Vol. XX. APRIL 15, 1897. No. 116.

LUCIFER.

ON THE WATCH-TOWER.

The Platonic Solids.

"ΜΗΔΕΙΣ ΑΓΕΩΜΕΤΡΗΤΟΣ ΕΙΣΙΤΩ."

"Let no one who is ignorant of geometry enter"—such was the legend engraved on the portal of the Pythagorean and Platonic school of Grecian antiquity. Why the profane should have been confronted with such an apparently strange warning has never been sufficiently made clear by modern scholarship. That the study of geometry is an admirable mental discipline is acknowledged on all sides, but that there is a really vital side to the mathematical science —a really living interest—has never been seriously advanced by the moderns, who laugh at the "puerile speculations" of Pythagoras with regard to numbers, and look on the mathematical symbolism of Plato as a "joke" of the Athenian sage.

Nevertheless that "God geometrizes" has been made a familiar saying to Theosophical readers, has become more than a suspicion to modern science in some of its departments, and is a known fact of universal application to the small number of really serious Theosophical students. Not without reason was it that the initiated pupils of the Samian sage were called "mathematicians," whose aim was the attainment of that "mathesis" which was the goal of their philosophy, the wisdom whose lovers they declared themselves to be. Nor again did Plato "joke" in his Timæus and Republic and elsewhere, when he laid down the mathematical and geometrical nature of the creation, and based the whole of the scheme of his model state and philosophic utopia on such considerations, as may be seen from Adams' admirable essay on "The Nuptial Number of Plato," lately referred to in our pages.

Nor again were such men as Monoïmus and Valentinus among the Gnostics wild dreamers or puerile thinkers, in founding their systems of the cosmos on such a natural basis. The gnosis of the Gnostics was identical with the mathesis of the Pythagoreans, with the episteme of Plato, and the gñâna of the Vedântin philosophers; and that part of it which dealt with world-formation was the natural geometry of the Great Architect, under the laws of whom every particle of matter and every combination of particles must fall. "Theological arithmetic," as the Alexandrian doctors called it, was the highest application of the mathematical science, and only a huckstering age like our own can have the hardihood to deride an ideal which it has obscured with its vulgar commercialism, and all the concomitants of its "modern side" and "business" education.

It is true that the writings of the ancients have for the most part been destroyed or lost, while such fragments as remain display an ignorance of the material discoveries of our own age—which are indeed perhaps the most admirable of their kind.

But that the genius of to-day should persist in looking at all things merely through the spectacles of its own material discoveries, and be blind to the fact that although the eyes of antiquity gazed at the problem from a different point of view, it was in reality the same problem, and if it would but condescend to put on the spectacles of the past, it would have two points of view of the truth, and therefore an enormously increased power of perception—such a myopic state of affairs is regrettable.

But the self-complacency of to-day and of every present time whose watchword is invariably, "We are the people," ever reckons without its host. Blind to the great fact of rebirth, both of ideas and of men to reformulate them, it looks on its discoveries as entirely novel and owing to its own spontaneous genius. For it, Plato and Pythagoras and the Gnostics, the Theosophists of the past, are dead, and there's an end to them and their fantastic speculations. Platonic solids, indeed! Monads and dyads and triads, and tetractydes, contemplation and ecstasies, and blending of subject and object!—absurd, perfectly absurd! Plato did not invent a steam engine or type writer! True, but Archimedes, for whom even modern mechanism has some respect, invented some engines which are not yet out of date. And what did Archimedes say when

he had invented them for his princely patron of Syracuse? He lamented that he had profaned so great a science for such unworthy purposes! That was *his* point of view, although it may be out of date at the latter end of the nineteenth century.

But the ideas which clothed themselves in the garments woven by the genius of ancient Greece, are no longer out of birth, they are coming back again and are once more being re-incarnated, and re-clothed in the vestments woven in the looms of the practical genius of to-day.

Some time ago LUCIFER referred to a book written by the young scientist, Arthur Soria y Mata, entitled *Origen Poliédrico de las Especies*, and published at Madrid in 1894. It was a treatise dealing with the Platonic solids, that is to say, the five regular solids, tetrahedron, cube, octahedron, dodecahedron and icosahedron, as the basis of the origin of species, mineral, vegetable and animal, and contained many luminous ideas of an entirely novel nature so far as orthodox geometry is concerned. The treatise contained many diagrams of the models which had been constructed for Señor Soria by the extraordinary mechanical ability of our colleague Señor Manuel Treviño, the Secretary of the Madrid Lodge. Copies of these models were most kindly sent us by Señor Treviño, and have delighted all who have seen them by the surpassing beauty of their forms and the combinations of the regular polyhedra, some of which have never been previously constructed.

Among a few of our number these models have been carefully studied and a great deal of thought been spent on their genesis from the types which lie behind them in the world of subtle matter, one of the problems, perhaps the most important, which occupied the Pythagorean, Platonic and Gnostic students of such matters. How to express the condition of a state of matter which such thinkers as Hinton have referred to (perhaps erroneously) as the "fourth dimension," is a problem that has at present received no solution, and with it Señor Soria does not deal. It is with the actualities of physical matter that he deals, although the simple polyhedra are of the minutest of the minute ordering of atoms, far beyond the test of any physical organ or instrument.

What then was our delight to receive a few days ago a copy of the French translation of a second treatise by the same indefatigable

worker at this absorbing problem, entitled, *Contribución al Origen Poliédrico de la Especies* (Madrid, 1896). (We had already had his first work translated into French owing to the quality of our Spanish at Headquarters not being sufficient to grapple with scientific niceties). The new treatise of Señor Soria, which purports to be only the first part of a larger work, is more than interesting, it is absolutely fascinating to any lover of these studies, and when known will be read by thousands who have previously never heard of such things; for the text is clear, simple and proceeds on purely experimental lines which fall within the observation of the physical senses. The models which Señor Treviño has constructed with such extraordinary patience and ability are made to tell their own tale.

Although Señor Soria is aware of the existence of numerous points of contact between his discoveries and the writings of the ancients, he does not attempt to trespass on a domain which belongs rather to the scholar than the scientist. He confines himself solely to the latter aspect, and in our opinion demonstrates his case fully. He has rediscovered a science of endless possibilities, and the true origin of world-construction and every subordinate species. For the confirmation of this opinion we must, for the present, refer the reader to the book itself. It is of such importance that every effort will be made to have it translated into English, and this is certainly not the last that will be heard of it in the pages of LUCIFER.

The archæological side of the matter will also doubtless be treated in good time, as it enters intimately into the domain of our studies of the great theosophical systems of such giants of intellect as Pythagoras, Plato, Valentinus and Proclus. It is difficult to believe that Señor Soria has not been helped in the same way as those of us who have been studying the same problems; his essays are stuffed from cover to cover with theosophical ideas, and every student of theosophy will readily assimilate every detail of his work. We do not for one moment claim that the details are perfect or final, but we do assert that the main outlines of the theory are those of an infinite science of formative nature, supported by that most convincing of all proofs, ocular demonstration.

The nature of monadic existence, the laws of syzygy, similitude, harmony and perfect equilibrium, of types, and a thousand and one things familiar to students of cosmological science as taught by the

ancients, meet us on every page, though, of course, the nomenclature is different.

In the volume before us, the author treats of natural geometry, the geometry of solids, which he thus distinguishes from the abstractions of Euclidean geometry, under the main headings, Polyhedric Geometry, Chemical Geometry, Mineral Geometry or Crystallogenesis, Vegetable Geometry and Animal Geometry; and the Second Part is to deal with such ideas as Rational and Social Geometry, and World-formation.

Señor Soria, in making a distinction between Euclidean and natural geometry, like the rest of the general does not seem to be aware that the Elements which Euclid collected and formulated, in the fashion of his own peculiar genius, were only intended as an *introduction* to the contemplation of the Platonic solids which formed the crown of all geometry. There used to be a legend at school that certain books of Euclid were lost, but this is not so, as Professor De Morgan writes in that most admirable article of his in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, the best in the three volumes:

> The Elements consist of thirteen books written by Euclid, and two of which it is supposed that Hypsicles is the author. The first four and the sixth are on plane geometry; the fifth is on the theory of proportion, and applies to magnitude in general; the seventh, eighth and ninth, are on arithmetic; the tenth is on the arithmetical characteristics of the divisions of a straight line; the eleventh and twelfth are on the elements of solid geometry; the thirteenth (and also the fourteenth and fifteenth) are on the regular solids, which were so much studied among the Platonists as to bear the name of Platonic, and which, according to Proclus, were the objects on which the Elements were really meant to be written.

And if this is so, as indeed is the case, what can we say of the neglect of subsequent ages which have considered those solids as the most useless part of geometry?

The perfect Platonic, and even the irregular Kepler and Archimedean solids, are left severely alone, just as the admirable Elements of Theology of Proclus, formulated with the exactitude and logical sequence of a Euclid, are neglected by a generation which boasts that it has outgrown Plato.

When his royal patron, Ptolemy, asked Euclid whether he could not make the Elements easier, the sage replied: "There is no royal road to geometry," even a king must go through the necessary

discipline. But that referred to the abstract conceptions of the science; as to the solids themselves, Señor Soria has found a way that is almost as simple as a Kindergarten building game.

* * *

The Passing of J. C. Staples.

Last autumn our colleague, Mr. J. C. Staples, the General Secretary of the Australasian Section, came back to England for a brief visit. He had decided to return to the work he loved beyond all else by the boat of January 18th; but January found him confined to his bed, suffering most cruelly from pains in the head and lapses of memory, the cause of his sufferings at first escaping the detection of the most skilful physicians. As time went on, however, it became evident that the trouble arose from a deep-seated tumour, which gradually led to the paralysis of the optic nerve and the total blindness of the patient. The disease drew on, and finally all hopes of restoring the brain to health had to be abandoned. It is, therefore, with gladness that we have to announce that our friend was permitted to abandon his worn-out body on April 1st, and pass on to that rest which he has so well won, and which will be illumined with the ever-present aid of those who know not the name of ingratitude. When he comes again to resume his work on earth, let us hope that he will return to a better age than the unpropitious time in which we are at present labouring.

John C. Staples was a man respected and beloved by all who knew him. We have never heard a disparaging word spoken of our colleague, for he was courtesy and gentleness itself in all his words and deeds. Though his name was not so familiar to the general Society as the names of our most prolific writers, he was nevertheless personally known and highly esteemed by many in this country, and by all in his own Section in Australia.

It seems almost regrettable that when a body has been trained for such admirable theosophical work as our colleague was engaged in, it should have to be given up; but it needs must be that the right has befallen, and so we cannot be permitted to express regret.

Indeed in any case *that* would be foolish. Theosophy has long convinced us of the absolute certainty that "there is no death"—to use a hackneyed phrase. J. C. Staples is not only as much alive as

but more alive than we are, as far as his continued consciousness is concerned; he is merely shut off from the murky interludes of the externalities of this unsatisfactory state of affairs called earth-life.

"Poor Staples!" we heard someone remark, thus bringing into his thought an idea totally foreign to theosophical realities. Why indeed lip-believers in Christianity should almost invariably speak of the "dead" as "poor so-and-so" is beyond our comprehension. They clearly do not believe that "poor so-and-so" has been taken to "the arms of Jesus," as the hymn has it; still, on the other hand, they can hardly believe that their departed friend is gone to eternal damnation, for one generally makes an exception to one's own friends. Is it, then, that they think that "so-and-so" is to be commiserated for being deprived of the "joys of life"—meaning life down here? Then, are the joys of heaven inferior to earthly delights?

But all the ideas of the generality, not only in Christian lands, but in every other land of to-day, concerning "death"—(mark the stupid word itself)—are absurd and contradictory; and the hideous funereal trappings and signs of woe in which Christians rejoice are a ghastly affront to the idea of a benign Providence, who is even at the lowest estimate an "all-merciful Father."

Why should we grieve for the "dead"? Surely we ought to rejoice; unless indeed the person has been very evil! Thousands of years ago the ancient Thracians, of whom Herodotus tells us, used to sit round the lifeless bodies of their friends, and rejoice to think them at last free of their prison house. Are we then so far behind the common sense of thousands of years ago?

We should ever remember that in reality we are not sorry for the dead; our grief is not for the dead but *for ourselves*. This *selfish* grief hinders and does not aid the soul of our beloved on its journey to rest between two lives.

Let us have flowers and white horses, and happy music at funerals, and not that eternal black for everything, which would damp the enthusiasm of a martyr, and is an insult to nature.

If the Theosophical Society could but bring about the overthrow of the black fetish of death which the people hug to their bosoms, what a great work would be accomplished!

The Platonists of old—mere Pagans of course—did not refer to death in such an ignorant fashion. They did not say of one of their

friends, " Poor A. is dead," or " It is so sad; poor B. breathed his last yesterday "—they recited to each other triumphant declarations of the soul's immortality, and of its real nature, saying " Agathocles is now blessed," " Melita is at length truly happy."

Therefore, too, we say that John C. Staples, not our *late* colleague, but our colleague still, is now happy, nay, even blessed.

* * *

Fair offerings of flowers were sent by the European Section in the name of the whole Society, by the Australian from members of that Section in England, by Mrs. Besant and the Blavatsky Lodge, and by other friends. The General Secretary represented the Society when the body was buried at Brighton on the 6th; Mrs. Parker and Miss Minet, late officers of the Melbourne Branch, represented Australia; and Dr. King, the President, and a number of members of the Brighton Lodge, by whom Mr. Staples was well-known and loved, were also present.

* * *

G. R. S. M.

A Pure Heart penetrateth Heaven and Hell.—THOMAS À KEMPIS.

REINCARNATION.

OUR view of Reincarnation will become clearer and more in congruity with natural order, if we look at it as universal in principle, and then consider the special case of the reincarnation of the human soul. In studying it, this special case is generally wrenched from its place in natural order, and is considered as a dislocated fragment, greatly to its detriment. For all evolution consists of an evolving life, passing from form to form as it evolves, and storing up in itself the experience gained through the forms; the reincarnation of the human soul is not the introduction of a new principle into evolution, but the adaptation of the universal principle to meet the conditions rendered necessary by the individualization of the continuously evolving life.

Mr. Lafcadio Hearn * has put this point well in considering the bearing of the idea of pre-existence on the scientific thought of the West. He says:

With the acceptance of the doctrine of evolution, old forms of thought crumbled; new ideas everywhere arose to take the place of worn-out dogmas; and we now have the spectacle of a general intellectual movement in directions strangely parallel with Oriental philosophy. The unprecedented rapidity and multiformity of scientific progress during the last fifty years could not have failed to provoke an equally unprecedented intellectual quickening among the non-scientific. That the highest and most complex organisms have been developed from the lowest and simplest; that a single physical basis of life is the substance of the whole living world; that no line of separation can be drawn between the animal and vegetable; that the difference between life and non-life is only a difference of degree, not of kind; that matter is not less incomprehensible than mind, while both are but varying manifestations of one and the same unknown reality—these have already become the commonplaces of the new philosophy. After the first recognition even by theology of physical evolution, it was easy to predict that the recognition of psychical evolution could not be indefinitely delayed; for the barrier erected by old dogma to keep men from looking backward had been broken down. And to-day for the student of scientific psychology the idea of pre-existence passes out of the realm of theory into the

* Mr. Hearn has lost his way in expression, but not, I think, in his inner view, in part of his exposition of the Buddhist statement of this doctrine, and his use of the word "ego" will mislead the reader of his very interesting chapter on this subject if the distinction between the real and the illusory ego is not steadily kept in mind.

realm of fact, proving the Buddhist explanation of the universal mystery quite as plausible as any other. "None but very hasty thinkers," wrote the late Professor Huxley, "will reject it on the ground of inherent absurdity. Like the doctrine of evolution itself, that of transmigration has its roots in the world of reality; and it may claim such support as the great argument from analogy is capable of supplying." (*Evolution and Ethics*, p. 61, ed. 1894). *

Let us consider the Monad of form, Âtma-Buddhi. In this Monad, the outbreathed life of the Logos, lie hidden all the divine powers, but, as the student knows, they are latent, not manifest and functioning. They are to be gradually aroused by external impacts, it being of the very nature of life to vibrate in answer to vibrations that play upon it. As all possibilities of vibrations exist in the Monad, any vibration touching it will arouse its corresponding vibratory power, and in this way one force after another will pass from the latent to the active† state. Herein lies the secret of evolution; the environment acts on the form of the living creature—and all things, be it remembered, live—and this action, transmitted through the enveloping form to the life, the Monad, within it, arouses responsive vibrations which thrill outwards from the Monad through the form, throwing its particles, in turn, into vibration, and re-arranging them into a shape corresponding, or adapted, to the initial impact. This is the action and reaction between the environment and the organism, which have been recognized by all biologists, and which are considered by some as giving a sufficient mechanical explanation of evolution. Their patient and careful observation of these actions and reactions yields, however, no explanation as to why the organism should thus react to stimuli, and the Ancient Wisdom is needed to unveil the secret of evolution, by pointing to the Self in the heart of all forms, the hidden mainspring of all the movements in nature.

Having grasped this fundamental idea of a life containing the possibility of responding to every vibration that can reach it from the external universe, the actual responses being gradually drawn forth by the play upon it of external forces, the next fundamental idea to be grasped is that of the continuity of life and forms. Forms transmit their peculiarities to other forms that proceed from them,

* *Kokoro, Hints and Echoes of Japanese Inner Life.* By Lafcadio Hearn, pp. 237-239 (London, 1896).

† From the static to the kinetic condition, the physicist would say.

these other forms being part of their own substance, separated off to lead an independent existence. By fission, by budding, by extrusion of germs, by development of the offspring within the maternal womb, a physical continuity is preserved, every new form being derived from a preceding form and reproducing its characteristics.* Science groups these facts under the name of the law of heredity, and its observations on the transmission of form are worthy of attention, and are illuminative of the workings of Nature in the phenomenal world. But it must be remembered that it applies only to the building of the physical body, into which enter the materials provided by the parents.

Her more hidden workings, those workings of life without which form could not be, have received no attention, not being susceptible of physical observation, and this gap can only be filled by the teachings of the Ancient Wisdom, given by Those who used superphysical powers of observation, and verifiable gradually by every pupil who studies patiently in Their schools.

There is continuity of life as well as continuity of form, and it is the continuing life—with ever more and more of its latent energies rendered active by the stimuli received through successive forms—which resumes into itself the experiences obtained by its encasings in form; for when the form perishes, the life has the record of those experiences in increased energies aroused by them, and is ready to pour itself into the new forms derived from the old, carrying with it this accumulated store. While it was in the previous form, it played through it, adapting it to express each newly awakened energy; the form hands on these adaptations, inwrought into its substance, to the separated part of itself that we speak of as its offspring, which being of its substance must needs have the peculiarities of that substance; the life pours itself into that offspring with all its awakened powers, and moulds it yet further; and so on and on. Modern science is proving more and more clearly that heredity plays an ever-decreasing part in the evolution of the higher creatures, that mental and moral qualities are not transmitted from parents to offspring, and that the higher the qualities the more patent is this fact; the child of a genius is oft-times a dolt; common-

* The student might wisely familiarize himself with the researches of Weissmann on the continuity of germ-plasm.

place parents give birth to a genius. A continuing substratum there must be in which mental and moral qualities inhere, in order that they may increase, else would Nature, in this most important department of her work, be a creature of erratic uncaused production instead of showing orderly continuity. On this science is dumb, but the Ancient Wisdom teaches that this continuing substratum is the Monad, which is the receptacle of all results, the storehouse in which all experiences are garnered as increasingly active powers.

