am not so wise as you gentlemen are, but there never seemed to me any difficulty in understanding what is meant by "Universal Brotherhood." I think it means that we should be patient and unselfish and generous and good natured, with everyone, as we naturally would be with a brother of whom we were fond.

HERMAN.—You are quite right, Miss Pannikin, that is the true idea precisely. But if you settle vexed questions in that summary manner, what is to become of the philosophers and metaphysicians, to say nothing of the moralists and the economists? Their occupation will be gone, their sport entirely spoiled! It is like thoughtlessly killing the fox that your "hunt" has carefully brought ten miles in a basket to the "meet," and which you expected to give you a splendid run over fine open country.

WESTUN.—Excellent as Miss Pannikin's definition is, it does not cover all the ground, I fear. She presumes that you love the brother, and that in turn presupposes that he is worthy of love; otherwise you would be guilty of the weakest kind of "nepotism." Now there are cases in which a very good man has a villain for a brother, and should the good man "love" his villainous brother? Is it natural that he should do so, any more than a sheep should love a tiger? If he is unable to love his brother because he is unworthy of love,—because, in fact, by a law of nature as certain as that of gravitation, his brother excites quite other sentiments in his mind—how can anyone expect me, a stranger, to love that individual?

HERMAN.—Hurrah! the fox is not killed after all! Tallyho!

MR. TAMARIND.—Let me say this: perhaps I am very stupid, but I do not see why you 'should not be just as forgiving and generous and patient and unselfish in the case of a villain even, as in that of a virtuous man, but of course in an appropriate way; and I think that is what Jesus meant when he said that those who are sick need the physician, not those that are whole. I know that when Hannah, my maid, stole a broach of mine once, and I spoke quietly to her, and showed her how stupid and ungrateful she was, I thought he would never stop crying. She lived with me for three years afterwards,—till she got married,—and was the best of girls all the time. If I had sent for a policeman, and had her put in prison, where would she probably be now?

P. S. R.—It is remarkable that so many languages use a similar word for brother,—Anglo-Saxon, bróðher; Icelandic bróðir; Persian, brata; Irish, brathair; French, frère; Latin, frater; Greek, phrater; German, bruder; Russian, brat; Bohemian, bratra, and so on, all of which are derived from the Sanscrit, *Bhratra*. *Bhratra* has a very distinct derivative meaning in Sanskrit, while in no other language that I know of has the word for "brother" any meaning: It is derived from the Sanscrit *Bhūrñ*, to support and protect, and *Bhratara* is one who supports and protects; which I think fully justifies Mrs. Tamarind's view.

MRS. TAMARIND.—Why, that gives *brother* a "universal" meaning at once and explains the whole idea!

P. S. R.—Moreover; the fact that when it is desired to denote a true or uterine brother the compound *Bharáta-Sahodora* which expresses the fact is employed, shows that in olden times men took a much wider view of their duties of protecting and supporting one another than at present;—man's fellow man was then his "brother." The idea is also derived from the Sanscrit that "brother" in this general sense includes both sexes. (*Bhrátru Bhaginyau, Bhrátara Wubhau*).

WESTUN.—That might do very well for primitive times, but now people must learn to protect themselves, and help themselves. Self-reliance is the virtue of adult mankind.

EASTUN.—No; not entirely. Man is helpless from birth to death without what you may call the *brotherly* help of others,—given at present generally "for a consideration." No one can be really self-reliant except in a very narrow circle. To do for others out of goodness of heart the services we now render to each other for payment would be "brotherhood."

P. S. R.—Looking at the subject from another standpoint, that is to say dropping the name, and considering the thing itself, we may say that the most sacred Hindu works declare that the highest rule of man's conduct is *Ahimsa*, "non-injury,"—which the *Mahábhárata* explains to mean, not simply supineness or abstinence from evil, but active benevolence,—and that in its turn is defined to be the treatment of others as one wishes oneself to be treated; which signifies, abstinence from evil, and performance of good, without reference to any particular persons or particular times. And what is this universal and undeviating kindness and helpfulness but the realization of Universal Brotherhood?

ONE OF THE STAFF.—Ah, my dear Judge! Were all that only possible, what a happy world it would be; but surely your own daily experiences on the Bench must show you that you might as well expect people to fly as to treat each other as you depict.

P. S. R.—It is a mistake to suppose that brotherly love always means indulgence and pardon; it would then be frequently anything but a blessing. A genuine love is one that promotes virtue and consequently happiness; and if we directly or indirectly suffer any violation of duty by our fellow subjects to go unnoticed and uncorrected, at a proper time and in a proper manner, we promote no virtue, but vice; we secure no happiness, but misery, not only in reference to the individual concerned, but to the whole society in which he is moving about.

EASTUN.—That is the particular kind of brotherly love that some of us overflow with to a remarkable extent!—Eh, Herman?

(*Enter PANDIT B. C. and BABU X. They salaam and take seats.*)

WESTUN.—It is a pity you were not here a little earlier, Gentlemen, for we have been discussing Universal Brotherhood, which, it is said in the West, you know, the Hindu caste system makes impossible in India.

BABU X.—On the contrary; Universal Brotherhood is the essence of our caste system.

WESTUN.—Oh come, I say, X. Babu, that is a little *too* strong!

BABU X.—Are not brothers of different ages?

WESTUN.—Certainly,—except in case of twins!

BABU X.—Would a young man of 20 ask his little brother of 5 years old to go to a ball with him, or allow him to smoke his cigars, pull down his books, or play with his razors?

WESTUN.—I hardly fancy he would, in a well regulated family!

BABU X.—Exactly! and it is because we Hindus are a well regulated family that we make the distinctions we do between the castes. One of your poets speaks, I think, of “the Elder brothers of the race;” if there are Elder brothers there must be younger ones; and as a matter of fact there are a good many gradations in age, or what in this case is equivalent to age, in knowledge, force of character, ability and, in general terms, what you Westerners are so fond of talking about,—development. Those gradations are acknowledged and provided for by our caste system.

EASTUN.—You had better surrender at discretion, Westun!

WESTUN.—Not at all! To make the simile correct it would need that brothers remained for ever at the same age. A child of five grows successively into a boy of ten, a youth of fifteen, and young man of twenty; whereas the Sudra does not grow up into a Vaishya, and then develop into a Kshatriya, and finally blossom into a Brahman. But even a Sudra may and sometimes does develop all the qualities which you Hindus say distinguish the Brahman, and still he is treated just as if he were a typical Sudra. When your little brother grows up to manhood you certainly do not continue to treat him as if he were still five years old. There is a very big hole in your argument, X. Babu.