These two principles firmly grasped—of the Monad with potentialities becoming powers, and of the continuity of life and form—we can proceed to study their working out in detail, and we shall find that they solve many of the perplexing problems of modern science, as well as the yet more heart-searching problems confronted by the philanthropist and the sage.

Let us start by considering the Monad as it is first subjected to the impacts from the formless levels of the mental planes, the very beginning of the evolution of form. Its first faint responsive thrillings draw round it some of the matter of that plane, and we have the gradual evolution of the first elemental kingdom. The great fundamental types of the Monad are seven in number, sometimes imaged as like the seven colours of the solar spectrum, derived from the three primary.* Each of these types has its own colouring of characteristics, and this colouring persists throughout the æonian cycle of its evolution, affecting all the series of living things that are animated by it. Now begins the process of subdivision in each of these types, that will be carried on, subdividing and ever subdividing, until the individual is reached. The currents set up by the commencing outward-going energies of the Monad—to follow one line of evolution will suffice; the other six are like unto it in principle—have but brief form-life, yet whatever experience can be gained through them is represented by an increasedly responsive life in the Monad who is their source and cause; and this responsive life consists of vibrations that are often

* "As above, so below." We instinctively remember the three Logoi and the seven primæval Sons of the Fire; in Christian symbolism, the Trinity and the "Seven Spirits that are before the throne," or in Zoroastrian, Ahura-mazdâo and the seven Ameshaspentas.

incongruous with each other, a tendency towards separation is set up within the Monad, the harmoniously vibrating forces grouping themselves together for, as it were, concerted action, until various sub-monads, if the epithet may for a moment be allowed, are formed, alike in their main characteristics, but differing in details, like shades of the same colour. These become, by impacts from the lower levels of the mental plane, the Monads of the second elemental kingdom, belonging to the form-region of that plane, and the process continues, the Monad ever adding to its power to respond, each being the inspiring life of countless forms, through which it receives vibrations, and as the forms disintegrate, constantly vivifying new forms; the process of subdivision also continues from the cause already described. Each Monad thus continually incarnates itself in forms, and garners within itself as awakened powers all the results obtained through the forms it animates. We may well regard these Monads as the souls of groups of forms, and as evolution proceeds these forms show more and more attributes, the attributes being the powers of the monadic group-soul manifested through the forms in which it is incarnated. The innumerable sub-monads of this second elemental kingdom presently reach a stage of evolution at which they begin to respond to the vibrations of astral matter, and they begin to act on the astral plane, becoming the Monads of the third elemental kingdom, and repeating in this grosser world all the processes already accomplished on the mental plane. They become more and more numerous as monadic group-souls, showing more and more diversity in detail, the number of forms animated by each becoming less as the specialized characteristics become more and more marked. Meanwhile, it may be said, the everflowing stream of life from the LOGOS supplies new Monads of form on the higher levels, so that the evolution proceeds continuously, and as the more evolved Monads incarnate in the lower worlds their place is taken by the newly emerged Monads in the higher.

By this ever-repeated process of the reincarnation of the Monads, or monadic group-souls, in the astral world, their evolution proceeds, until they are ready to respond to the impacts upon them from physical matter. When we remember that the ultimate atoms of each plane have their sphere-walls composed of the coarsest matter of

the plane immediately above it, it is easy to see how the Monads become responsive to the impacts from one plane after another. When, in the first elemental kingdom, the Monad had become accustomed to thrill responsively to the impacts of the matter of that plane, it would soon begin to answer to vibrations received *through the coarsest forms of that matter* from the matter of the plane next below. So, in its coatings of matter that were the forms composed of the coarsest materials of the mental plane, it would become susceptible to vibrations of astral atomic matter; and, when incarnated in forms of the coarsest astral matter, it would similarly become responsive to the impacts of atomic physical ether, the sphere-walls of which are constituted of the grossest astral materials. Thus the Monad may be regarded as reaching the physical plane, and there it begins, or more accurately, all these monadic group-souls begin, to incarnate themselves in filmy physical forms, the etheric doubles of the future dense minerals of the physical world. Into these filmy forms the nature-spirits build the denser physical materials, and thus minerals of all kinds are formed, the most rigid vehicles in which the evolving life encloses itself, and through which the least of its powers can express themselves. Each monadic group-soul has its own mineral expressions, the mineral forms in which it is incarnated, and the specialization has now reached a high degree. These monadic group-souls are sometimes called in their totality the mineral Monad, or the Monad incarnating in the mineral kingdom.

From this time forward the awakened energies of the Monad play a less passive part in evolution. They begin to seek expression actively to some extent when once aroused into functioning, and to exercise a distinctly moulding influence over the forms in which they are imprisoned. As they became too active for their mineral embodiment, the beginnings of the more plastic forms of the vegetable kingdom manifest themselves, the nature-spirits aiding this evolution throughout the physical kingdoms. In the mineral kingdom there had already been shown a tendency towards the definite organization of form, the laying down of certain lines* along which the growth proceeded. This tendency governs henceforth all the building of forms, and is the cause of the exquisite

* The axes of growth, which determine form. They appear definitely in crystals.

symmetry of natural objects, with which every observer is familiar. The monadic group-souls in the vegetable kingdom undergo division and subdivision with increasing rapidity, in consequence of the still greater variety of impacts to which they are subjected, the evolution of families, genera, and species being due to this invisible subdivision. When any genus, with its generic monadic group-soul, is subjected to very varying conditions, *i.e.*, when the forms connected with it receive very different impacts, a fresh tendency to subdivide is set up in the Monad, and various species are evolved, each having its own specific monadic group-soul. When Nature is left to her own working the process is slow, although the nature-spirits do much towards the differentiation of species; but when man has been evolved, and when he begins his artificial systems of cultivation, encouraging the play of one set of forces, warding off another, then this differentiation can be brought about with considerable rapidity, and specific differences are readily evolved. So long as actual division has not taken place in the monadic group-soul, the subjection of the forms to similar influences may again eradicate the separative tendency, but when that division is completed the new species are definitely and firmly established, and are ready to send out offshoots of their own.

In some of the longer-lived members of the vegetable kingdom the element of personality begins to manifest itself, the stability of the organism rendering possible this foreshadowing of individuality. With a tree, living for scores of years, the recurrence of similar conditions causing similar impacts, the seasons ever returning year after year, the consecutive internal motions caused by them, the rising of the sap, the putting forth of leaves, the touches of the wind, of the sunbeams, of the rain—all these outer influences with their rhythmical progression—set up responsive thrillings in the monadic group-soul, and as the sequence impresses itself by continual repetition, the recurrence of one leads to the dim expectation of its oft-repeated successor. Nature evolves no quality suddenly, and these are the first faint adumbrations of what will later be memory and anticipation.

In the vegetable kingdom also appear the foreshadowings of sensation, evolving in its higher members to what the western psychologist would term "massive" sensations of pleasure and dis-

comfort.* It must be remembered that the Monad has drawn round itself materials of the planes through which it has descended, and hence is able to contact impacts from those planes, the strongest and those most nearly allied to the grossest forms of matter being the first to make themselves felt. Sunshine and the chill of its absence at last impress themselves on the monadic consciousness, and its astral coating, thrown into faint vibrations, gives rise to the slight massive kind of sensation spoken of. Rain and drought affecting the mechanical constitution of the form, and its power to convey vibrations to the ensouling Monad—are another of the "pairs of opposites" the play of which arouses the recognition of difference, which is the root alike of all sensation, and later, of all thought. Thus by their repeated plant-reincarnations the monadic group-souls in the vegetable kingdom evolve, until those that ensoul the highest members of the kingdom are ready for the next step.

This step carries them into the animal kingdom, and here they slowly evolve in their physical and astral vehicles a very distinct personality. The animal, being free to move about, subjects itself to a greater variety of conditions than can be experienced by the plant, rooted to a single spot, and this variety, as ever, promotes differentiation. The monadic group-soul, however, which animates a number of wild animals of the same species or sub-species, while it receives a great variety of impacts, since they are for the most part repeated continually and are shared by all the members of the group, differentiates but slowly. These aid in the development of the physical and astral bodies, and through them the monadic group-soul gathers much experience. When the form of a member of the group perishes, the experience gathered through that form is accumulated in the monadic group-soul, and may be said to colour it; the slightly increased life of the monadic group-soul, poured into all the forms which compose its group, shares among all the experience of the perished form, and in this way continually repeated experiences, stored up in the monadic group-soul, appear as instincts, "accumulated hereditary experiences" in the new forms. Countless birds having fallen a prey to hawks, chicks just out of the egg will cower at the approach of one of the hereditary enemies, for the life that is

* The "massive" sensation is one that pervades the organism and is not felt especially in any one part more than in others. It is the antithesis of the "acute."

incarnated in them knows the danger, and the innate instinct is the expression of its knowledge. In this way are formed the wonderful instincts that guard animals from innumerable habitual perils, while a new danger finds them unprepared and only bewilders them.

As animals now come under the influence of man, the monadic group-soul evolves with greatly increased rapidity, and, from causes similar to those which affect plants under domestication, subdivision of the incarnating life is more readily brought about. Personality evolves and becomes more and more strongly marked; in the earlier stages it may almost be said to be compound—a whole flock of wild creatures will act as though moved by a single personality, so completely are the forms dominated by the common soul, and it, in turn, affected by the impulses from the external world. Domesticated animals of the higher types, the elephant, the horse, the cat, the dog, show a more individualized personality—two dogs, for instance, may act very differently under the impact of the same circumstances. The monadic group-soul incarnates in a decreasing number of forms as it gradually approaches the point at which complete individualization will be reached. The desire-body, or kâmic vehicle, becomes considerably developed, and persists for some time after the death of the physical body, leading an independent existence in kâmaloka. At last the decreasing number of forms animated by a monadic group-soul comes down to unity, and it animates a succession of single forms—a condition differing from human reincarnation only by the absence of Manas, with its causal and mental bodies. The mental matter brought down by the monadic group-soul begins to be susceptible to impacts from the mental plane, and the animal is then ready to receive the third great out-pouring of the life of the LOGOS—the tabernacle is ready for the reception of the human Monad.

The human Monad is, as we have seen, triple in its nature, its three aspects being denominated respectively, the Spirit, the spiritual Soul, and the human Soul, Âtmâ, Buddhi, Manas. Doubtless, in the course of æons of evolution, the upwardly evolving Monad of form might have unfolded Manas by progressive growth, but both in the human race in the past, and in the animals of the present, such has not been the course of Nature. When the house was ready the tenant was sent down; from the higher planes of being the âtmic life

descended, veiling itself in Buddhi, as a golden thread, and its third aspect, Manas, showing itself in the higher levels of the formless world of the mental plane, germinal Manas within the form was fructified, and the embryonic causal body was formed by the union. This is the individualization of the spirit, the encasing of it in form, and this spirit encased in the causal body is the soul, the individual, the real man. This is his birth-hour, for though his essence be eternal, unborn and undying, his birth in time as an individual is definite.

Further, this outpoured life reaches the evolving forms not directly but by intermediaries. The human race having attained the point of receptivity, certain great Ones, called Sons of Mind,* cast into men the monadic spark of Âtma-Buddhi-Manas, needed for the formation of the embryonic soul. And some of these great Ones actually incarnated in human forms, in order to become the guides and teachers of the infant humanity. These Sons of Mind had completed Their own intellectual evolution in other worlds, and came to this younger world, our earth, for the purpose of thus aiding in the evolution of the human race. They are, in truth, the spiritual fathers of the bulk of our humanity.

Other intelligences of much lower grade, men who had evolved in preceding cycles in another world, incarnated among the descendants of the race that received its infant souls in the way just described. As this race evolved, the human tabernacles improved, and myriads of souls that were awaiting the opportunity of incarnation, that they might continue their evolution, took birth among its children. These partially evolved souls are also spoken of in the ancient records as Sons of Mind, for they were possessed of mind, although comparatively it was but little developed—child souls we may call them, in distinguishment from the embryonic souls of the bulk of humanity, and the mature souls of these great Teachers. These child souls, by reason of their more evolved intelligencies, formed the leading types of the ancient world, the classes higher in mentality, and therefore in the power of acquiring knowledge, that dominated the masses of less developed men in antiquity. And thus arose, in our world, the enormous differences

* Mânasa-putra is the technical name, being merely the Sanskrit for Sons of Mind.

in mental and moral capacity which separate the most highly evolved from the least evolved races, and which, even within the limits of a single race, separate the lofty philosophic thinker from the well-nigh animal type of the most depraved of his own nation. These differences are but differences of the stage of evolution, of the age of the soul, and they have been found to exist throughout the whole history of humanity on this globe. Go back as far as we may in historic records, and we find lofty intelligence and debased ignorance side by side, and the occult records, carrying us backwards, tell a similar story of the early millennia of humanity. Nor should this distress us, as though some had been unduly favoured and others unduly burdened for the struggle of life. The loftiest soul had its childhood and its infancy, albeit in previous worlds, where other souls were as high above it as others are below it now; the lowest soul shall climb to where our highest are standing, and souls yet unborn shall occupy its present place in evolution. Things seem unjust because we wrench our world out of its place in evolution, and set it apart in isolation, with no forerunners and no successors. It is our ignorance that sees the injustice; the ways of Nature are equal, and she brings to all her children infancy, childhood and manhood. Not hers the fault if our folly demands that all souls shall occupy the same stage of evolution at the same time, and cries "Unjust!" if the demand be not fulfilled.

ANNIE BESANT.

(*To be concluded.*)

THE NATURE OF THE REAL MAN.

Know ye not, and do ye not understand that ye are all angels, all archangels, gods and lords, all rulers, all the great invisibles, all those of the midst, those of every region of them that are on the right, all the great ones of the emanations of the light with all their glory; that ye are all, of yourselves and in yourselves in turn, from one mass and one matter, and one substance; ye are all from the same mixture?

—PISTIS SOPHIA, 247, 248.

THE WISH TO BELIEVE.

IT is a fact which theologians may lament, but which is nevertheless beyond question, that even thinking men are for the most part directed in their acceptance of dogma, not so much by the conviction that it is logically proved to them, as by the perception that it rounds out, harmonizes, and completes the view their own experience has already given them; that (to use a common phrase) it answers to their needs, or to speak more correctly, that it does not contradict their prejudices. The old proverb has it, "A man convinced against his will, is of the same opinion still." No one, for example, possessed of a reasonable amount of sympathy and insight, can fail in reading Cardinal Newman's *Apologia pro Vita sua*, to detect the faint, unconfessed undertone of this which runs all through it. He is thoroughly, profoundly convinced that his beloved *via media* is proved impossible—his *head* is entirely Catholic; but, all the same, to the very end of his life, his *heart* cannot help repeating over and over, Ah! if it only *could* have been possible! This, indeed, seems to me the secret of the book's instant success in reconquering for him the respect and sympathy of the English Protestant world; every line of it was evidence for him that his heart had never for a moment been a traitor to his first love, and the popular instinct (which is often more true and more sensitive than the conclusions of the learned) accepted that heart-homage as far more important than any theological differences.

In like manner, when we undertake to set forth the leading ideas of the Wisdom Religion to an ordinary circle of hearers or readers, there is something even more imperative than to express them clearly. We have to show how far they are compatible with the conceptions which already occupy the field, how little we actually deny and how much we explain and raise to a higher level; and thus (as far as possible) to dispose our hearers to give the new learn-

ing a favourable hearing—to make them *wish* to believe. Nearly all our audience will be in every case, at least nominally, Christians; and even those who consider themselves too "enlightened" to believe what are ordinarily understood as the doctrines of Christianity, usually set much store on the name, were it only as an additional sweet morsel to roll under the tongue of their self-complacency. So that whilst we may often have to speak sharply and incisively as to the defects of the Christian faith (as I have myself frequently done), to speak rudely and contemptuously of what is, with all its weakness, the very best thing these Christians have in their souls—the one promise of something better to come—is that sort of mistake which is worse than a crime. It is by the religion which they have that we must draw them onwards.

Now the very first question which will rise to their lips will be something in this shape, "Does your doctrine interfere with our faith in Jesus?" and on the answer we give will depend our whole chance of getting a farther hearing at all. We must not be impatient with them; the fact is, that a vague belief in the "love of Jesus" is very nearly all that the present generation of religious Protestants has left to cling to; and its members feel that if *that* be disturbed, they are driven from their last anchorage and swept away into unknown seas to perish. It would be a serious mistake to suppose that the effect of the last half century's advances in history and criticism is limited to the minds of sufficient intelligence to take in their actual results. Down to the most uneducated Ranter or Salvationist there is everywhere a sense of change, if only such a sense as we may imagine an oyster to have of the ebbing tide, a sense that much which used to be certain may very possibly turn out to be mistaken. Even those who most loudly proclaim "the old Gospel," speak so loud, chiefly to drown the growing whisper in their own hearts, that even in religion "the old order changeth, yielding place to new." Some, in this anxiety, strive to keep their position by the authority of a living Church, supposed the actual, inspired keeper of a changeless Faith. Those to whom this is possible will find there a noble ideal which has power to draw out much (though not all) of the best there is in man, and which will very probably fulfil all the needs of their present incarnation. But for most of those around us this is *not* possible; and these instinctively prepare for

the coming storm in the sailor's way, by throwing overboard every thing which can possibly be dispensed with, and reducing themselves to what they call "simple faith in Christ." A dear and good Evangelical friend wrote me not long ago, words which express this condition of mind well enough. "I am afraid," she says, "that the reaction may have a depressing effect on your faith in God and the Bible; and you know that, however your faith may have been shaken in the past, the fact still remains that he that believeth shall be saved and he that believeth not shall be condemned. I shall still keep the hope that you may find the peace that comes from a simple trust in a loving Saviour."

There is an—innocence let us politely call it, against which we are told that even the Gods fight in vain; and I freely confess that in actual fact I evaded the task of making my position as a Theosophist clear to my affectionate correspondent, honestly judging it beyond my power. But suppose we take her as a type of the class I am speaking of, and consider what we have to reply. Her confession of faith would run. "I believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God, who died to save me; I believe that when I die He *will* save me, and take me to Heaven to live with Him for ever. With St. Paul I am *resolved* to know nothing but Christ and Him crucified."

Now this is to her, and to many thousands of her fellows, an entirely satisfactory account of things. It would be absolutely useless, as it would be unpardonably heartless, to try to raise in her mind the difficulties which crowd in ours, to attempt to make her understand the vastness of the ocean she thinks she has got safely packed into her teacup. Teach her you cannot; but could it be possible to put our views of Jesus in such a way that she and they might perceive, if but dimly and uncertainly, that the reason we refuse to pronounce their formula is simply that we think too highly of Him so to limit our reverence? It would be a vast step in advance if we could thus bring the ordinary Christian to understand that we are not "Atheists" and "Unbelievers"; that we are on their side, "rowing in the same boat," though, as in Jerrold's jest, "with vastly different sculls."