BABU X.—Brother Westun has struck upon a point which is at present a moot one with Hindus themselves, and he would find many learned men among us to agree with him, that there ought to be some method by which promotion to a higher caste might be possible in cases of exceptional love of learning, intelligence or spirituality. Those who favor this idea declare it to be no innovation, but a return to the original Vedic or perhaps pre-Vedic practice. Our learned friend, the Pandit over there, could, however, tell you more about this than I can.

PANDIT B. C.—Caste, I think, is a misnomer. It is a European word. When the Aryans came into India, they were, like every other people, divided into classes for the sake of convenience;—soldiers, who were the rulers; priests, who were the literary class; and traders. “Sudra,” from its most probable derivation, means laborer or mechanic. “Sudra” was also the ancient name of a district near the Punjab, which was one of the early conquests of the Aryan invaders, and the term may have afterwards been applied to all subjugated peoples. The Aryan conquerors seem thus to have made a regular “lower class” out of the aboriginal races and tribes they subdued, which class they kept in semi-servitude, but recognizing it as belonging to the community, since its members, the Sudras, embraced the Aryan religion. The tribes that were not conquered, and which kept their old religion, were *outcastes*,—outside the castes,—and not

admitted into the community; therefore they ranked much below the Sudras.

WESTUN.—But that does not touch the question: Whether they could pass from a lower to a higher caste?

PANDIT B. C.—There is no doubt in my mind, after careful study of the whole question, that before the castes, or Varnas, became religious institutions, the transfer from one caste to another was possible. The Kshatriyas were the rulers, and there are recorded instances of the sons of a Kshatriya becoming both Brahmins and Vaishyas, very much as the son of a military man among you might become a clergyman or a merchant. A high casteman sometimes even became a Sudra, probably because he was degraded for having committed some great crime. The children of a Brahman by a Sudra woman were formerly reckoned as Brahmins, now they would be Sudras; the great Vyasa himself, the compiler of the Vedas, had such a parentage.

A. K.—Have you any particulars now as to the circumstances of these transfers from one caste to another, or of the ceremonies attending them?

PANDIT B. C.—No; but the wonder to me is that so much has been allowed to remain in our old books showing that castes were not originally so exclusive as they are now. I believe that the castes were purely social distinctions at first, very like your various classes,—upper, middle, and lower,—and that there was probably about the same kind of difficulty for a man to pass from one caste to another as there is in Europe at present, but much more disinclination to do so on the part of our caste-men. It is not likely in that case that the promotion or degradation of a caste Hindu would be provided for by very particular rules or elaborate ceremonies; these belong rather to religious than to social matters, and caste had not then as yet become a religious institution such as it is at present.

EASTUN.—We must not forget that the promotion in question and corresponding degradation are firmly believed by the Hindus to be going on all the time, but not in the manner Westun means. They are believed to take place during succeeding incarnations; and this belief is at the present day a very strong incentive for them to good conduct; this, indeed is one of the reasons why many far-sighted men defend the caste system, even though they see its evils, and do not themselves believe in the theory in question.

MR. TAMARIND.—What is that theory, Mr. Eastun?

EASTUN.—Why, that if a Sudra, even, behaves virtuously and religiously during this life, he will be reborn in a higher caste—perhaps even a Brahman; and that a Brahman who behaves in the opposite way will be re-born in a lower, or even in the lowest caste. You can imagine how strong an incentive to a good life that belief must be.

MISS PANNIKIN.—Is that *really true*, do you think?

HERMAN.—Oh, Miss Pannikin! In the name of all that is ideal and spiritual, let me entreat of you not to be so terribly matter-of-fact! To ask a philosopher point blank at short range like that to tell you in confidence whether his ideas are “*really true*,” is

cruelly—almost brutally—disconcerting. It is the prick of a pin that depletes him at once! Be content to know that “*si non è vero è ben trovato*,” which is the most that we somewhat ignorant and very ordinary mortals are justified in saying in this universe of Maya about any of our theories. When you have developed your higher faculties and larger consciousness, it will be time enough to talk of the “really true.”

PANDIT B. C.—Whether it be true or not true in Brother Herman’s estimation that this graded system of re-incarnation according to merit is a fact in nature, that doctrine seems to have been believed in by the Rishis and Sages who have left us our sacred books, and who are universally credited by us with having possessed the deeper sources of knowledge he alludes to. There are many passages in our scriptures that support the belief mentioned by Mr. Eastun. For instance, a sloka in Manu recurs to my memory: “Age by age men ascend by virtue of austerity and lofty seed to a higher position here among men; or descend by the opposite to a low position, all being in accordance with their birth.” Again, Gautama says: “In the seventh generation men obtain a change of caste, either being raised to a higher one or degraded to a lower one;” the word “generation” has no sense here, I think, unless it be understood to mean *incarnation*.

WESTUN.—It would be much better, I fancy, to settle the account, if possible, here and now, in one incarnation. Ready cash is a far better basis to go upon than credit: and to tell you the truth, although I believe firmly in re-incarnation, as the only logical solution of the riddle of life, still I feel the extreme difficulty of ever getting the world seriously to regard our mundane existence from that point of view.

PANDIT B. C.—The Western world, perhaps; and I am not quite sure of even that. Would any one have believed 2,000 years ago that the West could ever be got to believe in the Christian “Scheme of Salvation?” Still it would seem that promotion by re-incarnation is really one of the cases in which, when the Eastern mind meets the Western in friendly contest, a point is reached, beyond which the latter cannot follow the arguments of the former; for the Western reasoning, other than purely theological, is wholly confined to this one life on earth. We absolutely refuse to judge of things from that very limited standpoint. To do so, seems to us the very acme of irrationality,—nay, of childishness of intellect. It seems to us like taking into account only the present day, in matters that concern our earthly life, and leaving out of consideration our yesterdays and our tomorrows which constitute twenty or thirty thousand times as much of our whole lives as any given twenty-four hours. It is in fact a refusal to apply to man’s case a universal law of nature,—namely, conservation of energy with progressive development, by means of successive periods of activity and repose.

ONE OF THE STAFF.—I fear our learned brother underestimates the subtlety of the Western mind. He forgets that our scientists are now agreed that even if men are perishable, *types* develop and survive. Anyone can understand how an individual or conscious

Ego could very easily pass through a series of developing processes or re-incarnations, just as a steel pen goes through some twenty or thirty different stages of manufacture before it is ready for the market; but it requires a deeply metaphysical intellect to understand how a *type* survives and progresses, since a “type,” in the sense in which the word is here used, is a pure abstraction, born of the scientific mind, and without the smallest claim to any existence,—of a kind at least that science would recognize as existence at all.

(Enter R. R. R. AND HINDU KOOSH, Esq., M. A.—*They exchange salutes with those present and take seats*.)

MISS PANNIKIN.—Oh, Gentlemen! Do let us talk of something else now; my poor head is actually swimming!

R. R. R.—Has any one read Mr. Besant’s pamphlet, “Why I became a Theosophist?”

EASTUN.—Every one here has, I should think. It is magnificent.

R. R. R.—I don’t call that statement of hers magnificent: that a Theosophist must be a Pantheist. In that case I am no Theosophist, for, like a very large number of other Fellows of the Society, I am a Theist.

EASTUN.—The pamphlet is perhaps a little bit crude in parts, and wastes time and space over a local preacher named Foote.

WESTUN.—My dear fellow, he is a free-thought martyr! He got locked up for some silly talk, which the magistrates very kindly considered “blasphemy,” and thereby he became a hero in his little circle.

EASTUN.—He belongs to the type of local preacher all the same. With regard to Mrs. Besant it seems to me that, like a good many older Theosophists, she confounds Theosophy with Occultism. The Secret Doctrine is certainly pantheistic,—and a doctrine which many would call a polytheistic pantheism seems to be the necessary basis of practical as well as of theoretical Occultism. But surely it is not necessary to be a proficient in the profoundest religious metaphysics in order to become truthful, unselfish, tolerant and forgiving, or, indeed, to possess all the other qualities which, as high authorities tell us, distinguish the “true Theosophist.” Were that the case, there would not be many Theosophists in the world, for very few have studied Nature in all her aspects, visible and invisible, sufficiently deeply to be warranted in expressing an opinion about the existence or non-existence of a personal element in “God;” and even then their opinion is no evidence of the fact. As to those who have made no profound study of Eastern philosophy and metaphysics, they simply do not know what they are talking about. One can scarcely keep from laughing when one hears these respectable mediocrities pompously delivering off-hand, dogmatic judgments on such questions as the personality of the Supreme Power!

HERMAN.—Just name a few of the prominent Theosophists who, according to that ruling of yours, Eastun, would be allowed to express any opinion at all on those subjects. Are there three “pale-faces” in the whole Society who would fill the bill? Go ahead, Eastun, you are challenged;—I call for names!

EASTUN.—I vote that Brother Herman be suppressed !
(Cries of "hear, hear" and "agreed," and laughter.)

HERMAN.—Well ! am I suppressed yet ?

EASTUN.—Yes,—unanimously,—old man !

HERMAN.—How strange it is that I feel no different ! My pulse still beats with its usual calmness ; the sun still shines,—at least the moon does at this particular moment. I wonder whether *death* will be a similar kind of suppression ! You know, I suppose, that the "Spirits" which visit séance rooms are sometimes quite unaware that they have been disembodied, and indignantly refuse to believe it at first.

MISS PANNIKIN.—Oh, Mr. Herman ! Do make all them be quiet. The Judge is telling such a nice story.

P. S. R.—I was just saying that I lately visited a sacred mountain called Nandidrug in the Mysore Province. A Brahman and his family live in a village on its side. I asked this Brahman why he remained in such an out-of-the-way place. He told me that ten years previously he and two others, relatives, ascended the mountain one day, and when they got near the top they found a cave, which tradition says was once occupied by a Sadhu, or holy man. Just in front of the cave they saw what surprised them very much. A piece of ground, a few feet square, had been levelled, and rubbed over with cow-dung, as every sacred place is in India. In the centre a fire was burning, and all round, at the corners, were flowers and rice, but no human being could be seen.

MISS PANNIKIN.—Was it an astral fire ?

P. S. R.—Oh no ; a fire made with sticks. Well, they went near, and noticed two fruits such as they had never seen before, lying just outside the square. These fruits were like plantains or bananas in shape and size, but bright blue in colour. Not seeing any owner they broke one of the fruits in two, and found it had no separate skin or rind like a banana, but was eatable throughout, like an apple. It tasted delicious, so all three ate some, and they carried a piece away with them, which they afterwards gave to a relative to eat.

MAJOR TAMARIND.—Precious fools they must have been ! They might have been poisoned. I remember once when we were stationed at———

MRS. TAMARIND.—Tell us about it afterwards, dear. Go on please, Judge.

P. S. R.—The Major's intuition is good, but not quite correct. When supper time came none of those who had eaten of the fruit felt in the least hungry. The idea of food disgusted them. Next morning they wanted no breakfast. Dinner time came but they could not touch it ; the same with supper and with breakfast next day.

MR. G. TROTTER.—They must have been terribly weak by that time !

P. S. R.—Quite the contrary : they went about their business as usual, and never felt better in their lives. Nevertheless, their families became alarmed about them, and they got frightened themselves, so all four forced themselves to "take nourishment,"—

one on the second day, two on the third, and one on the fourth,—although it required a painful effort to do so. Well, my Brahman, who had held out the longest, was sitting on his pandal the evening he broke his fast, when an old man approached. He was weeping and wringing his hands, and could hardly speak for some minutes. Then he said : "Oh, what have you gentlemen done ! You have ruined me altogether. I spent 12 years wishing for this fruit, and just when I get it, you and your friends come and eat it up without being benefited yourselves. And now my heart is broken !"

MR. G. TROTTER.—Why on earth was he so anxious about these fruits ? What benefit did he expect ?

P. S. R.—The Brahman asked the old man those questions, to which he replied : "Any one who eats one of those fruits, and fasts for seven days, will never feel hungry again, but can go without food for the rest of his life, and feel well and strong all the time."

EASTUN.—I wish some one would send a few of those fruits to Head-quarters ! They would simplify matters exceedingly.

MAJOR TAMARIND.—I would not thank you for one ! What on earth would one do during meal times ? I should like to see myself moping outside while the others were enjoying their dinners ! By Jove, it would be———

MRS. TAMARIND.—Yes, my dear, I can imagine what a life we would have of it ! The Major, I must tell you, gets dreadfully frightened about himself if he gets "off his feed," as he calls it. He thinks he is going to die of starvation at once.