Let us make the attempt. We must have a name for her; let us call her (as St. Francis de Sales called his pupil in his *Introduction to the Devout Life*) Philothea. It designates her kind well enough,

the souls whose sole anchor in the confusion around them is that they love God to the best of their power, blindly; knowing nothing of Him except that as they think He sent His Son to redeem them. To wish to know more is sinful, we must be content with this "simple Gospel."

But for all that, my dear Philothea, you would like to know a little more. Suppose we start together, Bible in hand, and see if we can get a little further without risking your salvation. I think it is possible. Like you, we believe in a God, Infinite, beyond time and space, in whom "there is no variableness nor shadow of turning," as your Bible says. We believe that in Him (or Her or It, all is one when we speak of the Infinite) were all things before they were manifested by Him; that in Him at this present moment we "live and move and have our being." That from Him proceeded the "Word," of whom you read in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel; and that from this Word (the only manifestation of God possible to us, for "no man hath seen the Father at any time") you and I and all mankind proceeded. "Without Him was not anything made that was made." So that in this way all of us are the sons of God, as Jesus Himself so often insisted. When the Pharisees attacked Him because, said they, He made Himself the Son of God, He did not reply by saying that He meant this in the sense of an *origin* different from the rest of mankind, but answered, "If the Prophet called *them* Gods to whom the word of God came, how say ye of the Son of Man whom God has sanctified and sent into the world, You blaspheme?"

Philothea. Do you mean to say then, like the Unitarians, that Jesus was a mere man like ourselves? Don't you believe in the Atonement?

Author. My dear friend, we are very far indeed from thinking Jesus Christ was a mere man like ourselves. But are you sure that you quite understand what it is to be a man like ourselves? St. Paul says, you know, "*Now* are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be."

Ph. Yes; but then *he* was inspired. He was not speaking to such as we are. *We* are not sons of God, our hearts are desperately wicked. Don't you know the text?

A. My dear child, he was inspired; I quite agree, and by virtue

of his inspiration he wrote, "All are the sons of God." I believe that text, don't you? If you really want to know what the Bible teaches you, you must not pass over the texts which don't fit your views. Let me tell you what St. Paul meant and what we mean when we speak of "a man like ourselves." You look at a man, your outer eyes see a body, and from various indications you conclude there is a mind dwelling in it. Your Bible says there is a "soul" in it; you don't see that, but you believe it, and that that soul will be somehow affected for all eternity by what it thinks and does during this mortal life. But how came the soul there, and what is it?

Your Bible tells you of that Word of God that "in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead"; and of ourselves that "of that fulness we have all received." In another figure we are told that "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. . . . That was the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." With such passages as these before you, you can hardly object to our statement that this "soul" of ours is really a detached portion of the Life of the Word, a spark from that Flame, a drop from that Ocean. As such, you have this first dignity of man, that he is not the mere "creature of a day," which moralists make him; that wherever and whenever he may have lived before, he has lived from a time which you are accustomed to express (not so very wrongly) as "all eternity"; and that he will live for all eternity to come. Of every human being in existence that is true which is said of the Word, that he came forth from God, that he (the spirit, the higher portion of him), even now dwells with God, and that to God he will return. It is not possible for any one who believes in an eternal Heaven to question this statement.

But we know something more of man than this. There are many steps in the progress whereby the Divine Spark at last comes to manifestation in this physical body. It is not for us to say with St. Paul that to be "absent from the body" is at once to be "present with the Lord." There are many wrappings to be taken off before we come to the higher soul, still more before we reach the Ocean of Life from which that has descended; and death does not at once remove them. Let us ask a question. Why did the soul choose thus to enwrap itself and to undertake this long and often painful path? Why not stay quietly with God when it was there?

Ph. How can you, how *dare* you ask such questions? It is presumption to pry into the secrets of God. He made our souls and our bodies, we have no right to ask why. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?"

A. My dear Philothea, it is just because we are convinced that God must have done what is right, that we do venture to enquire. It is impossible you can *mean* that He is at liberty to do wrong if such be His pleasure, though you often use words which imply that; but at first sight the world around us looks very much as if the Maker *did* enjoy doing wrong. And this idea is so utterly unendurable to us that we cannot acquiesce in it as being the "Will of God." To a Bushman or a Hottentot you may say, "Believe this; you can't understand why!" But we, the educated and intelligent men of the most advanced races on the globe, *can* understand why; and not only can, but *must*. If your "simple faith" cannot answer our questions, so much the worse; we must have a more complicated faith—that is all.

Now if we lay down the general principle that man came forth from God to gain experience—to grow—to become *worth* reuniting with God at the end of his pilgrimage; I do not think you can find any text to the contrary, and I think I could, if we had time, produce a good many which imply it. But this general principle works out in ways which must considerably modify and enlarge your views, and I hope to show that we believe all you do—and a great deal more!

If we look backwards, it means that we were not "made" or "created" at the time of our last birth into the world; but have grown up from very small beginnings in past ages; and farther, that there is nothing unreasonable in supposing that as our present circumstances are (at least to a great extent) the results of our past conduct, so the condition of things in which we found ourselves at birth—the bodily and mental powers we possessed and the circumstances, favourable or otherwise, which have encouraged or limited their use, were also the result of our previous conduct *before* birth. And if you turn to the Gospel you will find in the narrative of the man born blind this very view actually taken by the disciples and acquiesced in by their Lord. "Master," say they, "who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" To this ques-

tion, He replies, not by what would be *to you* the natural answer, that the man could not have sinned before he was born, but by the statement that in this particular case his blindness was not a punishment of sin committed before his birth, by either himself or his parents, but, in truth, a blessing in disguise.

There can be no difficulty raised over the obvious view that in this series of lives some must have made much more progress than others, and indeed that some may have gone back. We need only watch the lives of those around us to see how little progress a life, in most cases, means. On the other hand, some must have gone ahead. Every man or woman of genius, as we say, is a soul which has thus far outstripped the rest, and has attained an advance which the race in general may require millions of years to reach. Such advance is not a "gift" of a capricious Nature or God, but is an indication that, perhaps for many thousands of years, the soul has dedicated itself with iron resolution to that study which now seems to come by Nature.

If, then, my dear Philothea, you have followed me so far; you will be able to see that even regarding Jesus as a mere man (which we do not), we are, as I said at the beginning, very far from regarding him as a man *like ourselves*. To us he is, simply as a man, almost immeasurably above us, and the reverence we can honestly pay him as such is (I venture to say it) something above the best you know how to give to him as God.

Ph. This is all very fine talking; but if he is man he can't be God, and to worship him would be blasphemy. You can't get over *that!*

A. My dear Philothea, it is the very object with which I set out—to help you to get over that! If you will have patience with me whilst I continue my exposition, I will try to show you what we mean by our advance, looking, no longer backward, but forward, from where we stand; and to suggest what the dignity and power of a soul which is a few millions of years before its fellows may be. No explanation can give us a real idea of it, but at least I think I can show you that it far surpasses all *your* ideas of a God. Then add to that the immediate inspiration of the Word Himself; and when I have shown you the Christ in all this power and glory, all being spent for the salvation of the world now and as long as that world

lasts, I will venture to ask you whether such a presentation is not something nobler and greater than your claim of reverence merely because of something done to the physical body he dwelt in two thousand years ago.

A. A. WELLS.

(*To be concluded.*)

THE END OF FAUST.

MANY who have read the first part of Goethe's *Faust* with intense enjoyment and felt the world both explained and illumined by it, may have been slightly discouraged when they made an attempt to understand the second part. In fact it may be considered exceedingly doubtful whether more than a very elect few have ever struggled through and arrived at that rich guerdon for lovers of poetry and mysticism—the extreme end of *Faust*. As a rule, with the exception of the well-known line, "Das Ewig-weibliche," the very beautiful verses which compose it are overlooked. They have been set to music by Schumann, and it is impossible to say more than that he has entirely succeeded in his object. The power of sound is here called in to intensify and enlarge the meaning of the words and explain them to us in a way that mere reading in black and white could never do. It is one of the rare instances of "perfect music set to noble words."

The few pages comprising the third part of *Faust*, or end of the second part, for it is not always divided off, will well repay study and consideration. They show that Goethe should be considered as a mystic as well as a philosopher and a poet. As they practically stand quite alone, this last part may be treated for our purpose as a separate poem. It might also be perfectly well considered as an allegory describing the deliverance of the soul from the bonds that hold it, its intense longing for the divine, and the humility and sympathy that arise from temptation, failure and conquest.

It may be helpful to first briefly explain the course of events which have led up to this final scene through the long and perplexing second part.

We find that Faust has lived a long life with many and varied

experiences. His last act however is his best; when quite an old man he spends much time and labour in draining and rescuing a considerable piece of waste land. On this he builds houses and founds a colony, thus enabling many people to live happily on a hitherto useless waste. The world is clearly the better for his work. Forgetting the old agreement with Mephistopheles, by virtue of which he holds his privilege of continued life and prosperity, he exclaims, "I now enjoy the happiest moment of my life," and wishes that it may not pass away. But the contract had enacted that, should the moment ever come when he should be happy enough to wish it to remain because it was so perfect, he should then lose all and resign his soul.

Faust, in his dreary pessimism, after a life of disappointment, had been so certain that he never could or would say this, that he had eagerly agreed to such a condition, thinking himself to be thus perfectly sure of eternal life in this world. For many years his opinion of himself was justified as he wandered wearily to and fro, trying every sort of human experience—pleasure, travel, study, and finding all more or less unexciting. Now, however, when he had devoted himself to practical philanthropy and become really interested in his new occupation, he forgot everything in this great happiness and made the fatal exclamation. He immediately falls back dead, and a struggle takes place for the possession of his soul between the powers of good and evil, which terminates in a victory for the former in consequence of his work for the good of others, work which must result in his final salvation, as is later explained.

Here we take up the last part of the drama. It deals with Faust after his death, and opens with a description of a sacred place where woods wave in the air, and where roots and stems of trees cling to the rocks and climb up on them. It is evidently not on earth, but in some higher sphere. It is called a field or garden of holy love or religious devotion, and holy anchorites wander about mixing freely with wild beasts, which here are tame and harmless. A student of Theosophy when just instructed about the supersensual planes is strongly reminded of these verses.

Next we have the three mystical figures, Patres Ecstaticus, Profundus and Seraphicus, who represent the three aspects of devotion—the ecstatic, the deep and silent, and the angelic. Most

striking is the passionate cry of the first, Pater Ecstaticus, declaring the longing of the heart for the divine, and his resolve to destroy all that can hinder or intervene between it and its aim and end. He will welcome shattering blows or wounds, burning by fire, anything that can destroy the worthless and temporal, and let the true lasting star of eternal love shine out in him. The music expresses this wonderful struggling through minor keys and accidentals to a full close at the final consummation when the star of the soul shines out.

Pater Profundus then describes how all the mighty power of the woods, the streams and the rocks, does but show the almighty love which forms and nourishes all; the waterfalls, and the lightning that clears the air, are also love's messengers.

The third speaker, Pater Seraphicus, sees a cloud through the pines, which proves to be a choir of the spirits of young children, "lost to their parents but gained to the angels." These are happy in having no trace of earth's troubles, but are at present under limitations, and so cannot rise to higher circles without his help. They must, therefore, become one with him in a mystical union when they will rise spiritually and enable the God within them to shine more clearly and be seen through the veil. This revelation of love and the divine, he explains, is the food of the spirit, which thus can increase and develop in happiness. The line, "Denn das ist der Geister Nahrung," may in some degree recall the passage in Plato's *Phædo:* "But the soul will calm passion and follow reason, and dwell in her (knowledge) beholding the true and the divine, and thence derive nourishment." And again in the *Phædrus:* "Now the divine is beauty, wisdom, goodness, and the like—and by these the soul is nourished and grows apace." We have the same idea here of the soul obtaining the food necessary for its development, by which only it can live and grow.

This scene of the three Fathers forms a kind of prelude, and the real drama of the closing scenes of the history of Faust now begins.

An angel is seen far above bearing Faust's immortal body and singing a song of triumphant rejoicing at its escape from the powers of evil, the reason being:

Wer immer strebend sich bemüht	(Whoever strives untiringly
Den können wir erlösen.	Salvation can obtain.)

In other words, a man can attain liberation by action or deliverance from the bonds of the flesh and from evil by devoted labour for others.

The angels then sing a splendid chorus of victory. This should be heard as well as read, as the triumphant chords of Schumann's music ring long after in the ears and seem to be hardly earthly, but indeed a song of the angels. An interlude in a softer, more pathetic key shows how the child angels scatter roses over the body of Faust.

A new figure now appears, Dr. Marianus. It is uncertain whether this is meant to be Faust translated into a spiritual form or simply another mystical figure. The last supposition seems more probable, as he describes most movingly the attitude of penitent souls who in earthly life found it "so hard to fight and so easy to fall," and who are now here assembled to intercede for and welcome their erring brother. There is no shade of personal feeling or memory of the past, and the speaker is only an abstraction, as indeed are all the characters with the exception of the one "once called Gretchen," who prays to the One without likeness for him "so beloved formerly who is coming back at last."

Der früh Geliebte
Nicht mehr Getrübte
Er kommt zurück.

It is evident that her continued prayers and the force of her love for Faust have helped to bring him where he is.

The chorus of penitents sing of the chains which held them so tightly and which they broke with such difficulty, of the words and looks that so easily deceived, of the feet that so easily slipped, and all unite in intercession for their new brother. There are more songs and prayers of the same description which lead up to the end of the whole poem, where the new day and higher spheres open before the soul who has raised himself out of the mire and won his freedom by working for others.

The final chorus contains the deepest thoughts of the whole poem in a very few words:

Alles Vergängliche	(All that is transitory
Ist nur ein Gleichniss.	As symbol we see,
Das Unzulängliche	The unattainable

Hier wird's Ereigniss.	Possessed will be.
Das Unbeshreibliche	The indescribable
Hier ist es gethan.	Here is done.
Das Ewig-weibliche	The ever-womanly
Zieht uns hinan.	Draws us on.)

The verse is given here in the original, as it is practically untranslatable, though a faint attempt at a literal rendering in English is appended for the benefit of non-German readers. The first idea that all that is visible and earthly, all that passes away, is only a symbol by which we can get some idea of true Reality, is found at the root of all religions and philosophies, though perhaps never more satisfactorily and adequately expressed than in these lines. And the assurance that in the unseen life there is certain proof of the existence of what is here unattainable and indescribable, must rouse a responding chord in many hearts. Everyone who has realized something of what the unattainable is, and also the fact that it *is* unattainable in this physical life with our earthly senses, will understand what the hope of fulfilment of their best dreams and aspirations might be. And those who know most about the indescribable, know well that nothing through which we can express ourselves here, whether music or poetry or art, can do more than give an occasional glimpse of the realities that we are sure must exist somewhere.

The last pages of this poem contain many thoughts in a few very beautiful words, written with great power and conciseness. It has been impossible to do more than select a few of the leading ideas for consideration, such as the necessity of destroying the worthless and trivial before the soul can shine out in its full beauty; the universal love that supports and underlies all; the true food of the spirit necessary before it can grow and develop; or the salvation of an erring and selfish man through unselfish work for humanity; also the difficulties of keeping a sure foot and a steady head in the manifold temptations of life; and the tolerance and charity which those who have got through successfully show to those who have failed to do so.

These are only a few of the closely compressed ideas which are crowded in before the completion of the play in that final chorus which rises to such a height and so completely removes us from the

phenomenal world; it forms a fitting close to the great drama of *Faust*, which contains so much metaphysics, such beautiful poetry, so many wise and deep thoughts, and touches on such innumerable points of interest.

C. CUST.

ON SOME REMARKABLE PASSAGES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(*Concluded from p.* 27.)

There are several other passages in the N. T. which can only be interpreted properly by Eastern doctrines. Thus the remarkable and ill understood passage in Luke v. 36-39, that no new patch can harmonize with an old garment, and that new wine cannot be put into old bottles, seems common-place, but acquires a lofty spiritual meaning through the celebrated Sanskrit poem, the Bhagavad Gîtâ, where (ii. 22) it is said that as a man changes old garments for new, so he exchanges his old bodies for new ones (reincarnation). Another passage (*ib.* 26) implies that there was a still unsettled question whether the soul is immortal and never dies, or in a sense mortal and constantly revived or reborn—equally implying reincarnation, for the same soul is meant in either case.

Now these passages determine the real meaning of that in Luke, which has nothing to do with what precedes or what follows, but is an isolated parable. Both passages refer to reincarnation and a question whether the old *body* revives with the soul (assumed to be immortal), and they mean that it does *not*, and a reason is given by the allegory, that the old body could not be suited to the new state of the soul. Both assume re-birth, and controvert the docrine of the resurrection of the *body*, that on rebirth the old body is somehow restored to the immortal revived spirit, notwithstanding every atom of it may have passed innumerable times into other bodies, animal, vegetable or mineral, and been appropriated by other spirits as their temporary garb, and might just as well be claimed by them. The new wine cannot be put into the old bottles (the receptacle of the spirit-body); nor can an old garment be patched up by a new addition, for they would not harmonize.

Other isolated passages may be noticed for their suggestion of Eastern ideas being present to the writer's mind. In Acts viii. 9, *μάγον* should perhaps be read for *μέγαν*, which would be so easily confounded with it; *i.e.*, instead of the meaningless "that he was some great one," "that he was a kind of magician or sorcerer," explaining what goes before.

In Acts x. 11, we again find the word *σκεῦος*, which the English version renders a "vessel." It is, however, *nomen generalissimum*, and means "some *thing*," as in Matt. xii. 29 ("things"), Mark xii. 16 ("anything"), etc. It seems in fact a mystical term, and probably derived from the Gnostics or their predecessors the Stoics, and instead of rendering it as if the animals descended tied up in a linen bag, it might rather be compared with the mystical descent of the "Sangreal," as in Tennyson's:

> And down the long beam stole the Holy Grail.

The whole is a vision in an ecstatic state.

Another very singular word demands notice. In 2 Peter ii. 3, *κρῖμα* seems not to mean merely "judgment" (*κρίσις*), but what is called karma, *i.e.*, used in a mystical sense as designating the whole consequences of a life of sin, of which the result is *ἀπώλεια*—loss (a lost soul). We might render perhaps, "whose old karma is not idle—is not inactive—and the downfall awaiting them no sluggard." It may possibly be an attempt to connect *καρμα* with a known Greek root, and naturally so, as implying a kind of final sentence or judgment. Κρῖμα is not classical Greek, but occurs in early Stoic writers, as *Polybius*, xxiv., 1-12. (*Cf.* Apoc. xvii. 1.)

In James i. 23, there is a remarkable passage, *κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αυτοῦ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ*, which is absurdly rendered "beholding his natural face in a mirror"! with a still more absurd note, "Greek, the face of his birth," which is unintelligible. It is clear the translators had not the remotest idea of what was meant. Ἔσόπτρον is indeed a "mirror," but what mirror? Why, a magic mirror, and the true meaning is "contemplating" (not "beholding," as it implies a more continuous act than a mere look) the image (features) of his *nativity* in a magic mirror, for he has hardly clearly discerned it when *it* vanishes away (not, as rendered, "*he* departs"!). The vision or shade is gone, vanished. And what is symbolized by this magic mirror? The answer is, that in which

the whole universe is depicted and all that has been acted in it, the great world-mirror, which in Sanskrit is called âkâsha—as different from air, and even ether, as air is from a stone.