MISS PANNIKIN.—Then it was this old man who had lit the fire and put the flowers there ?

P. S. R.—Yes ; and he explained that he was just coming to see if the fruit was there, when he saw the strangers eating it ; and as it was too late to save it he said nothing, hoping that it would benefit them who ate it. He had learned, however, that they had not fasted for seven days, as they ought to have done, and hence his lamentations.

MISS PANNIKIN.—Where did the fruits come from ?

P. S. R.—That is what I should like to know myself. He got them, he said, by wishing for them. By the bye, the Brahman told me that even as it was, the fruit had produced some effect, for that all those who had eaten of it found ever afterwards that they could go for days without food, and feel very little inconvenience ;—a slight appetite came at meal times, but soon went away again.

EASTUN.—I have several times heard stories in India about similar fruits, procurable by constant meditation and devotion. The idea undoubtedly is that they grow in no earthly garden, but are brought from another sphere to the person who earns them,—by a process which in the West would be called "materialization." Am I not right, Judge ?

P. S. R.—That is one explanation ; another is that they are brought by elementals from as yet unknown regions of our earth, there are many regions of which our geographers know nothing ;—the Himalayas, for instance, are full of mysteries.

MR. HINDU KOOSH.—The partition between this world and another, or between this state of consciousness and another, seems to be very thin, and easily broken through. A friend of mine the other day, who is experimenting in hypnotism, sent a boy who was in the clairvoyant state to look for a treasure, said to be concealed in a certain mountain. The boy said he saw the treasure, but was afraid to go near it, as it was guarded by a fierce-looking man with a big club. My friend commanded the boy to approach it, and presently he cried out, "Oh, the man is coming to attack me," and thereon he fell down insensible, as if heavily struck. On immediately examining the boy a great bruise was found on the side of his head and face, where he declared the man had struck him with his club. I heard of another very similar case that occurred lately, in which a grown man, who was practising concentration inadvisedly, received a severe contusion from a man who appeared to his inner senses while in a condition similar, no doubt, to the hypnotic.

MR. G. TROTTER.—It certainly does seem to me like going back to childhood's days to listen seriously to such extraordinary stories. You will not think me rude, I hope, if, I ask whether there is the smallest scientific evidence for these beliefs?

EASTUN.—That depends upon what you call "scientific evidence." If you mean the testimony of "scientific men," as the expression is generally understood, you must look for it where men of science are chiefly to be found,—in the West. Since, however, men of science almost invariably refuse to occupy themselves with these things, further than occasionally getting up ingenious but rough and fraudulent imitations of some of those they read of, you certainly would not get much satisfaction in that quarter. If you mean the testimony of an expert who has thoroughly studied these subjects, you must search in the East; but it is doubtful whether you, a sceptic and stranger, would find a teacher,—for a witness of that kind would necessarily be a teacher. It is not very encouraging for an expert in these things to find that those who profess loudly their "anxiety to be convinced" scout everything he says and laugh at him to his face; or else misunderstand and misreport all he tells them. What do you yourself mean, Mr. Trotter, by "scientific evidence?"

MR. G. TROTTER.—Well, if these strange things took place under test conditions in the presence of a committee of trained observers, I should call it scientific evidence.

ONE OF THE STAFF.—Don't forget that there are two kinds of evidence, equally "scientific," and each governed by its own canons,—the legal and the physical; which respectively have to do with matters of observation and matters of experiment. The latter is not applicable to these phenomena in more than a slight degree, for we do not know the laws that govern either their production or their manifestation; but by means of the former, people could come as near to certainty in these matters as in most of the affairs of life, if they could only manage to be honest with themselves, and to lay aside prejudice and conceit.

EASTUN.—I think, moreover, that all lawyers will concede that as regards legal evidence, or even a knowledge of what constitutes proof by means of it, men of science are very often complete boobies. What asses they frequently make of themselves in the witness box! And yet the inconsiderate cry of the general public is for a jury of scientific men to sit upon matters of which they are notoriously and even boastfully ignorant.

WESTUN.—I don't quite see that, Eastun. These things, after all, are phenomena, and as such are amenable to *scientific observation*, if not always to experiment. If you happened to find a cow's egg, would it not be more conclusive to lay it on the table for examination, than to hide it away and bring fifty people to swear they had seen it?

BABU X.—A cow's egg would require no witnesses, because it would remain as evidence of its own existence. Occult phenomena are ephemeral, and can no more be laid upon the table than a rainbow can be hung upon the wall.

R. R. R.—The tendency of modern science is, I think, to allow more weight than formerly to what you name "legal evidence." I read the other day that most medical men now concede the occurrence of spontaneous combustion of the human body, which all but a few of them declared an impossibility half a century ago, although the evidence is about the same now as then; for they have neither been able to observe scientifically a case of this extraordinary death, nor to produce it experimentally, and can have come to believe in it by only attaching more weight to the recorded testimony of witnesses.

HERMAN.—I fancy Dickens' description of Mr. Krook's death had more effect on the stony mind of modern science than anything else. Doctors are human after all, and are not proof against the persuasive power of plausibility; moreover once they get started they will go on till they believe anything. Look how they have lately gone in for mesmerism and electro-biology under the names of hypnotism, telepathy, and so forth, after having covered those very same phenomena with ignorant ridicule for a hundred years. All that a scientific man apparently requires as a condition of belief is to be allowed to call an old thing by a new name, his own preferred, and to be permitted to pretend that he has discovered it himself.

WESTUN.—You forget, Herman, that the intense credulity of even the learned a few hundred years ago has necessarily made our scientific men laudably cautious. The essence of the scientific method consists in provisionally denying the existence of anything that cannot be explained, and provisionally conceding the possibility of what can be explained.

HERMAN.—I like that word "provisionally"! Look here Eastun: If a traveller informed the British Association that he had discovered a tribe in the centre of Africa, the members of which suddenly exploded when they had reached the age of about 30 years;—would he be believed?

EASTUN.—Hardly!

HERMAN.—Suppose, however, he laid on the table some Seidlitz powders, labelled “Sediment from the wells of the exploding people,” would not the men of science, finding on analysis that this sediment consisted of tartaric acid and carbonate of lime, most probably formulate a highly scientific explanation for the explosions!—Saturation of the tissues by cumulative doses of an effervescent mixture, causing after a certain time a tension which required only a slight shock, a sneeze perhaps, to start sudden and general effervescence which the unscientific observer would call an explosion. And, honor bright, would not the men of science, having thus found an explanation for the phenomenon, regard anyone who denied the existence of the exploding tribe as an unscientific ignoramus?

R. R. R.—Brother Herman’s supposition is, of course, a burlesque; but it points to a certain narrow tendency in modern science, which I fancy is an unfortunate fact. We Hindus, however, have acquired a great respect and admiration for the *patient industry* and *careful accuracy* of modern scientific research, and the thorough-going nature of its investigations in matters which it does investigate seriously. Those large volumes on the “Phantasms of the Living” are to me a perfect marvel. I admire the minute way in which every incident of every story is verified in an elaborate manner; but I marvel also at the fact that such minute verification should be deemed necessary, especially as the outcome of it all in the way of any light thrown upon the subject is practically nil. It seems to me that when thousands of similar instances occur, one gains nothing by a monotonous verification of them all. Their value as evidence cannot be measured by the thousand, any more than by the mile or by the ton. A few well authenticated instances ought to be as good as hundreds for anyone with the slightest intuition. People do not analyse every bit of ore in a mine in order to estimate how much gold the whole mine contains.

BABU X.—It is because we admire the Western patience and thoroughness that we regret that Western men of science are blind to the marvellous phenomena which many people here believe in, no doubt, too readily, and therefore superstitiously. If Western views of nature, and of the legitimate field of science, were wider and broader, your men of science might not only teach us much, but also learn much from us in return.

R. R. R.—To put the matter in a nutshell:—The East needs to have its “standard of probability” lowered, and the West needs to have its “standard of possibility” raised.

Mrs. TAMARIND.—Do listen! Does it not sound as if some one were asleep? I have heard it, off and on, for the last hour.

They all listen; and in the silence they hear the beating of the surf on the sea shore, which acts as a melodious accompaniment to a distinct and rhythmical “Snugggrrrrr—Snugggrrrrr”.

Mrs. TAMARIND.—Why, I declare it is the little Acting Editor! Do wake him up Mr. Westun.

HERMAN.—Let the poor fellow sleep! Perchance he is dreaming of the happy days of innocence, ere ever he heard of the *Theosophist*.

(Westun shakes the sleeper).

ED. OF THE T. (speaking indistinctly).—I assure you I had not the least intention of saying anything disrespectful of our beloved and revered Madame Blavatsky.

WESTUN (shaking him violently).—Wake up, old man! Wake up!

ED. OF THE T.—Eh? What? I haven’t been to sleep, I assure you. I heard every word you said.

HERMAN.—What were we talking about?

ED. OF THE T.—About Universal Brotherhood of course. It is a subject of paramount importance, but it is the most extraordinary thing that it always makes me feel a little drowsy. I don’t see anything to laugh at I’m sure, Herman.

MAJOR TAMARIND (Smiling).—Well, I suppose it is about time we all were feeling a little drowsy. Get your hats, my dears, and say good night and *au revoir*.

(*Exeunt omnes.*)

SANDILLYA-UPANISHAD OF ATHARVANA-VEDA.

[Translated by the Kumbakonam T. S.]

(Continued from Vol. X, p. 552.)

BY the repression of the breath (Pranayama) through inhalation, &c., by continual practice therein which does not cause pain to one’s self, and by meditating in a secluded place, the fluctuations of the mind are arrested. Through the right realisation of the true nature of the sound which is at the end of the pronunciation of the syllable *Om* (viz., *Ardhamatra*), and when *Sushupti* (dreamless sleeping state) is rightly cognised through consciousness, the fluctuations of Prana are repressed. When the hole at the root of the palate is closed by the tongue with effort, and when the breath goes up through it (the hole), then the fluctuations of Prana are stopped. When the consciousness (*Samvit*) is merged in Prana, and when through practice the Prana goes through the upper hole into the *Dwathantha* (the 12th centre), then the fluctuations of Prana are stopped. When the eye of consciousness (the spiritual or third eye) becomes calm and clear so as to be able to distinctly see in the transparent *akas* at a distance of 12 digits from the tip of his nose, then the fluctuations of Prana are stopped. When the thoughts arising in the mind are bound up in the calm contemplation of the stellar world between one’s eye-brows and are (thus) destroyed, then the fluctuations cease. When the knowledge which is of the form of the knowable, which is beneficent and which is untouched by any modifications arises in one and is known as *Om* only and no other, then the fluctuations cease. By the contemplation for a long time of the *akas* which is in the heart, and by the contemplation of the mind as free from affinities (*Vásanas*), (or a mind free from them), then the fluctuations of Prana cease. By these methods and various others suggested by (one’s) thoughts, and by means of the many (spiritual) guides, the fluctuations cease.

Having by contraction opened the door of Kundalini, one should force open the door of Moksha. Closing with her mouth the door through which one ought to go, the Kundilini sleeps crooked in form and coiled up like a serpent. He who causes this Kundalini to move,—he is an emancipated person. If this Kundalini were to sleep in the upper part of the neck of any Yogi, it goes towards his emancipation. If it were to sleep in the lower part (of the body), it is for the bondage of the ignorant. Leaving the two nadis, Ida and Pingala, it (Prana) should move in Sushumna. That is the supreme seat of Vishnu. One should practise (Pranayama) repression of the breath with the concentration of the mind. The mind should not be allowed by a clever man to rest on any other thing. One should not worship Vishnu during the day. One should not worship Vishnu during the night. One should always worship him, and one should not worship him, during day and night. The wisdom-producing hole (viz., Khechari-mudra) has five channels (or holes). Oh Sandilya! this is the Khechari-mudra; practise it. With one who sits in the Khechari-mudra, the air which was flowing before through the left and right nadis now flows through the middle one (Sushumna). There is no doubt about it. You should swallow the empty air through the way (viz., Sushumna, that is) between Ida and Pingala. In that place is Khechari-mudra situated, and that is the seat of Truth. That is Khechari-mudra which is situated in the Akasachakra (in the head) in the seat called Niralamba (lit: without support) between the sun and moon (viz., Ida and Pingala). When the tongue has been lengthened to the length of a Kala (a digit) by the incision (of the *Frenum lingum*) and by rubbing and milking it (the tongue), fix the gaze between the two eyebrows and close the hole in the skull with the tongue. This is Khechari-mudra. When the tongue and the Chitta (mind) are both in the Akas (Khecharathi), then the person with his tongue raised up becomes immortal. Firmly pressing the yoni (perinæum) by the left heel, stretching out the right leg, grasping the feet with both hands and inhaling the air through the nostrils, practise the *Kandha—Bandha*¹ retaining the air upward. By that all afflictions are destroyed; then poison is digested as if it were nectar. Asthma, splenic disease, the turning up of the anus and the numbness of the skin are removed. This is the means of conquering Prana and destroying death. Pressing the yoni by the left heel, place the other foot over the left thigh: inhale the air, rest the chin on the chest, contract the yoni and contemplate as far as possible your atma as situated within your mind. Thus is the direct perception (of Truth) attained.