Just afterwards (*ib.* v. 25), we find the reason for the illustration, where "ὁ παρακυψὰς εἰς" does not mean "he that looketh into," but "he that *stoopeth down* and looketh at his image," etc. So Coleridge, who no doubt took it from the Berlenberg Bible (which is often more correct than Luther's version), "*bückend einschauet.*" Luther's "*durchschauet in*" is taken from the Vulgate, "*perspexerit in*," but is less accurate.

The law is compared by the Jewish convert to a mystical mirror in which truth is discernible, as shadows in water, faint and yet real representations, suggesting the real object.

Another noticeable passage is Apoc., vii. 17, where we find τὸ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ θρόνου. Both English versions have "(the Lamb) which is *in the midst of* the throne"! which in the first place is not Greek or English, and in the second is not sense. The true meaning is the "central figure of the throne"; *i.e.*, the second person of the Trinity, for of course the "Father" is not supposed to be visible to any eye of saint or mystic. (Ἀνάμεσον is really one word, though that is not material.) Luther has "*mitten im Stuhl*," which would perhaps bear the meaning above given to the expression, and has been absurdly altered to "*in der mitte des Stuhls*" in the modern version as given by Stier u. Theile.

The three most striking and characteristic narratives in the Gospels are: (1) the Judas legend, which deserves an essay to itself, on account of its object and the skill with which it has been constructed and interwoven with the two following; (2) the Last Supper, and (3) the Crucifixion; which, unless wholly symbolical, have no parallel in any other religion, but if symbolical merely and not narratives of actual events, have more than one. Are they related, for instance, to the ancient Greek Mysteries, or the still more ancient ones from which those were derived?

It is impossible to regard the legend of Judas Iscariot as the relation of a historical fact, but it forms a fitting introduction to those that follow.

Judas may perhaps be identified with the Devadatta of the Buddhists. The whole of Matt. xxvii. is full of strange and

suspicious passages. Although the Judas story is inserted with consummate skill (xxvi. 14-16, 25; xxvii. 3-10), it is impossible, when the attention is once directed to it, not to suspect that the whole story was got up to save the character of Peter. As to him, it was not doubted that he was a traitor (though not in the viler sense), that he thrice denied his Master. How then could this be got over? Only by the substitution of a scapegoat. Strike out all that relates to Judas—who may possibly be the author of the strange epistle that goes by that name—and the whole is intelligible, as also the doubt and even detestation in which Peter was held by Paul. Clearly Paul did not think Peter held the keys, as he everywhere speaks of Peter as maintaining the *Jewish* traditions, even to the extent of circumcision! But this painful question is dropped by the adherents of Peter in modern times. Nor do we often hear cited, "Begone, *Satan!* for thou (Peter) art my stumbling-block," etc. (Matt. xvi. 23), "for your thoughts are ever bent on (φρονεῖς) not divine but mundane matters."

In ch. xxvii. 22, Bar-abbas is Bar-Abba*a* (Syriac), "Son of the Father," who in Matt. is not exhibited as a criminal, but only as "a noted prisoner"; and the story (which is unintelligible as told) receives some light by supposing that he was a rival Messiah or Christ and had his own followers. Pilate has to judge between the two (verse 17), and obviously inclines to Jesus; the vile mob favour his rival and get him off (verse 21, etc.), though according to *a totally different tradition* Barabbas was a robber in prison for his crimes (Luke xxiii. 19, and Mark xv. 7), where we find ὁ λεγόμενος βαραββᾶς, the so-called "Son of the Father," exactly as we find, Matt. xxvii. 17, 22, τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστὸν, "the so-called Christ," both terms probably implying a denial of an assumed fact. Mark treats Barabbas as leader of a faction and riot, whose *followers* (not himself) had committed murder in the riot.

Pilate seems not to know (verse 17) who Christ was or claimed to be, or which of the two claimants they mean (verse 21), and he names Barabbas first, perhaps as at least known to him by name.

Seeing Jesus a mere man, and falsely supposing he claims to be the Jewish Messiah, the mob deem him guilty of the greatest of crimes as a blasphemer, but as under the Romans their judges had

no power of life and death, they prefer to save a criminal to the man they deemed both criminal and blasphemer.

The inimitable pathos of the description of the "Last Supper" and the "Crucifixion" implies writers of considerable power and poetical imagination; and probably the best intellects of the religious of those days (the second century of our era) were employed in depicting these scenes of abiding interest, and connecting them with existing traditions.

Yet they may not be more tenable as actual facts that occurred than the almost equally poetic legend of the Sangreal in the Middle Ages, which might almost be regarded as an accessory legend, and one written quite in the same spirit. Here if anywhere we should find hints taken from the ancient Mysteries.

In the case of the Last Supper, there may be a secret reference to older Mysteries.

The *bread* recalls the name of Demeter (Ceres) and the Eleusinian Mysteries; ἄρτος is in strictness a *loaf* of wheat-bread only.

The *wine*, the Mysteries of Iacchus. That they have a symbolical meaning, few can doubt. Here, too, we may perhaps trace the original reason of the *cup* being refused to the laity by the Roman Catholic Church, it implying a higher initiation. Baptism, as the first initiation, entitles to the former, but not to the latter.

This, indeed, assumes that the rites of Iacchus were more important than those of Demeter, which is contrary to the common opinion. But the correctness of this opinion is very doubtful, as the Eleusinian rites of Demeter and Kore (Proserpine, Persephone) were properly merely local and peculiar to Eleusis, and those of Iacchus certainly Eastern and probably far more extensive, venerable and ancient. That they may have degenerated to orgies and revelling was probable from the nature of the symbol.

The very fact that the Eleusinian Mysteries were divided into Greater and Lesser seems to imply a complete independence of the other Mysteries, while the fact of their being originally local and confined to Eleusis shows that they must have been relatively of less importance, while the Mysteries of Iacchus were derived from Egypt or Asia, and widely celebrated.

But it does not seem that the Eleusinian Mysteries were known at all outside the sphere of Greek influence.

The ancient doctrine of the Mysteries, which is now again attracting attention, seems likely to explain many hitherto unsolved problems. An instance from the O. T. may be the strange story of the intended sacrifice of his son Isaac by Abraham, which perhaps really refers to the son's initiation in the Mysteries, as we are told that on initiation the neophyte passed under the knife of the hierophant, the sacrifice being symbolical and of course not consummated. In Gen. xxii., it is said that Abraham was ordered by the *A*ĕlōhīm to sacrifice his son in the land of Moriyāh. It is very remarkable that in the Samaritan version we have the land of H-z-y-th-h, *i.e.*, the "Vision," for Moriyāh, which seems to show that the latter word is really derived from the root r-a-h (see). Hence the explanation in verse 14, which substitutes the later name of "to-day"—Y'hōwāh—for *A*ĕlōhīm. This is absurdly referred by modern commentators to verse 13, as if it could mean "the Lord will provide," *i.e.*, the substituted *ram*. At the end of verse 14, the Samaritan version is "Y'hōwāh will restore his soul (or him) to life," strangely different from the Hebrew.

The whole legend cannot be taken literally. It might be more rationally interpreted as a vision attributed to the personage called Abraham.

The double name of Abraham and Abram implies two very different and distant periods. Neither is, nor can be, Jewish, the supposed derivations being nonsensical (Ab-ra'ham and Ab-ram). They are certainly symbolical, and probably come from the root b-r-y, analogous to the Sanskrit root bṛih, like Brahma and Brahman—a strange fact, which will no doubt some day receive its explanation.

Again, we find in the Gospels reference to the "mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," to which the Apostles only are admitted (Matt. xiii. 11; Mark iv. 11). And this is the reason given for the parables, or exoteric teaching, as the ordinary teaching suited to the multitude.

We may reasonably conclude that the parables have one and all a symbolical meaning, higher than the mere words convey.

With the saying in Mark iv. 11, the "mysteries of *the kingdom of God*," we must combine what is perhaps the most remarkable of

all the sayings attributed to Jesus in any Gospel. "The kingdom of God *is within you*!" (Luke xvii. 21, where the word used is the unmistakable ἐντὸς, not the ambiguous ἐν), so strangely misunderstood by most Christians to this hour. (*Cf.* John iii. 3, which refers to rebirth, ἄνωθεν, from on high.)

It can only refer to the progress of the human soul, the culture of which is the only true civilization, morality and worship.

This World-Religion is taught by the Great Teacher, in direct opposition to the Jewish religion of a mere race.

F. H. BOWRING.

THE PHÆDO OF PLATO.

(*Continued from p.* 19.)

Let us turn now to the objection of Cebes, who, admitting the pre-existence of the soul, and that it is more lasting than the body, suggests that nevertheless, after wearing out many bodies (whether in one earth-life or in several), it may itself ultimately perish. The discourse in which this objection is refuted, and the argument for immortality carried to a triumphant conclusion, is an admirable example of Socratic dialectic. It opens with an enquiry into the cause of generation and corruption. When Socrates was a young man he was "wonderfully desirous of that knowledge which is called a history of nature." In other words, he occupied himself, as our modern men of science occupy themselves, in tracing effects to their so-called natural or material causes; as, for example, the senses to the action of the brain, the faculties of memory and opinion to the senses, and so forth. But, unlike the moderns, he soon discovered that he was on a wrong track. These so-called natural causes are not, properly speaking, causes at all, but rather conditions. For it is important to distinguish clearly between the cause by which a thing exists, and the conditions which make its existence in a certain respect possible. The cause is simple and always the same; the conditions are manifold and various. Thus, to take one of Socrates' own illustrations, the addition of one to one produces two; and again, by a process directly the reverse of this, *viz.*, the halving of one, two

are produced; yet the cause of two subsists neither in addition nor in division. These are merely conditions under which it becomes possible for the idea of duality to manifest itself. Or, to take another instance, a picture is said to be beautiful when the forms and colours which constitute it are harmoniously composed and skilfully contrasted. But these sensible forms and colours are not the cause of its beauty. The cause subsists in the idea of beauty, which is participated by the soul of the artist, and by him expressed on his canvas under the material conditions of colour and form. A further illustration given by Socrates shows with great clearness the mistake which is made by those who look not beyond physical reasons for the causes of things. They argue as one who should say that the cause of his (Socrates') sitting there is, that his body contains certain bones and sinews, naturally adapted to assume such a position. But the true cause is in the mind, and not in the body at all. He sits there because he judges it best to do so. It is quite true that without such bones and sinews it would be impossible for him to sit; but the bones and sinews are not the cause of his sitting, but simply the conditions under which the cause is enabled to proceed into effect.

The earlier Greek philosophers, for the most part, occupied themselves with the investigation of the physical causes or conditions of things. Anaxagoras, however, perceived that in order to set in motion the corporeal particles, by the combination and separation of which the sensible world is manifested, there was need of some moving principle, exempt from its participants; since body, of itself, is inert and motionless. This moving principle he denominated intellect (νοῦς), "the rarest and purest of all things," which imparted a revolving motion to the infinite mass of mingled particles, a motion beginning in one point and gradually extending itself to infinity. By this motion the particles were separated, and the order of the universe was evolved. But although Anaxagoras thus established, as the cause of sensible manifestation, a transcendent principle, to which he himself attributes absolute power and absolute knowledge, it is clear from the evidence of both Plato and Aristotle that he did not carry out his own doctrine to its logical conclusion. Aristotle says of him that he "uses intellect as a machine to the fabrication of the world, and when he doubts on what account it necessarily is, he introduces it arbitrarily. But in other things he considers every-

thing else rather than intellect as the cause of generated natures."* This statement is perfectly consistent with the account of Anaxagoras given by Socrates in the dialogue which we are now discussing.

To arrive at the true cause of things we must investigate in what manner it is best for them to subsist; since the First Cause, which is also the Final Cause, is that which is beyond all things best—*viz.*, the Good Itself. By the final cause I mean that for the sake of which everything subsists, that to which all things naturally tend as the supreme object of their desire. This is the Good, and it is identical with the One from which all things primarily proceed; for all good is rooted in union, as all evil in disunion; and thus the first Good is also the first Unity. In the second rank comes the Exemplary Cause, which is, as we said before, the intelligible Idea emanating from the Good. In this abide, in occult union, the ideas, or forms (εἴδη), as they are also called, which are the exemplars or archetypes of all existing things. All these ideas, subsisting occultly in intelligible being, are differentiated and manifested by the third, or efficient, Cause, which is Intellect. Each of these ideas is said to be, in relation to the whole series which participates it, as the One Itself is to the entire universe. "The whole world," says Proclus, "is suspended from the all-perfect monad of ideas, and the parts of the visible universe from monads which are separated from one another."† Now the monad of ideas, the first Idea wherein all ideas are comprehended, is nothing else than Being Itself, the intelligible exemplar of the sensible universe. This is, to the whole world, the cause of such being, or appearance of being, as it possesses, for being is the one idea of which all things without exception participate so far as they are capable. Moreover, all the parts of the universe participate further of the particular ideas which are comprehended in this "all-perfect monad." All ideas are everywhere similarly present, although the measure of their participation depends upon the aptitude of the recipient; not, indeed, upon its essential aptitude, since all things possess the whole in potentiality; but upon its aptitude in energy. Every recipient of forms energizes more fully according to certain forms, and less fully according to certain other

* *Metaphysics*, i. 4 Taylor's translation, p. 13.

† Cited in Taylor's *Plato* iii. p. 13.

forms, and it is therefore said to belong especially to the series proceeding from that idea which its energies chiefly manifest. Thus, every animated body belongs primarily to the series of Animal Itself; and again, some things energize principally according to the form, or idea, of the good,* others according to that of the beautiful, and so forth. The power which discriminates ideas, and calls them into manifestation, is Intellect, the active or efficient cause of the universe.

But it has been already observed, that without contraries there could be no manifestation. In order, therefore, for the manifestation of being it is necessary to introduce its contrary, non-being. We remarked that being was denominated the monad of ideas, as the exemplary cause of all existence. In the sensible world existence is manifested as a circle of generation and corruption. Generation, then, as a passing into being, is referred to being itself as its cause; while the cause of corruption, or the passing out of being, is consequently non-being; and intellect is, as we said, the active cause which produces manifestation. But the energy of intellect is eternal, and, in order for the production of temporal manifestation—*i.e.*, the circle of generation and corruption—there is need of an energy manifesting itself in time. This is the energy of soul, which proceeds from intellect, and translates into the language of time the ideas of eternity. Thus, to recapitulate: beyond intellect and the intelligible, beyond being itself, is the causeless cause of being, which we indicate by the names of the Good and the One. Then, of all that participates of being, the Idea is the cause: as intelligible being, exemplary; as intellect, efficient. In intellect, therefore, the cause of all things primarily subsists, and it subsists secondarily in soul, which is intellectual in its essence, and the vehicle by which the creative intellect acts upon the universe. Soul manifests in time the ideas which it derives from intellect, and is the immediate cause of all that exists and takes place in the sensible world.

Now, with regard to contraries: we have already seen that in generated natures—natures which subsist in becoming—contrary proceeds from contrary. This, of course, does not mean that a certain thing actually becomes the contrary to itself, which is obviously

*A distinction must be made between Good, as an intelligible idea, and *the Good*, which transcends all being.

impossible; but it means that the subject which participates of contraries, from being in the condition represented by one contrary, proceeds into that represented by the other. If we consider, for example, an animal as a subject participating of the contraries heat and cold, we may say that from being cold it becomes hot, or from being hot becomes cold; but we may not say that heat itself becomes cold, or that cold itself becomes heat. Or if we take as an instance the contraries generation and corruption, we say that every thing which is generated becomes corrupted, and that from this corruption a new generation is produced; but we do not say that generation itself, abstracted from the subject of generation, becomes corruption, or that corruption becomes generation. When, therefore, to one contrary another accedes, the former, being incapable of receiving that which accedes, is either destroyed, or, if it be indestructible, withdraws from the subject in which it is manifested. Thus, if cold approach a body which participates of heat, in proportion as the cold accedes, the heat withdraws; since heat itself is incapable of receiving cold. And further, not only is one contrary incapable of receiving its contrary, but if anything, which is not itself a contrary, so subsists as to partake essentially, or as a condition of its very existence, of the nature of some contrary, this thing also can never receive the contrary of that of which it thus participates. For instance, the odd and the even are contraries. But the number three, although not itself the contrary of anything, is what we term an odd number; that is, a number which essentially participates of the idea of odd, and cannot exist without participating it. Not only, then, is the odd itself incapable of receiving the even, but the number three, which is not the odd itself, but which necessarily partakes of the nature of the odd, is likewise incapable of receiving the idea of even.

It was said that soul is the cause of all existence in the sensible world. It is soul, therefore, which imparts form to matter, life and motion to body. Now the productive energy of the soul is twofold; for it produces either by its essence or by will. But it imparts life to the body by its essence, as fire imparts heat; since if the presence of life in the body depended alone upon the will of the soul, that life might at any moment be withdrawn from the body by the mere cessation of the will that it should continue. This, however, is not

the case. Wherever soul is present, there of necessity is life; and whenever the soul departs from the body, death of necessity accedes to it. If, therefore, the soul imparts life, not by will, but by its very essence, it is essentially vital; for it cannot impart that which it does not possess. But life is a contrary, and death is the contrary of life. It has been shown already that that which essentially participates of a contrary is incapable of receiving the contrary of that of which it participates. Since the soul, therefore, participates essentially of life, it is incapable of receiving death, and is consequently immortal.

Again, fire imparts heat to body by its essence; that is to say, from the mere fact of fire being present the participation of heat by a body adapted to participate it, follows as a matter of necessity. Heat, therefore, is an essential property of fire, without which fire would not be fire. But since fire is thus incapable of receiving the contrary of heat, if cold approach it, it either departs or perishes. For in a certain sense fire may be said to perish, since this terrestrial fire which we so designate is not a simple essence, not the pure element at all, but a composite, dependent for its existence upon the concurrence of other elements. But since all composites may be dissolved, fire also perishes as fire by dissolution, and the heat which it essentially contains, is not indeed annihilated, but is dissipated into the surrounding atmosphere. Now life is an essential property of the soul, as heat is of fire; and when death approaches, the soul must in like manner either withdraw from the body which it animates, or suffer dissolution. But the soul, being incorporeal, is a simple essence, and cannot be dissolved, since it is not composed of parts. When death, then, arrives, the body perishes, for the life which it contains is not of its own essence; but the soul, being essentially vital and incomposite, is not receptive of death or of dissolution. It does not, therefore, in any wise cease to exist, but withdraws itself, safe and sound, from the perishing body.

W. C. WARD.

(To be continued.)

AMONG THE GNOSTICS OF THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES.

(*Continued from p.* 42.)

THE PERATÆ OF HIPPOLYTUS.