Inhaling the Prana from outside and filling the stomach with it, centre the Prana with the mind in the middle of the navel, at the tip of the nose and at the toes during the Sandhyas (sunset and sunrise) or at all times. (Thus) the Yogi is freed from all diseases and fatigue. By centering his Prana at the tip of his nose, he obtains mastery over the element of air; by centering it at the middle of his navel, all diseases are destroyed; by centering it at the toes, his body becomes light. He who drinks the air (drawn)

through the tongue destroys fatigue, thirst and diseases. He who drinks the air with his mouth during the two Sandhyas (sunrise and sunset) and the last two hours of the night, within three months, Saraswati (the goddess of speech) is present in his vak (speech)—(viz., he becomes eloquent in his speech). In six months he is free from all diseases. Drawing the air by the tongue retain the air at the root of the tongue. The wise man thus drinking nectar enjoys all prosperity. Fixing the Atma in the Atma itself in the middle of the eyebrows (having inhaled) through Ida and breaking through that (centre) thirty times, even a sick man is freed from disease. He who draws the air through the nadis and retains it for half an hour in the navel and in its sides, becomes freed from disease. He who for the space of a month during the three Sandhyas (sunset, sunrise and midnight or noon) draws the air through the tongue, pierces 30 times and retains his breath in the middle of his navel, becomes freed from all fevers and poisons. He who retains the Prana together with the mind at the tip of his nose even for the space of a Muhurta (48 minutes), destroys all sins that were committed by him during 100 births. By the conquest of *Tharam* (Om. Sound) he knows all things.

By retaining the mind at the tip of his nose he acquires a knowledge of the Indra² world: below that he acquires a knowledge of Agni³ (fire) world. By retaining the mind at the eye he gets a knowledge of all worlds: in the ear, a knowledge of Yama (the god of death) world: in the sides of the ear, a knowledge of Niriti⁴ world: in the back of it (the ear), a knowledge of Varuna⁵ (god of rain) world: in the left ear, a knowledge of Vayu (air) world: in the throat, a knowledge of Soma⁶ world: in the left eye, a knowledge of Siva⁷ world: in the head, a knowledge of Brahma world: in the soles of the feet, a knowledge of Athala⁸ world: in the feet, a knowledge of Vithala world: in the ankles, a knowledge of Nithala world: in the calves, a knowledge of Suthala world: in the knees, a knowledge of Mahathala world: in the thighs, a knowledge of Rasathala world: in the loins, a knowledge of Thalathala world: in the navel, a knowledge of Bhuloka (earth world): in the stomach, a knowledge of Bhuvar (world): in the heart, a knowledge of Suvar (world): in the place above the heart, a knowledge of Mahar world: in the throat, a knowledge of Jano world: in the middle of the brows, a knowledge of Thapo world: in the head, a knowledge of Satya world.

By conquering Dharma (virtue) and Adharma (non-virtue), one knows the past and the future. By centering it on the sound of every creature a knowledge of the cry (language) of the beast is produced. By centering it on the Sanchitakarma¹¹ a knowledge of one's previous births arises in him. By centering it on the mind of another, a knowledge of the mind (thoughts) of others is induced. By fixing it on Bala (the strength), the strength of persons like Hanuman¹² is obtained. By fixing it on the sun, a knowledge of the worlds arises. By fixing it on the moon, a knowledge of the constellation is produced. By fixing it on Dhruva (Polar-star), a perception of its motion is induced. By fixing it on his own (self), one acquires the knowledge of Purusha: on the navel, he

attains a knowledge of Kayavuha (the mystical arrangement of all the particles of the body so as to enable a person to wear out his whole Karma in one life) : on the well of the throat, freedom from hunger and thirst arises : on the Kurmanadi (which is situated below the well of the throat), a firmness (of concentration) takes place. By fixing it on the pupil of the eye he obtains the sight of the Siddhas (spiritual personages). By conquering the Akas in the body he is able to soar in the Akas : (in short) by centering the mind in any place, he conquers the Siddhis (psychical powers) appertaining to that place.

V. A person possessed of Yama and Nyama, avoiding all company, having finished his course of study, delighting in truth and virtue, having conquered (his) anger, being engaged in the service of his spiritual instructor, being obedient to his parents and well instructed in all the religious practices and knowledge of his Asrama (order of life), should go to a sacred grove abounding in fruits, roots and water. There he should select a pleasant spot always resounding with the chanting of the Vedas, frequented by Brahmavits (knowers of Brahm), who persevere in the duties of their order of life and filled with fruits, roots, flower and water. (Else) either in a temple or on the banks of a river, or in a village or in a town he should build a beautiful monastery. It should be neither too long nor too high, should have a small door, should be besmeared well with cowdung and should have every sort of protection.¹⁵ There listening to the exposition of Vedanta, he should begin to practise Yoga. In the beginning having worshipped Vinayaka (Ganesa)¹¹ he should salute his Ishta-devata (tutelary divinity); and sitting in any of the abovementioned postures on a soft seat facing either the east or the north and having conquered them, the learned man keeping his head and neck erect and fixing his gaze on the tip of his nose, should see the sphere of the moon between his eyebrows and drink the nectar (flowing therefrom) with his eyes.

Inhaling the air through Ida¹⁵ for the space of 12 matras¹⁶, he should contemplate on the sphere of fire¹⁷ situated in the belly as surrounded with flames, and having as its bindu (seed) र (ra); then he should exhale it through Pingala¹⁸. Again inhaling it through Pingala and retaining it (within), he should exhale it through Ida. For the space of 28 months¹⁹ he should practice six times at every sitting during the three Sandhyas (morning, evening and noon) and during the intervals. By this, the nadis become purified. Then the body becomes light and bright, the (gastric) fire is increased (within) and he begins to hear distinctly (the spiritual sounds).