HIPPOLYTUS says that the mysteries symbolized by the serpent are at the root of all Gnosticism, and though the Church father himself has not the ghost of an idea what these mysteries really are, as is amply proved by all his remarks, we agree with him, as we have demonstrated above. He then proceeds to treat of the system of the Peratæ, to whom we have already referred, and whose mysteries (Hippolytus calls them their "blasphemy against Christ") had been kept secret "for many years." We know from other sources that the school was prior to Clement of Alexandria. The system of the Peratæ was based on an analogy with sidereal considerations, and depended on the tradition of the ancient Chaldæan star-cult. In Book iv., Hippolytus had already endeavoured to refute the Chaldæan system of the star-spheres, and though he makes some good points against the vulgar astrology of the time, does not affect the mysterious doctrine of the septenary spheres of which the empirical horoscopists had long lost the secret, and for which they had substituted the physical planets; this theory is adopted by Plato from the Pythagorean tradition in his Timæus. Hippolytus had the Peratic school especially in mind in his attempted refutation of the art of the astrologers and mathematicians, of which however he admits he had no practical knowledge, but space compels us to simply refer the student to the fourth book of his Philosophumena for the outline of astrology which the Church father presents.

According to the Peratic school, the universe was symbolized by a circle enclosing a triangle. The triangle denoted the primal trichotomy into the three worlds, ingenerable, self-generable, and generable. Thus there were for them three aspects of the Logos,

or in other words, three Gods, or three Logoi, or three Minds, or three Men. When the world-process had reached the completion of its devolution, the Saviour descended from the ingenerable world or æon; the type of the Saviour is that of a man perfected, "with a threefold nature, and threefold body, and threefold power, having in himself all [species of] concretions and potentialities from the three divisions of the universe"; according to the Pauline phrase: "It pleased Him that in him should dwell all fulness (the plerôma) bodily."

It is from the two higher worlds, the ingenerable and self-generable, that the seeds of all sorts of potentialities are sent down into this generable or formal world.

Hippolytus here breaks off, and after informing us that the founders of the school were a certain Euphrates (whom Origen calls the founder of those Ophites to whom Celsus referred about 150 A.D.) and Celbes, whom he elsewhere calls Acembes and Ademes, proceeds to tell us something more of the Chaldæan art. He then says that he will quote from a number of Peratic treatises to show that their ideas were similar to those of the Chaldæans.

The Saviour has not only a human but a cosmic task to perform, the cosmic task is to separate the good from the bad among the sidereal powers and influences; the same peculiarity of soteriology is brought into prominence in the Pistis Sophia treatise to which we shall refer later on. The "wars in heaven" precede the conflict of good and evil on earth.

The treatise from which Hippolytus proceeds to quote is evidently a Gnostic commentary on an old Chaldæan or Syrian cosmogonic scripture, which the commentator proceeds to explain in Greek mythological terms. The beginning of this mysterious treatise runs as follows:

"I am the voice of awakening from slumber in the æon (world) of night. Henceforth I begin to strip naked the power that proceedeth from Chaos. It is the power of the abyssmal slime, which raiseth up the clay of the imperishable vast moist [principle], the whole might of convulsion, of the colour of water, ever moving, supporting the steady, checking the tottering . . . the faithful steward of the track of the æthers, rejoicing in that which streameth forth from the twelve founts of the Law, the power

which taketh its type from the impress of the power of the invisible waters above."

This power is called Thalassa, evidently the Thalatth or World-Mother of the Chaldæans. The twelve sources are also called twelve mouths, or pipes, through which the world-powers pour hissing. It is the power which is surrounded by a dodecagonal pyramid or dodecahedron, a hint which should persuade astrologers to reconsider their signs of the zodiac.

Hippolytus' quotations and summary here become very obscure and require a critical treatment which has not yet been accorded them; we are finally told that the matter is taken from a treatise dealing with the formal or generable world, for it is denominated The Proasteioi up to the Æther; that is to say, the hierarchies of powers as far as the æther, which were probably represented diagramatically by a series of concentric circles, a "proasteion," being the space round a city's walls.

Hippolytus here again points out the correspondence between astrological symbolism and the teaching of this school of Gnosticism; it is, he says, simply astrology allegorized, or rather we should say cosmogony theologized. These Peratics, or Transcendentalists, derive their name from the following considerations.

They believed that nothing which exists by generation can survive destruction, and thus the sphere of generation is also the fate-sphere. He then who knows nothing beyond this is bound to the wheel of fate; but "he who is conversant with the compulsion of generation [saṁsâra], and the paths through which man has entered into the [generable] world" can proceed through and pass beyond (transcend) destruction. This destruction is the "Water" which is the "generation of men," and which is the element in which the hierarchies of generation hold their sway, and have their being. It is called water because it is of that colour, namely, the lower ether.

The treatise from which Hippolytus quotes, again dives into the depths of mythology, and among other things adduces the "Myth of the Going forth," and its mystical interpretation; finally, the Gnostic commentator explains the opening verses of the prologue to the fourth canonical Gospel. Hippolytus, however, is beginning to be baffled by the amazing intricacy of the system, as he tells us,

and thus breaks off, and apparently takes up another treatise from which to quote. The new treatise is of an exceedingly mystical character, and seemingly deals with the psychological physiology of the school.

The universe is figured forth as triple; Father, Son and Matter (Hylê), each of endless potentialities. The Son, the fashioning Logos, stands midway between the immovable Father and moving Matter. At one time he is turned to the Father and receives the powers in his disk (face, or "person"), and then turning casts them into Matter which is devoid of form; and thus the Matter is moulded and the formal world is produced.

We here see an attempt to graft a higher teaching of the same nature as the Platonic doctrine of types and ideas on to the primitive symbolism of imperfectly observed natural phenomena. The sun is the Father, the moon is the Son, and the earth is Matter. The moon is figured as a serpent, owing to its serpentine path, and its phases are imagined as the turning of its face towards the sun, and again towards the earth. If this is correct, however, the immobility of the sun and the motion of the earth give us reason to believe that the Chaldæans were better acquainted with astronomy than the followers of the far later Hipparcho-Ptolemæic geocentricism. The Gnostic writer also has a correct theory of magnetic and other influences, which he quaintly sets forth. We can, moreover, distinguish three strata of interpretation: (i.) metaphysical and spiritual—the ideal world, the intermediate, and the visible universe; (ii.) the world of generation—and its sun, moon and earth forces; and (iii.) the analogical psycho-physiological process in man.

The last is thus explained. The brain is the Father, the cerebellum the Son, and the medulla Matter or Hylê. "The cerebellum by an ineffable and inscrutable process, attracts through the pineal gland the spiritual and life-giving essence from the vaulted chamber [? third venticle]. And on receiving this, the cerebellum [also] in an ineffable manner, imparts the 'ideas,' just as the Son does, to Matter; or, in other words, the seeds and the genera of things produced according to the flesh flow along into the spinal marrow." And, adds Hippolytus, the main secrets of the school depend on a knowledge of these correspondences, but it would be

impious for him to say anything more on the matter, a scruple which is surprising to find in a Church father.

The Sethians of Hippolytus.

Closely connected with the Gnostics above described, are the Sethians to whom Hippolytus next devotes his attention. He speaks of their "innumerable commentaries," and refers his readers especially to a certain treatise, called The Paraphrase of Seth, for a digest of their doctrines. But whether or not Hippolytus quotes from this document himself or from some other treatise or treatises, is not apparent. The title, Paraphrase of Seth, is exceedingly puzzling; it is difficult to say what is the exact meaning of the term "paraphrasis," and the doctrines set forth by Hippolytus have no connection with the Seth legend. Can it possibly be that there is a connection between the name "Seth" and the mysterious "Setheus" of the Codex Brucianus?

The term Sethians, as used by Hippolytus, is not only puzzling on this account, but also because his summary differs entirely from the scraps of information on the system of the Sethites supposed to have been mentioned in his lost Syntagma, and allied to the doctrine of the Nicolaitans by the epitomizers. In the latter fragments the hero Seth was chosen as the type of the good man, the perfect, the prototype of Christ.

The Sethians of whom we are treating, begin with a trinity, Light, Spirit and Darkness, which again, in one respect, reminds us of the Sâṅkhya triguṇa, or triple powers of nature, sattva, rajas, tamas.

The Spirit is not, however, to be thought of as a breath or wind, but as it were a subtle odour spreading everywhere. All three principles then are intermingled the one with the other. And the Darkness strives to retain the Light and the Spirit, and imprison the Light-spark in matter; while the Light and the Spirit, on their side, strive to raise their powers aloft and rescue them from the Darkness.

All genera and species and individuals, nay the heaven and earth itself, are images of "seals"; they are produced according to certain pre-existent types. It was from the first concourse of the three original principles or powers that the first great form was pro-

duced, the impression of the great seal, namely, heaven and earth. This is symbolized by the world-egg in the womb of the Universe, and the rest of creation is worked out on the same analogy. The egg is in the waters, which are thrown into waves by the creative power, and it depends on the nature of the waves as to what the various creatures will be. Here we have the whole theory of vibrations and the germ-cell idea in full activity.

Into the bodies thus brought into existence by the waves of the waters (the vehicles of subtle matter), the Light-spark and the fragrance of the Spirit descend, and thus "mind or man" is "moulded into various species."

"And this [Light-spark] is a perfect god, who from the ingenerable Light from above, and from the Spirit, is borne down into the natural man, as into a shrine, by the tide of nature and the motion of the wind [the creative power which causes the waves]. . . . . Thus a minute spark, a divided splinter from above, like the ray of a star, has been mingled in the much compounded waters [bodies of various kinds made of subtle matter] of many (existences). . . . Every thought, then, and solicitude actuating the Light from above is as to how and in what manner mind may be set free from death —the evil and dark body—from the 'father' below, the [generative impulse] wind, which with agitation and tumult raised up the waves, and [finally] produced a perfect mind, his own son, and yet not his own in essence. For he [the mind] was a ray from above, from that perfect Light, overpowered in the dark and fearsome, and bitter, and blood-stained water; he also is a Light-spirit floating on the water."

The generative power is called not only "wind," but also "beast," and "serpent," the latter because of the hissing sound it produces, just like the whirling wind. Now the impure womb, or sphere of generation, can only produce mortal men, but the virgin or pure womb, the sphere of Light, can produce men immortal or gods. It is the descent of the Perfect Man or Logos into the pure man that alone can still the birth-pangs of the carnal man.

This natural and spiritual process is shown forth in the Mysteries; after passing through the Lesser Mysteries, which pertain to the cycle of generation, the candidate is washed or baptized, and putting off the dress of a servant, puts on a heavenly garment, and

drinks of the cup of life-giving water. That is to say, he leaves his servile form, the body which is subjected to the necessity of generation and is thus a slave, and ascends in his spiritual body to the state where is the ocean of immortality.

The Sethian school supported their theosophical tenets by analogies drawn from natural philosophy, and by the allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament, but, says Hippolytus, their system is nothing else than the tenets of the Orphic mysteries, which were celebrated in Achæa at Phlium, long before the Eleusinian. No doubt the Sethians based their theories on one or more of the traditions of the mystery-cult, but we need not follow Hippolytus in his selection of only one tradition, and that too in its grossest and most ignorant phase of vulgar phallicism.

The school seems also to have had some affinities with the Hermetic tradition, and used the analogy of natural and "alchemical" processes for the explanation of spiritual matters. For instance, after citing the example of the magnet, one of their books continues: "Thus the Light-ray [human soul] mingled with the water [animal soul], having obtained through discipline and instruction its own proper region, hastens towards the Logos [divine soul] that comes down from above in servile form [body]; and along with the Logos becomes Logos there where the Logos has its being, more speedily than iron [hastens] to the magnet."

The Docetæ of Hippolytus.

As previously remarked, the remains of the ancient bed of the stream of the Gnosis which we are endeavouring to survey, are so obscure, that nothing but a most imperfect outline, or rather a series of rough sketches of certain sections that some day further discovery may enable us to throw into the form of a map, can be attempted. Chronological indications are almost entirely wanting, and we can as yet form no idea of the correct sequence of these general Gnostic schools. We must therefore proceed at haphazard somewhat, and will next turn our attention to a school which Hippolytus (Bk. viii.) calls the Docetæ; seeing that their tenets are very similar to those of the three schools of which we have just treated. There is nothing, however, to show why this name is especially selected except the obscure reason that it is derived from

the attempt of these Gnostics to theorise on "inaccesible and incomprehensible matter." It may, therefore, be possible that they believed in the doctrine of the non-reality of matter; and that the name Docetæ ("Illusionists") is of similar derivation to the Mâyâ-vâdins of the Hindus. The system of the Gnostic circle bears a strong family likeness to the doctrines of the Basilidian and Valentinian schools, but the doctrine of the non-physical nature of the body of the Christ, which is the general characteristic of ordinary Docetism, is not more prominent with them than with many other schools. The outline of their tenets given by Hippolytus is as follows.

The primal Being is symbolized as the seed of a fig-tree, the mathematical point, which is everywhere smaller than small, yet greater than great, containing in itself infinite potentialities. He is the "refuge of the terror-stricken, the covering of the naked," and much else as allegorically set forth in the Scriptures. The manner of the infinite generation of things is also figured by the fig-tree, for from the seed comes the stem, and then leaves, and then fruit, the fruit in its turn containing seeds, and thence other stems, and so on in infinite manner; so all things come forth.

In this way, even before the sensible world was formed, was there an emanation of a divine or ideal world of three root-æons, each consisting of so many sub-æons, male-female; that is to say worlds, or beings, or planes, of self-generating powers. And this æon-world of light came forth from the one ideal seed or root of the universe, the ingenerable. Then the host of self-generable æons uniting together produce from the one Virgin (ideal cosmic substance), the Only-begotten (generated) one, the Saviour of the universe, the perfect æon; containing in himself all the powers of the ideal world of the æons, equal in power in all things to the original seed of the universe, the ingenerable. Thus was the Saviour of the ideal universe produced, the perfect æon. And thus all in that spiritual world was perfected, all being of the nature of that which transcends intellect, free from all deficiency. Thus was accomplished the eternal and ideal world-process in the spaces of the æons.

Next with regard to the emanation of the ideal world into the sensible universe. The third root-æon, in its turn, made itself threefold, containing in itself all the supernal potentialities. Thus,

then, its Light shone down upon the primordial chaotic substance, and the souls of all genera and species of living beings were infused into it. And when the third æon, or Logos, perceived that his ideas and impressions and types (χαρατῆρες)—the souls—were seized upon by the darkness, he separated the light from the darkness, and placed a firmament between, but this was only done after all the infinite species of the third æon had been intercepted in the darkness. And last of all the resemblance of the third æon himself was impressed upon the lower universe, and this resemblance is a "life-giving fire, generated from the light." Now this fire is the creative god which fashions the world as in the Mosaic account. This fabricating deity having no substance of his own, uses the darkness (gross matter) as his substance, out of which he makes bodies, and thus perpetually treats despitefully the eternal attributes of light which are imprisoned in the darkness. Thus until the coming of the Saviour, there was a vast delusion of souls, for these "ideas" are called souls (ψυχαὶ) because they have been breathed out (ἀπυψυγεῖσαι) from the (æons) above. These souls spend their lives in darkness, passing from one to another of the bodies which are under the ward of the creative power or world-fabricator.

In support of this the Gnostic author refers to the saying: "And if ye will receive it, this is Elias that was for to come; he that hath ears to hear, let him hear"; and also to Job ii. 9: "And I am a wanderer changing place after place and house after house." The latter passage is found in the version of the Seventy, but is omitted in the English translation.

It is by means of the Saviour that souls are set free from the circle of rebirth (metensomatosis), and faith is roused in men that their sins should be remitted. Thus, then, the Only-begotten Son gazing upon the soul-tragedy—the "images" of the supernal æons changing perpetually from one body to another of the darkness—willed to descend for their deliverance.

Now the individual æons above were not able to endure the whole fulness of the divine world, *i.e.*, the Son; and had they beheld it they would have been thrown into confusion at its greatness and the glory of its power, and would have feared for their existence. So the Saviour indrew his glory into himself, as it were the vastest of lightning flashes into the minutest of bodies, or as the sudden

cessation of light when the eyelids close, and so descended to the heavenly dome; and reaching the star-belt there, again indrew his glory, for even the apparently most minute light-giver of the star-sphere is a sun illuminating all space; and so the Saviour withdrew his glory again and entered into the domain of the third sphere of the third æon. And so he entered even into the darkness; that is to say, was incarnated in a body.

And his baptism was in this wise: he washed himself in the Jordan (the stream of the Logos), and after this purification in the water he became possessed of a spiritual body, a copy or impression of his virgin-made physical body; so that when the world-ruler (the god of generation) condemned his own plasm (the physical body) to death, *i.e.*, the cross, the spiritual body, nourished in the virgin physical body, might strip off the physical body, and nail it to the "tree," and thus the Christ would triumph over the powers and authorities of the world-ruler, and not be found naked, for he would put on his new spiritual body of adeptship instead of another body of flesh. Thus the saying: "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of the heavens; that which is born of the flesh is flesh."

As to Jesus Christ, the Gnostic writer wisely remarks, that this ideal can be seen from many sides; that each school has its own view, some a low, some a high view; and that this is in the nature of things. Finally none but the real Gnostics, that is those who have passed through similar initiations to Jesus, can understand the mystery face to face.

Monoïmus.

Hippolytus devotes his next section to a certain Monoïmus who is only mentioned by one other hæresiologist, namely Theodoret, in a brief paragraph. Monoïmus was an Arabian and lived somewhere in the latter half of the second century. His system is based on the idea of the Heavenly Man, the universe, and the son of this Man, the perfect man, all other men being but imperfect reflections of the one ideal type. His general ideas attach themselves to the cycle of Gnostic literature of which we are treating, and are elaborated by many mathematical and geometrical considerations from the Pythagorean and Platonic traditions. The theory of numbers and the

geometrical composition of the universe from elements which are symbolized by the five Platonic solids—namely, the tetrahedron, cube, octahedron, dodecahedron and icosahedron—are developed. All these geometrical symbols are produced by the monad, which he calls the iota, the yod and the "one horn." It is our old friend the serpentine force, the horn of plenty, the rod of Moses and of Hermes; in other words, it is the atom which is said by seers to be a conical swirl of forces. This monad is in numbers the decad, the perfect number and completion of the first series of numbers, after which the whole process begins again.

Now it was Moses' rod which brought to pass the plagues of Egypt according to the myth. These "plagues" are nothing else but transmutations of the matter of the physical body, *e.g.*, water into blood, etc., all of which is quaintly worked out by the writer.

The whole of this system, indeed, opens up a number of important considerations which would lead us far beyond the scope of the present essay. Monoïmus was undoubtedly a contemporary of the Valentinian school, if not a pupil of Valentinus, and the garbled version of his system as preserved by Hippolytus can be made to yield many important points which will throw light on the "theological arithmetic" of the Gnostic doctors. This may be proved some day to still preserve a seed which may grow into a tree of real mathematical knowledge.