VI. Prānāyāma is said to be the union of Prana and Apana. It is of three kinds—expiration, inspiration and cessation. They are associated with the letters of the (Sanskrit)²⁰ alphabet (for the right performance of Prānāyāma). Therefore Pranava (Om) only is said to be Prānāyāma. Sitting in the Padmasana (posture), the person should imagine that there is at the tip of his nose Gayatri²¹, a girl of red complexion, surrounded by the rays of the moon and mounted on a Hamsa (swan), having a mace in her

hand. She is the visible symbol of the letter A. The letter U has as its visible symbol Savitri²², a young woman of white color having a disc in her hand and riding on a Garuda (eagle). The letter M. has as its visible symbol Saraswati²³, an aged woman of black color riding on a bull, having a trident in her hand. He should meditate that the single letter—the supreme light—the Pranava (Om)—is the origin or source of these three letters A, U, and M. Drawing up the air through Ida for the space of 16 matras, he should meditate on the letter A during that time; retaining the inspired air for the space of 64 matras, he should meditate on the letter U during the time; he should then exhale the inspired air for the space of 32 matras, meditating on the letter M during that time. He should practise this in the above order over and over again.

(To be continued.)

NOTES.

(1). Lit. binding the air (up) the throat similar to Mahamudra (page 29, Siva Samhita).

(2 to 9). These correspond to the several directions and the gods presiding over them corresponding respectively to east, south-east, south, south-west, west, north-west, north and north-east.

(10). Of the 14 worlds there are 7 from earth beginning with Bhuloka and ending with Satyaloka, and 7 underneath the earth beginning with Athala world and ending with Thalathala. As the microcosm is after the macrocosm, so there are worlds situated in our body as in the universe. For fuller explanation vide notes on Nadabindu Upanishad, *Theosophist*, May 1889.

(11). This is that portion of our past Karma which is yet in store for us to be enjoyed in our future lives.

(12). He is son of Vayu, and incarnated as the monkey-god and lieutenant of Rama (god). He is the personification of strength.

(13). Both by physical protection and that of Mantras as to scare away evil spirits.

(14). He is the son of Siva (god) 'having an elephant's face,' symbolical of wisdom. He is considered as the remover of all obstacles, and as such he is invoked and worshipped in the beginning of every religious rite.

(15 and 18). Ida and Pingala are the 2 nadis upon which our breath alternates from the left nostril to the right and vice versa and between which is Sushumna. Hence these two terms are applied to and mean the left and right nostrils.

(16). According to Yoga Tatwa Upanishad, a Matra is the time occupied in circling the knee once with the palm of the hand and filipping the fingers.

(17). According to Varaha Upanishad the seat of fire is the Muladhara (sacral plexus).

(19). The original is not clear. It says, "For the space of 3, 4, 3, 4, 7, 3 and 4 months" which, when added, becomes 28.

(20). According to the Mantra Shastra Pranāyama is performed through the letters of the Sanscrit alphabet, the vowels corresponding to inspiration, &c.

(21, 22 and 23). These are the goddesses representing Sakte, and being the wives of Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra.

CRITICS OF CHRISTIANITY.

(HISTORICAL AND OTHER.)

IN answer to enquiries about books which *critically* examine the foundations of Christianity from a liberal or freethinking point of view (the only really critical one), we give herewith a list of some of the best recent works in English and French on the subject. When our readers have mastered their contents, we shall be happy to name others if these are found insufficient "to produce the desired effect." For our part, however, we should recommend the study of Eastern philosophy, and the attentive perusal of works on Theosophy, especially of Mme. Blavatsky's splendid books, "Isis Unveiled" and the "Secret Doctrine," rather than works of criticism on any religion; except, of course, in the case of someone whose "ancestral religion" sticks so close to his skin, that he can only rid himself of his prejudices by getting critical writers to tear them off of him in strips. Why should an unprejudiced mind need that one religion should be "disproved" any more than another? And if every one were impartial, and had to critically examine every religion that claimed infallibility, before he could commence to study Theosophy, most people would never begin that study at all. Still, there are many who take a vivid interest in the early history of the Christian faith, and to those the following list of works, which is far from being complete, will be both interesting and instructive.*

English.

RENAN'S History of the Origin of Christianity. Trans. from the French. 7 Vols. 2s. 6d. each.

STUART (J.).—Principles of Christianity. 8vo. 1889. 12s.

ANTIQUA MATER. A Study of Christian Origins. Cr. 8vo. 1889. 7s. 6d.

THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF CHRISTIANITY. Two Prize Essays. By the Rev. J. Broadhurst Nichols & Chas. W. Dymond, F. S. A. Cr. 8vo. 1889. 3s. 6d.

This volume contains the Prize Essays on the subject "Assuming the Tenets of Christianity to be Disproved, what would be the Social and Moral Effects of the discontinuance of its Teachings and the abolition of its Institution?"—One Essay being from the orthodox and one from the sceptical stand-point.

CRANBROOK (REV. JAS.).—The Founders of Christianity; or Discourses upon the Origin of the Christian Religion. P. 8vo. 1868. 6s.

GREG (W.R.).—The Creed of Christendom; its Foundations contrasted with Superstructure. 8th edition. 2 Vols. P. 8vo. 1883. 15s.

FEUERBACH (LUDWIG).—The Essence of Christianity. Translated from the German by Morian Evans. P. 8vo. 1881. 7s. 6d.

RENAN (E.).—Life of Jesus. Cr. 8vo. New Ed. 1887. 1s. 6d. Trans. from French.

STONE (G.).—Christianity before Christ, or Prototypes of our Faith and Culture. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

STRANGE (T. L.).—The Sources and Development of Christianity. 8vo. 1875. 5s.

* We are indebted to Messrs. Trübner for this list.—Ed.

STRANGE (T. L.).—What is Christianity? An Historical Sketch. Fcp. 8vo. 1880. 2s. 6d.

BRADLAUGH (CHAS.).—Theological Essays; containing, Who was Jesus? What did Jesus Teach? When were our Gospels written, &c. &c. 3s.

BESANT (ANNIE).—On Christianity, &c. 1 Vol. 3s. 6d.
Do. Theological Essays. 1 vol. 2s. 6d.

FURLONG (MAJOR GEN.).—Rulers of Life, or Sources of Streams of the Faiths of Man in all lands, showing the Evolution of Faiths from the rudest symbolisms to the latest spiritual developments. With Maps, Illustrations and a Chart. 2 Vols. 4to. £6-6-0.