We will conclude our sketch of the tenets of Monoïmus by quoting his opinion on the way to seek for God. In a letter to a certain Theophrastus, he writes: "Cease to seek after God (as without thee), and the universe, and things similar to these, seek Him from out of thyself, and learn who it is, who once and for all appropriateth all in thee unto Himself, and sayeth: 'My god, my mind, my reason, my soul, my body.' And learn whence is sorrow and joy, and love and hate, and waking though one would not, and sleeping though one would not, and getting angry though one would not, and falling in love though one would not. And if thou shouldst closely investigate these things, thou wilt find Him in thyself, one and many, just as the atom; thus finding from thyself a way out of thyself."

(To be continued.)

G. R. S. MEAD.

THE METAPHYSICS OF VEGETARIANISM.

It may be of interest to examine on what grounds Indian thinkers base the *raison d'être* of Vegetarianism. However short this survey may fall of an estimate adequate to the importance of the subject, still it is hoped that an appeal to a profound system of philosophy, which rejects the use of flesh-food, may strengthen the Vegetarian cause.

The starting point of the Vedânta is the self-evident fact that the five senses entirely depend on outside influences. The external objects of sense are the feeders and sustainers of the organs of sense. All sensations, whether agreeable or unpleasant, are conveyed inward to the mind. The mind reflects them, as in a mirror, and throws

the mantle of an alien glow

over the imagery. Sense-objects become changed into the likeness of the mind, and externalized again into thought-forms or language. Sensing, thinking, and naming, are inseparable and interdependent acts of the human mind—the threefold aspect of all knowledge. And just as the restless senses will rush outward for the gratification of their unceasing desires, miserable slaves to this transient world of forms, even so is our much-boasted knowledge itself, necessarily, of a worldly and evanescent character. Therefore, asks the Vedântist, how can man claim immortality as long as he lives in the senses?

The Vedânta philosophy postulates immortality rather on the ground that, besides sense-impressions and thoughts, there exists an unknown third in man, his true nature, which is latent and subdued while he is under the dominion of the senses, but which becomes manifest in proportion to the degree of restraint he puts on them. After holding back the outward-going energies, man is declared to regain the lost consciousness of his divine portion. This immortal part of man is called Âtman (lit. Self) in Sanskrit terminology. To the question, "How can Âtman be known?"—the Vedântist has the answer that Âtman cannot be known objectively, because it

transcends all knowledge; man knows it by being it. Âtman is the eternal principle in man, free from the weary round of births and deaths. Âtman is said to be independent of external forms, neither attracted by the attractive, nor repelled by the repellent; untouched by joy and sorrow; beyond all actions whether evil or good; serene; self-centred; the inward witness and judge of the historical play in which the outward man is acting his predestined part on the earthly stage. Body and mind, according to the Vedânta, are material vehicles through which Âtman works for outward expression. The fitness of these instruments, that is, physical health and purity of mind, stands in corresponding relationship to the spiritual growth of man. A diseased body and evil passions both cover and stifle the indwelling God, and dim man's knowledge that he is an immortal spirit.

Âtman is made manifest in all flesh. Though invisible, Âtman holds together, nay, calls into existence, the visible universe, for the purpose of revealing its divine nature. It seems many, though, in reality, there can be one Âtman only, eternally struggling for perfect expression in the manifold forms which unceasingly spring into being.

It is here that the Vedântic "Welt-Anschauung" comes in touch with the Vegetarian question. The idea is that he who has fully realized that one and the same Âtman is underlying and sustaining the universe, will, as a matter of course, be brought to identify himself with the whole creation, and gradually lose his individuality, even as a river does which is about to join the open sea. "I am the universe, and I love the universe as my own body." From the consciousness that there is only one force pervading creation, that creation shows variety in degree, but *is* unity in essence, it is but a small step beyond the narrow limits of personal, selfish interest. Once started on the way of unselfishness, human sympathies will grow stronger and wider until they embrace all flesh on earth. Man will even die himself that he may better live in others. The brutes will share in his universal love and compassion, for he will have learnt to see in all created life the manifestation of the same Âtman wherein he lives, and moves, and has his being.

It will now be understood why Vedânta philosophers are

Vegetarians. They reject flesh-food because it can only be obtained by immoral means. Suffering must be caused, and life taken in order to have meat or fish on the dinner table. Infliction of suffering for personal gratification is viewed as an act of selfishness, and selfishness arises out of ignorance. It is the ignorant man who becomes deluded into the mistaken belief that he is a body, whereas the wise man knows that he is a spirit, and that his body is but one expression out of the myriads of "words become flesh" which the same Holy Spirit illumines. When the veil of delusion is once removed from the mind, these foolish ideas of separateness in the universe will vanish, and so will all cruelty, and slaughter of what are seemingly different beings.

Vedântism, in common with the teachings of Christ, looks at human life as a deserved degradation and correction for the fall of man, and at this body of flesh as a temporary prison-house for man to repent this original sin which caused his birth down here, and to accomplish his own redemption. Both religious systems point to the same road of salvation, leading out of this vale of tears, upward, Godward, into perfect freedom—the road of self-denial and brotherly love. But while Vedântism, from very early times, has accepted the animal world into this universal brotherhood, Christianity strangely disregards the rights of the dumb creation.

ERNST HORRWITZ.

ON THE TRACK OF THE MSS.

The Globe of Feb. 12th, in its "Echoes of Science," is responsible for the statement that, "The Negus of Abyssinia has decreed the foundation of a great library in his capital of Addis-Ababa. It will contain all the best manuscripts of Ethiopia. Many of these are said to have been hidden on an island of Lake Zouay, called Debra-Sina, during the Moslem invasion of the sixteenth century, and recovered by Menelik, the present ruler."

OUR RELATION TO CHILDREN.

(*Concluded from p.* 68.)

IT is simply impossible to exaggerate the plasticity of these unformed vehicles. We know that the physical body of a child, if only its training be begun at a sufficiently early age, may be modified to a very considerable extent. An acrobat, for example, will take a boy of five or six years old, whose bones and muscles are not as yet as hardened and firmly set as ours are, and will gradually accustom his limbs and body to take readily and with comfort all sorts of positions which would be absolutely impossible for most of us, even with any amount of training. Yet our own bodies at the same age differed in no essential respect from that boy's, and if they had been put through the same exercises they would have become as supple and elastic as his, though now that they are definitely set no efforts that we could make, however long continued, could give them the same easy flexibility.

Now if the physical body of a child is thus plastic and readily impressible, his astral and mental vehicles are far more so. They thrill in response to every vibration which they encounter, and are eagerly receptive with regard to all influences, whether good or evil, which emanate from those around them. And they resemble the physical body also in this other characteristic—that though in early youth they are so susceptible and so easily moulded, they very soon set and stiffen and acquire definite habits, which when once firmly established can be altered only with great difficulty.

When we realize this we see at once the extreme importance of the surroundings in which a child passes his earliest years, and the heavy responsibility which rests upon every parent to see that the conditions of the child's development are as good as they can be made. The little creature is as clay in our hands, to mould almost as we will; moment by moment the germs of good or evil quality

brought over from the last birth are awakening into activity; moment by moment are being built up those vehicles which will condition the whole of his after life; and it rests with us to awaken the germ of good, to starve out the germ of evil. To a far larger extent than is ever realized by even the fondest parents, the child's future is under their control.

Think of all the friends whom you know so well, and try to imagine what splendid specimens of humanity they would be if all their good qualities were enormously intensified, and all the less estimable features absolutely weeded out of their characters. *That* is the result which it is in your power to produce in your child, if you do your full duty by him; such a specimen of humanity you may make him if you will but take the trouble.

But how? you will say; by precept? by education? Yes, truly, much may be done in that way when the time comes; but another and far greater power than that is in your hands—a power which you may begin to wield from the very moment of the child's birth, and even before that; and that is the power of the influence of your own life. To some extent this is recognized, for most civilized people are careful of their words and actions in the presence of a child, and it would be an unusually depraved parent who would allow his children to hear him use violent language, or to see him give way to a fit of passion; but what a man does not realize is that if he wishes to avoid doing the most serious harm to his little ones he must learn to control not only his words and deeds, but also his *thoughts*. It is true that you cannot immediately see the pernicious effect of an evil thought or desire upon the mind of your child, but none the less it is there, and it is more real and more terrible, more insidious and more far-reaching than the harm which is obvious to the physical eye.

If a parent allows himself to cherish feelings of anger or jealousy, of envy or avarice, of selfishness or pride, even though he may never give them outward expression, the vibrations which he thereby causes in his own desire-body are assuredly acting all the while upon the plastic astral body of his child, tuning its vibrations to the same key, awakening into activity any germs of these sins that may have been brought over from his past life, and setting up in him also the same set of evil habits, which when they have once

become definitely formed will be exceedingly difficult to correct. And this is exactly what is being done in the case of most of the children whom we see around us.

As it presents itself to a clairvoyant, the aura of a child is very often a most beautiful object—pure and bright in its colour, free as yet from the stains of sensuality and avarice, and from the dull cloud of ill-will and selfishness which so frequently darkens all the life of the adult. In it are to be seen lying latent all the germs and tendencies of which we have spoken—some of them evil, some of them good; and thus the possibilities of the child's future life lie plain before the eye of the watcher. But how sad it is to see the change which almost invariably comes over that lovely child-aura as the years pass on—to note how persistently the evil tendencies are fostered and strengthened by his environment, and how entirely the good ones are neglected! And so incarnation after incarnation is almost wasted, and a life which, with just a little more care and self-restraint on the part of the parents and teachers, might have borne rich fruit of spiritual development, comes practically to nothing, and at its close leaves scarce any harvest to be garnered into the ego of which it has been so very one-sided an expression.

When one watches the criminal carelessness with which those who are responsible for the bringing-up of children allow them to be perpetually surrounded by all kinds of evil and worldly thoughts, one ceases to marvel at the extraordinary slowness of human evolution, and the almost imperceptible progress which is all that the ego has to show for life after life spent in the toil and struggle of this lower world. Yet with so little more trouble so vast an improvement might be introduced! It needs no astral vision to see what a change would come over this weary old world if the majority, or even any large proportion of the next generation, were subjected to the process suggested above—if all their evil qualities were steadily repressed and atrophied for lack of nourishment, while all the good in them was assiduously cultivated and developed to the fullest possible extent. One has only to think what they in turn would do for *their* children to realize that in two or three generations all the conditions of life would be different, and a true golden age would have begun. For the world at large that age may still be distant, but surely we who are members of the Theosophical Society ought

each to be doing our best to hasten its advent; and though the influence of our example may not extend very far, it is at least within our power to see that our own children have for their development every advantage which we can give them.

The very greatest care, then, ought to be taken as to the surroundings of children, and people who will persist in thinking coarse and unloving thoughts should at least learn that while they are doing so they are unfit to come near the young, lest they infect them with a contagion more virulent than fever. Much care is needed, for example, in the selection of the nurses to whom children must sometimes be committed; though it is surely obvious that the less they are left in the hands of servants the better. Nurses often develope the strongest affection for their charges, and treat them as though they were of their own flesh and blood, yet this is not invariably the case; and, however that may be, it should be remembered that the servants are almost inevitably less educated and less refined than their mistresses, and that therefore a child who is left too much to their companionship is constantly subjected to the impact of thought which is at least not unlikely to be of a less elevated order than even the average level of that of his parents. So that the mother who wishes her child to grow up into a refined and delicate-minded man should entrust him to the care of others as little as possible, and should above all things take good heed to her own thoughts while watching over him.

Her great and cardinal rule should be to allow herself to harbour no thought and no desire which she would not wish to see reproduced in her son. Nor is this merely negative conquest over herself sufficient, for happily all that has been said about the influence and power of thought is true of good thoughts just as much as of evil ones, and so the parents' duty has a positive as well as a negative side. Not only must they abstain most carefully from fostering, by unworthy or selfish thoughts of their own, any evil tendency which may exist in their child, but it is also their duty to cultivate in themselves strong unselfish affection, pure thoughts, high and noble aspirations, in order that all these may react upon their charge, quicken whatever of good is already latent in him, and create a tendency towards any good quality which is as yet unrepresented in his character.

Nor need they have any fear that such effort on their part will fail in its effect, because they are unable to follow its action for lack of astral vision. To the sight of a trained clairvoyant the whole transaction is obvious; he would distinguish the vibrations set up in the mind-body of the parent by the inception of the thought, would see it radiating forth, and note the sympathetic vibration created by its impingement upon the mind-body of the child; and if he renewed his observations at intervals during some considerable period he would discern the gradual but permanent change produced in that mind-body by the constant repetition of the same stimulus to progress. If the parents themselves possessed the astral sight, it would no doubt be of great assistance to them in showing exactly what were the capabilities of their child, and in what directions he most needed development; but if they have not yet that advantage, there need not therefore be the slightest doubt or question about the result, for that must follow sustained effort with mathematical certainty, whether the process of its working be visible to them or not.

And not only should a parent watch his thoughts, but his moods also. A child is quick to notice and to resent injustice; and if he finds himself scolded at one time for an action which on another occasion caused only amusement, what wonder that his sense of the invariability of nature's laws is outraged! Again, when trouble or sorrow comes upon the parent, as in this world it sometimes must, it is surely his duty to try as far as possible to prevent his load of grief from weighing upon his children as well as upon himself; at least when in their presence he should make a special effort to be cheerful and resigned, lest the dull leaden hue of depression should extend itself from his aura to theirs. Yet again, many a well-meaning parent has an anxious and fussy nature—is always fidgetting about trifles, and worrying his children and himself about matters which are really quite unimportant. If he could but observe clairvoyantly the utter unrest and disquiet which he thus produces in his aura, and could further see how these vibrations introduce quite unnecessary agitation and irritation into the susceptible auras of his children, he would no longer be surprised at their occasional outbursts of petulance or nervous excitability, and would realize that in such a case he is often far more to blame than they. What he should contemplate and set before him as his object is a restful,

unruffled spirit—the peace which passeth all understanding—the perfect calm which comes from the confidence that all will at last be well.

It is further obvious that the training of the parents' character which is necessitated by these considerations is in every respect a splendid one, and that in thus helping on the evolution of their children they also benefit themselves to an extent which is absolutely incalculable, for the thoughts which at first have been summoned by conscious effort for the sake of the child will soon become natural and habitual, and will in time form the background of the parents' entire life.

It must not be supposed that these precautions may be relaxed as the child grows older, for though this extraordinary sensitiveness to the influence of his surroundings commences as soon as the ego descends upon the embryo long before birth takes place, it continues in most cases up to about the period of maturity. If such influences as are above suggested have been brought to bear upon him during infancy and childhood, the boy of twelve or fourteen will be far better equipped for the efforts which lie before him than his less fortunate companions with whom no special trouble has been taken. But it must be remembered that he is still far more impressionable than an adult, and the same strong help and guidance upon the mental plane must still be continued in order that the good habits both of thought and of action may not yield before the newer temptations which are likely to assail him.

Although in his earlier years it was naturally chiefly to his parents that he had to look for such assistance, all that has been said of their duties applies equally to anyone who comes into contact with children in any capacity, and most especially to those who undertake the tremendous responsibilities of the teacher. This influence for good or for evil over his pupils is one that cannot readily be measured, and (exactly as before) it depends not only upon what he says or what he does, but even more upon what he thinks. Many a master repeatedly reproves in his boys the exhibition of tendencies for the creation of which he is himself directly responsible; if his thought is selfish or impure, then he will find selfishness and impurity reflected all around him, nor does the evil caused by such a thought end with those whom it

immediately affects. The young minds upon which it is reflected take it up and magnify and strengthen it, and thus it reacts upon others in turn and becomes an unholy tradition handed down from one generation of boys to another, and so stamps its peculiar character upon a particular school or a particular class. The epidemic of vice which saps the life-blood of so many of our great schools could never have attained its present terrible dimensions if the thoughts of those who should have guided them had always remained pure and true. But happily a good tradition may be set up almost as easily as a bad one—not quite as easily, because there are always undesirable external influences to be taken into account; but still a teacher who realizes his responsibilities and manages his school upon the principles that have been suggested will very soon find that his self-control and self-devotion has not been fruitless.

I am convinced that there is only one way in which either parent or teacher can really obtain effective influence over a child and draw out all the best that is in him—and that is by winning his love and confidence. It is true that obedience may be extracted and discipline preserved by inspiring fear, but rules enforced by such a method are kept only so long as he who imposes them (or someone representing him) is present, and are invariably broken when there is no fear of detection; the child keeps them because he must, and not because he wishes to do so. But if, on the other hand, his affection has been invoked, his will at once ranges itself upon the side of the rule; he wishes to keep it, because he knows that in breaking it he would cause sorrow to one whom he loves; and if only this feeling be strong enough it will enable him to rise superior to all temptation, and the rule will be binding no matter who may be present or absent. Thus the object is attained not only much more thoroughly, but also much more easily and pleasantly both for teacher and pupil, and all the best side of the child's nature is called into activity, instead of all the worst. Instead of rousing the child's will into sullen and persistent opposition, the teacher arrays it on his own side in the contest against distractions or temptations; and thus results are achieved which could never be approached on the other system.

It is of the utmost importance always to try to understand the child, and to make him feel certain that he has one's friendliness and sympathy. All appearance of harshness must be carefully avoided,

and the reason of all instructions given to him should always be fully explained. It must indeed be made clear to him that sometimes sudden emergencies arise in which the older person has no time to explain his instructions, and he should understand that in such a case he should obey even though he may not fully comprehend; but even then the explanation should always be given afterwards. Unwise parents or teachers often make the mistake of habitually exacting obedience without understanding—a most unreasonable demand; indeed, they expect from the child at all times and under all conditions an angelic patience and saintliness which they are very far indeed from possessing themselves. They have not yet realized that harshness towards a child is always not only wicked but absolutely unreasonable and foolish as well, since it can never be the most effective way of obtaining from him what is desired.

It often happens that many of a child's faults are the direct results of the unnatural way in which he is treated. Sensitive and nervous to a degree, he constantly finds himself misunderstood and scolded or ill-treated for offences whose turpitude he does not in the least comprehend; is it wonderful that when the whole atmosphere about him reeks with the deceit and falsehood of his elders, his fears should sometimes drive him into untruthfulness also? Certainly in such a case the karma of the sin will fall most heavily upon those who by their criminal harshness have placed a weak and undeveloped being in a position where it was almost impossible to avoid it. If we expect truth from our children, we must first of all practise it ourselves; we must think truth as well as speak truth and act truth, before we can hope to be strong enough to save them from the sea of falsehood and deceit which surrounds us on every side. But if we treat them as reasonable beings—if we explain fully and patiently what we want from them, and show them that they have nothing to fear from us (for "perfect love casteth out fear")—then we shall find no difficulty about truthfulness.

A curious but not at all uncommon delusion—a relic perhaps of the terrible days when this unhappy country groaned under the ghastly tyranny of Puritanism—is that children can never be good unless they are unhappy, that they must be thwarted at every turn, and never by any chance allowed to have their own way in anything, because when they are enjoying themselves they must necess-

arily be in a condition of desperate wickedness! Absurd and atrocious as this doctrine is, various modifications of it are still widely prevalent, and it is responsible for a vast amount of cruelty and unnecessary misery wantonly inflicted upon little creatures whose only crime was that they were natural and happy. Undoubtedly nature intended that childhood should be a happy time, and we ought to spare no efforts to make it so, for in that respect as in all others if we thwart nature we do so at our peril.

It will help us much in our dealings with children if we remember that they also are egos, that their small and feeble physical bodies are after all but the accident of the moment, and that in reality we are all about the same age. Our business in training them is to develope only that in their lower nature which will co-operate with the ego—which will make it a better channel for the ego to work through. Long ago, in the golden age of the old Atlantean civilization, the importance of the office of the teacher of children was so fully recognized that none was permitted to hold it except a trained clairvoyant, who could see all the latent qualities and capabilities of his charges, and could therefore work intelligently with each so as to develope what was good in him and to amend what was evil. In the distant future of the sixth race it may be that that will be so once more; but that time is as yet far away, and we have to do our best under less favourable conditions. Yet unselfish affection is a wonderful quickener of the intuition, and those who really love their children will rarely be at a loss to comprehend their needs; and keen and persistent observation will give them, though at the cost of much more trouble, some approach to the clearer insight of their Atlantean predecessors. At any rate it is well worth the trying, for when once we realize our true responsibility in relation to children we shall assuredly think no labour too great which enables us to discharge it better.

A word should be said in conclusion upon the subject of religious training. Many members of our Society, while feeling that their children need something to take the place filled in ordinary education by the religious training, have yet found it almost impossible so to put Theosophy before them as to make it in any way intelligible to them. Some have even permitted their children to go through the ordinary routine of bible lessons, saying that they did not know

what else to do, and that though much of the teaching was obviously untrue it could be corrected afterwards. This, however, is a course which is entirely indefensible; no child should ever waste its time in learning what it will have to unlearn afterwards. If the true inner meaning of Christianity could be taught to our children, that indeed were well, because of course that would be pure Theosophy; but unfortunately that is not the form which religious instruction takes in our schools.

Nor is there any real difficulty in putting the grand truths of Theosophy intelligibly before the minds of our children. Certainly it is useless at first to trouble them with rounds and races, with lunar pitris and mânasaputra; but then, however interesting and valuable all this information may be, it is of little importance in the practical regulation of conduct, whereas the great ethical truths upon which the whole system rests can happily be made clear even to the childish understanding. What could be simpler in essence than the three great truths which are given to Sensa in *The Idyll of the White Lotus?*

"The soul of man is immortal, and its future is the future of a thing whose growth and splendour have no limit.

"The principle which gives life dwells in us and without us, is undying and eternally beneficent, is not heard nor seen or smelt, but is perceived by the man who desires perception.

"Each man is his own absolute law-giver, the dispenser of glory or gloom to himself—the decreer of his life, his reward, his punishment.

"These truths, which are as great as is life itself, are as simple as the simplest mind of man. Feed the hungry with them."

We might express these more tersely by saying: "Man is immortal; God is good; as we sow, so shall we reap." But surely none of our children can fail to grasp these simple ideas in their broad outline, though as they grow older they may spend many a year in learning more and more of the immensity of their full meaning. Teach them the grand old formula that "death is the gate of life"—not a terrible fate to be feared, but simply a stage of progress to be welcomed with interest. Teach them to live, not for themselves, but for others—to go through the world as friends and helpers, earnest in loving reverence and care for all

living things. A child's sympathies are so easily roused, and his delight in doing something is so great that he responds at once to the idea that he should try to help, and should never harm, all the creatures around him. He should be taught to be observant, that he may see where help is needed, whether by man or by animal, and promptly to supply the want so far as lies in his power.

A child likes to be loved, and he likes to protect, and both these feelings may be utilized in training him to be a friend of all creatures. He will readily learn to admire flowers as they grow, and not wish to pluck them heedlessly, casting them aside a few minutes later to wither on the road side; those which he plucks he will pick carefully, avoiding injury to the plant; he will preserve and tend them, and his way through wood and field will never be traceable by fading blossoms and uprooted plants.

As the parent teaches the child he will also be obliged to set the example in this as in other things, and so the child will thus again civilize his elders as well as improve himself. Birds and butterflies, cats and dogs, all will be his friends, and he will delight in their beauty instead of longing to chase or destroy them. Children thus trained will grow up into men and women recognizing their place in evolution and their work in the world, and each will serve as a fresh centre of humanizing force, gradually changing the direction of human influence on all lower things.

If thus we train our children, if we are thus careful in our relations with them, we shall bear nobly our greatest responsibility, and in so doing we shall help on the grand work of evolution; we shall be doing our duty, not only to our children, but to the human race—not only to their egos, but to those of the many millions yet to come.

C. W. LEADBEATER.

THE SÂṄKHYA PHILOSOPHY.

(*Concluded from p.* 74.)

BEFORE entering upon the comparison which follows, I ought to state that the particular Sâṅkhyan doctrine which is to be discussed here rests primarily upon the Bhagavat Gîtâ, while the form in which I use it is drawn from Shrî Shankarâchârya's Commentary upon that scripture. At the present day in India it would undoubtedly be accepted as orthodox Sâṅkhyan teaching, but as I am unable to adduce any older authorities for it than the Gîtâ and Shankarâchârya's commentary, it is at least open to question as to how far it belongs to the original Sâṅkhya. The statement in the Gîtâ most probably embodies an ancient oral tradition, so that in this respect we are likely to be upon fairly safe ground; but with Shankarâchârya's explanation of it the matter stands otherwise. In the first place, the commentary ascribed to that great teacher seems to me to lack those internal evidences which one expects to find in a genuine work of his, and seems rather to belong to a comparatively late stage in the development of Vedântic thought; secondly, the explanation of the passage in question, though undoubtedly embodying a very ancient tradition, is given as a Vedântic rather than as an explicitly Sâṅkhyan teaching. Still it may well be of true Sâṅkhyan origin, because the Vedânta has so obviously taken over the whole of the Sâṅkhyan teaching on cosmology that this particular point, if Sâṅkhyan originally, would naturally be adopted along with the rest. But the question cannot be decided in the present state of our knowledge, and so I shall treat the teaching in question as orthodox Sâṅkhya for the purposes of this comparison.

The passage in the Gîtâ which is of interest to us occurs in the seventh chapter, shlokas 4 and 5, which run as follows:

"Earth, water, fire, air, space, mind, understanding and egoism,

thus is my nature divided eight-fold. But this is a lower (form of my) nature. Know (that there is) another (form of my) nature, and higher than this, which is animate, oh, you of mighty arms! and by which this universe is upheld."

These verses are explained in the commentary ascribed to Shankarâchârya, as meaning that the life informing these various modifications of Prakṛiti is to be distinguished from the mere matter which encases it, though in concrete manifestation the two are so intimately associated that they are commonly taken together under the one name of Prakṛiti and its various modifications.

Turning now to our theosophical teaching, we have learnt, comparatively recently, that there are three distinct outpourings of the Divine Life. Of these, the first, proceeding from the Third Logos, calls into existence the matter of the various planes, and constitutes the life of atoms and molecules of matter. Into the great ocean of matter thus formed, the Second Logos pours forth the second great life-wave, which becomes the evolving monadic essence on plane after plane, building matter into form, and constituting the informing life and consciousness of all forms and creatures; always working in and through the matter called into existence by the first outpouring, ever functioning in conjunction with it in such intimate association, that for practical purposes even close students take them both together and only emphasize the distinction when there is special need for so doing. Finally, it is into the vehicle ultimately evolved by the monadic essence working upwards through matter that there descends the third outpouring, which is the pledge and guarantee of man's true immortality.

It seems that we have here a teaching very closely resembling the Sâṅhkyan doctrine which I have sketched above. There we had the matter and the informing life, both termed Prakṛiti, and both presided over and subservient to the interests of the Puruṣha, the individual soul, which would thus answer to the ray from the third outpouring of the divine life, which becomes individualized in the causal body of man, which is formed from the upward evolving monadic essence of the second life-wave veiled in the matter of the arûpa levels of the mânasic plane.

If this idea be true, it explains also why, in the Sâṅkhya, all action and its resultant karma is ascribed to Prakṛiti, while Puruṣha

is always asserted to be actionless and ever in itself exempt from suffering, stain or evil.

For we know that the binding effect of karma arises entirely from the self-centered desire which prompts to, or accompanies action. But this self-seeking desire obviously belongs exclusively to the causal body and the lower vehicles of man, and disappears more and more completely when consciousness becomes focussed and seated in the buddhic plane. This is clear from the fact that the dominant characteristic of consciousness when functioning on the buddhic plane is the complete absence of that "sense of separateness," which we all must recognize as the very root and mainspring of all self-seeking and desire to possess or enjoy. Therefore it seems not improbable that we shall be right in associating desire for self with the upward evolving monadic essence which has formed the causal body, and which—in present ordinary humanity—is the highest *active* element in man's constitution. For it is well-known that although the âtmic ray, or third outpouring, does exist within the causal body, yet it plays no active part, exerts no direct control or action upon its vehicles until these have attained a comparatively advanced condition of unfoldment and evolution. Thus for all practical purposes it would seem to be true—in regard to ordinary humanity in its present stage of progress—that all action proceeds from this monadic essence which has formed the causal body, or from the impulsions arising in the still lower vehicles. In other words, it all proceeds from Prakṛiti, and the saying of the Gîtâ becomes intelligible that "all action is Prakṛiti-born." For in ordinary mankind the âtmic ray is as yet quite undeveloped, even its buddhic vehicle is the merest thread, so that even in a man of well-developed intellect all his actions and activities have no higher source than the activity of the monadic essence of the second great outpouring, which forms his causal body.

The reader must here be reminded that these views are put forward as suggestions, as tentative gropings claiming neither authority, weight nor finality other than such as their inherent reasonableness may seem to deserve. For in the present state of our knowledge both of Theosophy and of Hindu philosophical thought, it is a most difficult task to determine with any accuracy the points of contact and the true parallelisms between the two.

For those who are able to perceive and know the truth of things on this and on higher planes by direct, immediate perception, such purely intellectual studies as these will, I am fully conscious, appear uninteresting and of small, if any, value. But I would humbly venture to remind them that even such exalted faculties as they enjoy must, of necessity, be liable to error and imperfection so long as any, even the smallest, trace of the personality remains. For in the language of the Sâṅkhya, until the ahaṅkâra, the individual "I," with its special idiosyncrasies and peculiarities, has become perfectly assimilated to and unified with the Divine Ray which informs it, all that can be seen even on the plane of the ego itself must, it would seem, be tinged and coloured by those special peculiarities and characteristics. This at least is the unanimous burden of Hindu teaching, and it certainly seems both inherently reasonable and entirely consonant with all our experience on this plane, where we members of the Theosophical Society have only too often had to lament in ourselves and in others the purblindness of intellect and of heart which results from prejudice, preconception, national or racial inheritance, and individual idiosyncrasy of mind or feeling.

Recognizing this, and bearing in mind that all free progress in knowledge has been the work of many minds, it may not be unprofitable for us to seek in the works of those who have gone before us for clues and indications by which to check our own observations and theorizings no less than to guide our attention to what might otherwise escape us. Herein, it seems to me, lies the great value for us all of such work as Mr. Mead is doing upon the Gnostic systems, and I should welcome with enthusiasm the appearance among us of workers who would qualify themselves to undertake, in the immensely vaster field of Hindu thought, such work as he is doing in that of the Gnostic schools.

BERTRAM KEIGHTLEY.

THEOSOPHICAL ACTIVITIES.

European Section.

Three new Branches of this Section have been formed in Holland within the past month, at Rotterdam, the Hague and Vlaardingen. These Branches bring the number in Holland to seven, the number required to form an independent Section. Application will shortly be made by these Lodges to the President-Founder so that they may form the Dutch Section, which will be the seventh belonging to the Society. Very close and friendly relations have always existed between the Dutch members and the European Headquarters, but owing to the difficulty of language, the office at Amsterdam has always been the real centre of the Dutch members for local business. The two Sections will of course work together as closely as heretofore, excepting only in purely business matters.

The Blavatsky Lodge lectures have been well attended throughout the past month, this being especially the case with the Sunday evening meetings, which concluded with the one on the Sunday before Easter. The last few meetings dealt with the subjects of hell and its correspondences in real nature, karma, with a series of illustrations drawn from the observations of successive incarnations, yoga, and magic in its various forms. Mr. Leadbeater in this course has condensed an immense amount of information, much of it quite fresh to his hearers, into a very short space of time. Mr. Mead in his lecture on "Theological Geometry" illustrated his somewhat abstruse subject by an excellent series of models of the Platonic solids and their variations.

Australian Section.

The Sydney Branch began a course of meetings with the new year, giving a progressive outline of Theosophical teachings, the course to extend over four months. The quarterly general meeting was held on Jan. 5th, at which Mons. Coulomb, formerly well-known in Theosophical literature under the pseudonym of Amaravella, was present and assisted. Some of the Lodges had a vacation of two or three weeks at Christmas, but have begun their meetings again as usual. The "Day-

spring" Branch at Sydney held its annual meeting on Jan. 11th, when the usual business matters were discussed. The President read a short general paper on Theosophy, following which was a discussion.

American Section.

Mrs. Besant's long and stormy journey of nearly five weeks from India to America was completed on Thursday, March 18th, when she arrived in New York, and was welcomed by Mr. Fullerton, the General Secretary of the American Section.

Even on the landing-place a number of reporters surrounded Mrs. Besant, and a paper, *The Tribune*, received on the way to the hotel, already contained a notice of her arrival. The whole afternoon was occupied in interviews, and the papers next day contained accounts—more or less inaccurate, but on the whole very friendly in character—of what Mrs. Besant had said.

Time flew on Friday and Saturday in receiving people, writing articles and letters, and in making final arrangements for the lecture to be given in Chickering Hall on Sunday evening.

Early on Sunday morning the Countess Wachtmeister arrived from Buffalo and Toronto, where she had been lecturing daily and working with many people in the movement. The Countess is still very exhausted after her arduous labours, which resulted in the formation of thirteen Branches and one centre for study and also in many new members.

The Countess accompanies Mrs. Besant, and thus the tour will be one of double activity.

During the absence of Mr. Walters, Count Axel Wachtmeister has been the acting editor of *Mercury*, the American Theosophical journal, and under his careful direction the paper has improved and is largely extending its circulation.

Mrs. Besant's first lecture in Chickering Hall on Sunday was a distinct success; the audience was attracted and interested, and the slides representing sketches of thought-forms and auras showed up well.

On Monday evening, after a busy day spent in seeing enquirers, in correspondence and in arranging the details of the proposed six months' tour through the States, a reception was held in the largest room of the hotel, and for an hour and a half a crowd of attentive listeners proved that the Americans are ready to hear and appreciate Theosophy.

The next two weeks are full of appointments, and Mrs. Besant is

now well launched on her American work, with every indication so far that the result will be a great revival of public interest in the Theosophical movement and that groups of students will be formed into Lodges of the Society.

On March 29th we leave for Washington, and the week is to be spent between that place and Philadelphia, the return to New York being in time for the Sunday lecture. On Monday, April 5th, we start for St. Louis, and will go on to Kansas, Topeka, Denver, Colorado, Leadville, Salt Lake City, and Ogden, on the way to Los Angeles.

A. J. W.

Ceylon Letter.

The latest movement organised in Ceylon is entitled the "Ceylon Band of Mercy." It is founded in connection with the Musaeus School and Orphanage and its object is to protect animals from ill-usage. We hope that several branches of the movement will be established.

The buildings in connection with the Musaeus School and Orphanage are practically finished now. The Institution was re-opened in February, and the house is now quite full of pupils.

Through the kindness of Mr. Hack, a competent assistant to Mrs. Higgins has been found in Miss Gweiner, from Adelaide.

The Hope Lodge meets every Sunday regularly. Beside the usual syllabus the reading of the *Growth of the Soul* has been taken up.

Mrs. Pickett, the mother of the late Miss Pickett, has assumed the direction of the Sangamitta Girls' School.

New Zealand Section.

The following report has been received:

The holidays are now quite over, and Branch meetings and classes have begun again.

The Auckland lectures and public meetings of late have been very well attended, there having been a steady growth of public interest during the last six months. Miss Edger's lectures since her return have drawn very large audiences and have been followed by long and interesting discussions. The subjects of the last two were "Practical Theosophy" and "Reincarnation."

There also seems to be a great interest in Theosophy in Christchurch, and the Branch grows steadily. Mrs. Draffin's recent lectures there evoked much interest, all of them being very well attended; one in particular, given in "Our Father's Church" and forming part of the evening service, drawing an audience of about 700.

Mr. and Mrs. Draffin's visit to the Branches has been very successful on the whole, and in conjunction with the General Secretary's recent tour should lead to increased activity everywhere.

We have to announce the final passing from his present body of our colleague John C. Staples, the General Secretary of the Australasian Section. For further details readers are referred to "On the Watch-Tower."

REVIEWS.

The Rational or Scientific Ideal of Morality.

By P. F. Fitzgerald. [London: Swan Sonnenschein; 1897.]

This work is not at all an easy one to review conscientiously. Its title page leads one to expect a systematic, consecutively coherent attempt to formulate the basis of a science of morals, and therefore the reader is unpleasantly affected when on attacking the book itself he finds these qualities absent to an irritating extent. The table of contents is to some degree a help in ascertaining what the author is aiming at; but one is brought up sharply every few pages by finding the thread of argument breaking off suddenly, and what seems a new and quite disconnected line abruptly taken up.

The effect of this is to produce the impression that the author has never fused his work into a whole in the fire of thought, but has contented himself with stringing together the notes, observations and reflections which from time to time he has jotted down, into this semblance of a book. Most assuredly it is not a creation, but a patchwork, and as such very disappointing to every lover of good and thorough work. Still that is not all which must be said in fairness to the author. For the book contains a certain amount of real thought—a rare enough commodity in these days—and here and there luminous and acute remarks. Besides, there is a queer flavour about it which attracts one's interest towards the writer. Think of a quasi-scholastic theologian, transplanted from the atmosphere of Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas and grafted upon the stock of nineteenth century neural psychology and German philosophy, and one has the two main currents which feed the author's mind. The result is, to say the least, singular and interesting from its very strangeness.

The basis of the whole is a philosophical theism—mediæval theism in the garb of later German philosophy—the validity of which, it is to be presumed, the author believes himself to have established in other works. Mediæval as his theism appears in phrase and tone, yet it is in several points very much up-to-date, if not *fin de siècle*, and no appeal whatsoever is made to revelation as such, though the writer seems to lean towards a vague theory of the divine revealing or unfolding itself through the minds of men, and his scriptures appear to be the works of all great poets and thinkers. His rather laboured paragraphs of philosophico-theological reasoning are interspersed with bright, acute remarks and quotations from many writers, which break in, not unwelcome, on the heaviness of many a page.

With a theistic basis of this kind, the problem of an ethic is not very difficult of solution, and with such broad lines to work upon it is not surprising that the conclusions should in many points coincide with those at which theosophical students have arrived. But it is certainly an original idea to make the doctrine of complemental or counterpartal souls—one male, the other female—a cardinal principle and conspicuous feature of his ethical philosophy. It is perhaps hardly fair to demur, on such a point, to the author's assumption that the soul *per se* is either male or female. But the fact remains that so far as I can discover not the smallest attempt is anywhere made in this work to justify, let alone to prove, this very gigantic assumption. And of course unless the assumption is either proved or granted, the moral theories built upon it are wholly baseless and void. Even thus, however, it may be interesting to see what the author makes out of the assumption he so calmly takes for granted.