SOURY (JULES).—Jesus and the Gospels of the Religion of Israel. 4s.

GILES (REV. DR.).—Apostolic Records of Early Christianity, from the date of the Crucifixion to the Middle of the 2nd Century. 8vo. 8s.

MACKAY (R. W.), M. A.—Rise and Progress of Christianity, 8vo. 10s. 6d.

SCOTT (THOS.) English. Life of Jesus. 2s. 6d.

BAUR (F. C.).—Church History of the First 3 Centuries. Translated from the 3rd German Edition. 2 Vols. 1878-79. 8vo. 21s.

Do. Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: his Epistles and Doctrine. A contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Trans. from the 2nd Edition. Edited by Rev. A. Menzes. 2 Vols. 1873-75. 8vo. 2s. 1d.

STRAUSS (Dr. D. F.).—Life of Jesus for the People. Authorized English Edition. 2 Vols. 1879. 24s.

SUPERNATURAL RELIGION, an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation. 3 Vols. 8vo. 36s.

French.

RENAN, E., Histoire des Origines du Christianisme. 7 Vols. d an Index; each vol. f. 7-50.

CAHAGNET, A., La Bible et ses idiots Defenseurs au Tribunal de la Philosophie modern. 1885, f. 1.

MONTEIL, E., Catechisme du libre-penseur. 1877. f. 3-50.

DUNN, H., Le Christianisme sans eglises, 1878. f. 2-50.

GUICHARD, V., La Liberté du Penseur; fin du pouvoir spirituel 1878. f. 3-50.

* Voltaire Rousseau, d'Alembert, Diderot, Helvetius, Baron d'Houllbach, etc.

Many criticisms of Christianity are also to be found throughout the works of Fenerbach, Moleschott, Büchner, Vogt and Strauss.

It is a curious thing to think that, as late as the year 1799, a book by a Mr. Houston, which criticised Christianity in what would now be considered a very quiet way, was seized by the English authorities and burned by the common hangman, and its publisher prosecuted. This book was called "Ecce Homo, or a Critical Inquiry into the History of Jesus Christ: being an Analysis of the Gospels." This work must not be confounded with another

* There are numerous well-known works by these authors bearing on this subject.

of the same name published a few years ago. Very soon works to disprove the divine origin of Christianity will have as much *serious* or "live" interest for the world (as distinguished from a literary or historical interest) as treatises on the ancient Greek or Roman gods and goddesses. Who now would read a learned work to prove seriously that Minerva did or did not *really* come out of Jupiter's head?

Correspondence.

"THE SORCEROUS SCIENCE."

TO THE EDITOR.

I was a little surprised to have my attention called to an article, page 632, July No. of *Theosophist*, and find there an account as above headed, written by _____ as no one else know the facts therein referred to except myself and those concerned. I should pay no attention to it had he not pointed me out so plainly by giving my peculiarities, and then put me forward as doing injustice to Christian science of which he is so ignorant, that he mistakes the name for *Mind-cure*, the teachers of which it was who attempted to play white magic on me,—the said teachers being in antagonism to the teachers of Christian science. Some people need to learn that exaggeration is often as far from truth as lying, and that statement answers most of the letter. Though it is a fact that mind influence was used to cause me to give up edmic living and failed, it never produced any desire for meat or any suffering, only a temporary appetite for ordinary cooked food, that nothing but a review and realization of the advantages of edmic diet saved me from, and I only got free from the tiresome struggle by going to a distant part of the country for a month from whence I returned strengthened in the truth, and the battle was over. I then made a very thorough practical study of *Mind-cure* and healed by it with marked success. Afterward studied Christian science, which has two sides according to the character of the practitioner; the dark psychologic side, by which people are healed in sin, and loose spiritually more than they gain physically, and the beautiful bright side where, through the awakened grace of their God within, they are led to so live that they are free from all physical and mental troubles. Let people learn to spend their time in spreading the light, and the darkness will pass away, but if their light is darkness, how great is that darkness of some of the would-be teachers? That there is a power of mind in the world by which two or three united minds may change the desires, opinions, religion, &c., of any individual who is not centered in truth I have enough evidence, and that it is the "Vril" by which the struggle that the world is entered into will principally be carried on there is no room to question, but condemnation in a wholesale way of a science we do not understand, or in fact of any science will not help. Fill the world with light and the darkness will be a back ground to make the light more beautiful by contrast.

Yours for the brotherhood of all science and of all men.

Aug. 26th 1889. }
SANTA CRUZ, }
CAL., U. S. A. }

EDMIC DIET.

[Our worthy brother, the writer of the above letter, is perfectly justified in denouncing ignorant judgments on the part of would be teachers. But surely no more striking testimony to the DANGER of Christian Science and *Mind-cure* could be given than his contained the admissions he makes in his own letter.—*ED.*]

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. XI. No. 123.—DECEMBER 1889.

सत्यात् नस्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

THE DWELLER OF THE THRESHOLD.

A CHAPTER ON ALCHEMY.

IT will perhaps be asked, why in this enlightened century we desire to call attention to *Alchemy*, which, by the majority of mankind, is looked upon as an array of vagaries, extravagancies and superstitions, having been repeatedly *ex-cathedra* declared to be such by modern scientific authorities. To those who put implicit faith in the infallibility of modern science we have no apology to offer; but to the unprejudiced investigator we answer that Alchemy—if properly understood—is a science embodying the highest truths, which a spiritually enlightened mortal may possibly attain, and that a practical knowledge of them is of the highest importance for his own eternal welfare and for the progression of mankind. Being a *spiritual science* it is also a *religion*; for "science" means *knowledge* of facts, and there can be no higher facts than those which relate to the highest state, which a man may possibly attain, and with which religion deals.

The word "religion" has a threefold meaning. In its highest aspect it means the practical application of wisdom, by which the divine element, germinally contained in the constitution of man, is awakened to self-consciousness and reunited as a conscious power to the divine source, from which it emanated in the beginning. This process is taught by those who are spiritually illuminated, but is beyond the full comprehension of those in whom the inner life has not yet awakened; for theoretical knowledge can never become real knowledge without practical experience.

In its second signification the word "religion" means a theoretical knowledge of the essential constitution of man, of the relation existing between man and the source from which he and everything else in nature originated, of his final destiny, etc. Here is the battle ground of the philosophers, theologians and other