To begin with, he holds, though nowhere does he prove, that complemental union is not only necessary for happiness, but for spiritual evolution. His argument in support of this amounts merely to the remark that since every human being is *eo ipso* imperfect and one-sided in development, as well as possessed of definite individual idiosyncrasies, hereditary and other, *therefore* perfection can only be attained through spiritual union with a complemental spirit. But in Heaven's name, why? One can imagine other ways of reaching such perfection, *e.g.*, our own theosophical doctrine of continual reincarnation. This conception and argument turns up again and again throughout the book, but one never seems to get at any sounder reasoning and more satisfactory proof.

To conclude: there is much of interest in this work for the thoughtful and *patient* reader; but judged according to its title page,

one must class it as a failure lacking in many most important essentials of lasting, solid work.

B. K.

THE NIGHT OF THE GODS.

By John O'Neill, Vol. II. [London: David Nutt: 1897.]

THE first volume of this work was reviewed in LUCIFER for October, 1893, by Mr. Mead, who dealt so thoroughly with the general purpose and scope of the work as to render it needless to go over the ground again in connection with the second volume. We must, however. thank Mr. Nutt for sending both volumes together at the present time, for the book is an exceeding useful and valuable one for purposes of reference, and contains an immensity of matter most interesting to students of comparative religion. And therefore, while confining this notice mainly to the new volume, we must again draw the attention of all students in our ranks to the claim which the now complete work has for a place on their shelves.

The present volume, while following out the same general lines of thought and research as its predecessor, deals mainly with myths embodying the idea of the wheel, circle or sphere of the heavens. The original feature in Mr. O'Neill's theory of the origin of these myths is that he substitutes for the time-worn solar theory the conception that it was the profound impression made upon the imagination of primitive man by the sublime spectacle of the revolution of the star-bespangled heavens as a whole round the north pole, which become symbolically associated, even if it did not originate, the idea of the wheel, whether in the form of the revolving millstone, the cart-wheel, the fire-wheel, the potter's wheel, etc., or any other symbol or example of rotary motion. This is at any rate an advance on the worn out solar theory of myths; though naturally from the theosophical standpoint it is even ludicrously inadequate for an explanation of the facts. But at any rate it serves as a not inefficient thread upon which Mr. O'Neill can string a large and most interesting collection of facts and instances, of legends and stories, of striking and, alas, very often unsound, etymologies.

In the first chapter we find quite a unique collection of examples grouped under the sub-heads of the praying-wheel, the fire-wheel, the heavens-wheel, the wheel-god, the wheel of fortune, the Egyptian glyph Ra, the wreath, all culminating in the Romaunt of the Rose and the Rose-windows of our Gothic cathedrals.

The second chapter carries on the wheel idea into association with

Buddha's footprints and other sacred imprints of the kind; the connecting idea being that of the God or hero of the heavens circumnambulating the Pole and leaving behind him his footprints as he does so. And so we are led through the three Steps of Vishnu, the three Legs of Manx and Irish legend to the Svastika, the labyrinth, the conch-shell and the Chakra or discus as a weapon. Thence to other allied weapons of various gods is an easy step, and so we find the wheel-theory threatening, like the solar theory, to swallow up the whole of mythology within its octopus grasp. For this same circular motion again is clearly the origin of dancing in religious rites; while the sphere in all its varieties from the winged sphere to the winged scarab only too obviously come into the same category. So at the end of this part, while full of gratitude to the author for the mass of materials which his learning and untiring research has thus focussed into an accessiable form, one cannot help wondering whether it ever struck him that a theory which explains too much explains nothing at all. And thus the very ingenuity and vastness of his work raises one's doubts as to the soundness of the substructure upon which he builds. And this feeling only tends to grow after reading—with intense interest, one cannot deny—the remaining chapters dealing with gods, rivers and mountains in myth and explaining any number of them in the same way. But one thing is certain, and that is the great debt which all serious students are under to the author for the immense mass of materials which he has amassed with such ungrudging labour and, with but few exceptions, minute and careful accuracy. An admirable index doubles the value of the work, and we only regret that stern death should have deprived us of one from whose continued labours so much valuable work was to have been expected.

B. K.

The Tattva Kaumudi of Vâchaspati Mishra.

A commentary on the Sâṅkhya-Kârikâ of Îshvara-Kṛishṇa, translated into English by Gangânâtha Jhâ, with the Sanskrit Text appended. [Bombay: 1896.]

Both the Sâṅkhya-Kârikâ of Îshvara-Kṛishṇa and the Sâṅkhya system of philosophy which the Kârikâ summarizes, are too well known to need any introduction here. But the Tattva-Kaumudî, or the Moonlight of Truth, as Vâchaspati Mishra calls his commentary on the Kârikâ, though as famous in India as its reputed author, is probably unknown to most people outside the limited circle of Sanskritists. A

translation, therefore, of such a work is welcome, and as far as I know this is the first attempt to put the Tattva-Kaumudî into an English form.

Although such books will not have much interest for those students of Theosophy whose object is more to realize truth at first hand than merely to reason upon it, they will, nevertheless, appeal to people who are still mainly concerned with the intellectual aspect and consider, as Mr. Davies, the translator of the Kârikâ, does, such inferential speculations as true philosophy. For the Tattva-Kaumudî, also the Kârikâ, and even the very Sâṅkhya aphorisms attributed to Kapila, as we now have them, are nothing more than inductions and inferences which can never satisfy the student who desires first hand knowledge. They are all entirely different from the original Sâṅkhya, which meant nothing more than "exposition" (Saṅkhyâyate anena iti), or "systematizing" of the *theory*, as opposed to Yoga, which originally meant *practice* or "application," in which sense it has been used even in the Gîtâ, when Shrî Kṛishna says: "Yoga is skilfulness in action" (II. 50). This contrast of Sâṅkhya and Yoga, science and art, theory and practice (or application, applying or joining oneself to *activity* and *not* to the Universal Self, for the Upaniṣhads never recognized two Selfs, individual and universal), is noticeable even in the Upaniṣhads. The Sâṅkhya, in fact, originated in an attempt to systematize and put into *scientific* and exact form the teachings of the Upaniṣhads, which in their spiritual enthusiasm disregarded all rules of a scientific language, such as exact definition of terms, the use of the same terms in the same sense throughout, and so on. They are indeed outbursts of poetry. They supplied, no doubt, facts and observations of seers in the transcendental regions, forming thus the basis of a transcendental science, which is what true philosophy is. But their loose terminology and poetical form caused much confusion to those who had no direct knowledge and had only to infer and speculate. To remove this difficulty, to bring down truth from the domain of poetry to the region of exact science, was the purpose of the Sâṅkhya, which, as has been noticed above, meant nothing more than "exposition" or "theorizing." Thus it is that the Sâṅkhya is the oldest of all schools of Hindu philosophy, being, in fact, synonymous with philosophy. But in later times the expositors almost left the transcendental behind, and dragged down the sublime system of thought to the mere speculation, in which form alone we find it to-day under the name of the Sâṅkhya School of philosophy. To remedy this evil appeared the Vedânta as a system which at once combined the transcendental and the rational. The present

translation, therefore, representing as it does the later Sâṅkhya, will be of interest chiefly to those who want to know more about the speculative life of the Hindus.

One word, however, regarding the author of the commentary, the Moonlight of Truth. Vâchaspati Mishra had such a remarkable adaptability of mind that he could study and write upon almost any school of philosophy from the standpoint of a strong advocate of that school. Thus he has written on the Vedânta, Sâṅkhya, Yoga, and Nyâya, always as a most orthodox representative of his theme. His intellectual life is an excellent example of the manner in which a man can study all subjects and identify himself with all and yet retain his own individuality. His greatest work is the Bhûmatî, a commentary on the Shârîraka Bhâṣhya of Shrî Shaṅkarâchârya.

As regards the present translation, it begins with an introduction giving the main ideas of the technical and speculative Sâṅkhya which will be of use to the beginner, though I am afraid the translation of the technical terms will not give adequate ideas to the reader. This is a very difficult task, as is known to any one who has attempted to translate Sanskrit technical terms into English. The translation also is in many cases rather free, this being probably due to the fact that the language and forms used by a Sanskrit scholiast can hardly be retained in every case. In many instances, however, the translation could be improved. In some cases the omission of a word or two has rendered the meaning imperfect. On page 57, for instance (Kârikâ xviii.), the omission of the phrase "not existing before" (apûrvâbhiḥ), has weakened the strong argument of the original. The translation of the technical term "adhidaivika" by "the supernatural" is more than unpardonable, for a learned Hindu ought to have known that there is no such thing. On the whole, however, the translation will be of service to those who want knowledge more general than critical.

The Sanskrit part is not, of course, meant for English readers. It is prefaced by a short account, or rather a legend, of Vâchaspati Mishra's life.

As regards the get up of the book, I am sorry I cannot say much in its favour. The author is not free from the chronic Hindu malady of mistransliteration of Sanskrit terms, which in this case may be due to the fault of the printer, who, though he may be excused for misprints in the English part of the book, is surely to be blamed for the numerous errors in the Sanskrit text, which, if the author tried to collect all, would swell his list of errata to a far greater bulk. It is a great pity that our Hindu people are so careless in this respect. J. C. C.

The Bible and the East.

By Lt.-Col. C. R. Conder, R.E. [London: William Blackwood and Sons.]

This work promises to give its readers in small compass the results of the latest explorations in Palestine, Egypt, and Assyria, and their bearings on the narratives of the Old Testament. Written, as it is, by one so thoroughly competent for the task as Lt.-Col. Conder (for so many years the leader of the Palestine Survey), it cannot fail to be valuable reading. It is written throughout from the standpoint of a devout believer in "the Bible, the whole Bible"—I cannot, however, conclude the quotation, for even in its pages we come on many an admission that "nothing but the Bible" is now out of date. With the cheery, breezy confidence which generally marks the religion of an old military or naval officer, he opens his batteries against the destructive school of criticism, and with a few sharp paragraphs like cannon-balls, finishes off to his own satisfaction the whole German position. On his main contention he is entitled to be heard with respect. He points out, not only that on many points the Egyptian and Assyrian records now first read off by our scholars confirm the Bible narrative, but that the use of the names of places is generally correct; the ancient names of places which did not exist or were otherwise named in Ezra's time, being correctly given in the history which purports to be of the ancient time—a thing we could hardly expect to find in a writer *inventing* it centuries afterwards. Whether however his demonstration goes beyond proof that the severe re-editing, which the sacred books certainly underwent after the captivity, had a foundation of real ancient narrative to work upon, may be fairly questioned. To discuss the matter at full length is a task we may leave to the critics he assails.

The writer would, however, indignantly repudiate what is to us the chief service of his book. He and such as he do a work for the enlightenment of mankind, perhaps at this present time even more useful than if he himself saw clearly the bearings of the new facts he speaks of. We are apt to think that the world's progress depends entirely on those great leaders who stand far ahead and call to us to come on. It might be so were all mankind fully grown, able to see and follow them; in reality the vast mass are children still, and need not an Alpine guide to lead them over glacier and precipice, but a judicious nursemaid to coax them into putting one foot before the other on level ground. These would never open one of our books,

but will read with avidity such a work as this, written by one who shares their faith, in defence of the orthodox view of the Bible. Confident in such a leader, they will take unquestioning such statements as these (to quote one or two out of many such):

"In natural science the belief in a slow development of life on the planet and in the great antiquity of man—historically speaking—is now generally accepted. . . . In the study of antiquity the early civilization of Asia has been proved to have been more perfect and more widely spread than scholars were willing once to believe. . . . The first chapter of Genesis no longer stands alone in literature as an ancient story of creation. The brick tablets of Assyria contain more than one ancient poem of creation. . . . The honest student may be forced to give up much that he once believed, to own that tradition among Hebrew writers in time, as in other cases, sometimes overlaid the figures of great heroes with popular legend, and that they speak to us in the tongue of their own age, not in the language of to-day."

It is far better that the suspicions of the orthodox Christian should not be roused by recognizing the logical bearing of this mode of thought upon his faith. His children will be brought up upon it, and will draw the conclusions he fails to see; and in the next generation (a class we could never have *directly* reached) our position will seem a mere matter of course—the world will have taken its single step forwards and be ready for the next. A. A. W.

THE LUTE OF APOLLO.

By Clifford Harrison. [London: A. D. Innes & Co., 1896. Price 5*s*. net.]

THIS charmingly arranged little book is an attempt to sketch the lines of an answer to that very deeply-rooted and widely-ramified question—What is Music? And in pointing out the paths which seem to him most nearly to reach the end of his enquiry, the author finds himself very close indeed to the Theosophical view. The student of occultism will be dissatisfied with this essay only on the ground of its incompleteness. Looked at from the vantage ground of Theosophical teaching, it is not that the author has trodden ways diverse, but that he has not pursued his road quite far enough. It should have brought him to the solution of his questions concerning what he calls "preternatural senses," to an explanation of that Pythagorean maxim to which he refers, "Everything is Number and Harmony."

But it may be that this criticism is uncalled for, and that Mr. Clifford Harrison has but remembered how much more important it is

to stimulate than to answer enquiry. It seems unlikely that so suggestive a writer would have neglected, in connection with a discourse upon music, to study such side-lights (among others) upon his subject as the law of cycles, the phenomena of clairvoyance touching the identity of colour with sound, and the mantram considered in reference to the laws of vibration.

Deserving of special attention are Mr. Harrison's remarks on the universal appeal of music; his strictures upon the miserably inadequate explanations of it by modern science; his discussion of music in nature, particularly bird-songs; his thoughts on the major and minor, and on the "two polarities," and his defence of the mysteries of number, where he excellently says:

"Before any opinion on the subject can be justly taken there must, at the least, be an acquaintance with the original meaning of numbers; the way they evolve from one another and their significance in other sciences, the meaning of the Monad, opposition, action and return; the resolution of the Ternary into the Quaternary, and back to Unity, not only algebraically but also geometrically, and on other planes; the working and meaning of Theosophical Reduction and Addition; the answering systems in geometry, and the fact that these principles work out in chemistry and all other sciences."

Here are a few sentences worth remembering:

"It is scarcely too fanciful to see in the recognition—intuitive, irrepressible and often unreasonable—which we sometimes give to the beauty of music, even when listening to music of a very poor and trivial character, a proof of the greatness of the force which is at work, and which no limitation or even degradation can make wholly inoperative.

"The mysterious authority and high investiture of music would be more understood and confessed, if we only believed with more than empty phrase, that a great poet is, in the deepest sense of the word, a *seer*. . . .

"The 'poetic' thought or image that will not stand the cold touch of 'scientific' truth, is not worth a moment's consideration, and the sooner it vanishes the better. But a true thought must gain life and force as it faces scrutiny and is handled by 'fact.' . . .

"Everything must surely have its meaning, and one would rather believe that we cannot, in our furthest and most extravagant imaginings, overstate those meanings, than that our feeble and wandering thought can go beyond reality."

Mr. Clifford Harrison has long been known as an exquisite artist

in recitation; he shows himself here an artist no less in prose. His style is delicate, lucid, apt.

The *Lute of Apollo* may be commended to every lover of music, and every lover of thought. L. Ll.

The Bhagavad Gita.

Translated by Annie Besant. [The Theosophical Publishing Society; 1897.]

We have just received a copy of a new and revised edition of Mrs. Besant's translation of the Gîtâ, printed in America by the T.P.S. The whole work has been carefully revised by the translator and one of her Indian colleagues mentioned in the preface. We doubt whether any translator of an old-world theosophical treatise can ever be satisfied with his or her translation. Each time we re-read the original we see some new shade of meaning that has hitherto escaped our notice, and in other respects we believe in Horace's rule to polish and repolish. This our colleagues have done and several passages which remained somewhat obscure in the first edition have started forth from their shadow and become as bright as day. Everyone with the instinct of the true scholar revises, only the stupid or careless rest content with what they have once done.

G. R. S. M.

A bad habit is lessened by abstaining from evil doing; but in order to acquire a good habit, this is not enough; we must practise it actively and steadily.

St. Francis de Sales.

He that works, whatsoever be his work, he bodies forth the forms of Things Unseen.

Carlyle.

But this thing is God,
To be man with thy might,
To grow straight in the strength of thy spirit, and live
Out thy life as the light.

Swinburne.

The Universe is the externalization of the Soul.

Emerson.

THEOSOPHICAL
AND
MYSTIC PUBLICATIONS.

THE Oriental Series of "Old Diary Leaves" has brought us, in *The Theosophist* for March, down to the end of Colonel Olcott's long tour through India, which he spent in lecturing and making mesmeric cures at every halting place. A picturesque description is given of a lecture delivered in front of the famous Hall of a Thousand Columns. Mrs. Besant contributes a valuable article on "The Education of Hindu Youth," sketching briefly a course of instruction especially adapted to the Indian character and present Indian conditions of life. In "Sun-Worship among the Parsis" the author interprets some of the statements by the use of Indian yoga ideas, comparing the nâdis with the symbolical accounts of the action of the sun on the earth. Under the title "Old Indian Theosophy," I. M. Hora translates into English a series of popular poems from the vernacular. The poems all deal with more or less religious subjects, but of course, in the translation, the original rhythm and sound are lost, so that they can hardly appeal to the reader as the translator tells us they do to those who hear them recited in the original. A note on the alleged second rotation of the earth, General Drayson's theory, is of interest to students of astronomy, but somewhat too technical for the general reader.

The Dawn is the title of a new Indian magazine, the first number of which is before us. The purpose of the journal is to give a picture of Hindu life and religion. Among the articles in the first number are: "A Plea for Karmakanda," "The Situation in India," and "What the Time needs." *The Thinker* for February is well up to its proper standard, and contains several articles of interest; S. Ramaswami Aiyar in "Body and Mind as Energy," applies modern psychological ideas to the teachings of the Upaniṣhads. We notice in a reprinted interview with the Swâmi Vivekânanda that this gentleman is now "His Holiness Shrî Swâmi." *The Arya Bâla Bodhini*, has an interesting article on "Dev Dharm," and a sketch of the founder of this sect, followed by "Superstition supported by Science," in which the science is somewhat erratic. We have also to acknowledge the receipt from Benares of *The Prashnottara*, from Calcutta of *The Journal of the Mahâ Bodhi Society*, from Bombay of *The Theosophic Gleaner*, and from Ceylon, of *Rays of Light*.

The Vâhan for April appears without the literary notes that have recently formed so important a feature, but, instead, gives its readers an exceptional quantity of "Enquirer." The answers are much longer than usual, and this is by no means a disadvantage, as there is more opportunity for a really satisfactory reply when space is not cramped. C. W. L. contributes an answer to a question respecting the present representatives of the various sub-races of the Atlantean race and gives some interesting particulars. Some of the answers are of an ethical description and one by A. A. W on savage animals is calculated to raise

a good deal of dispute, the point of view of the writer not being theosophically "orthodox."

Mercury for March opens with a paper by Mrs. Buffington Davis on "The Mission of Theosophy," followed by one on "Hindu Cycles and the Circle's Ratio," by Mr. Marques. The subject is an extension of a curious fact published in "Notes on Cycles," LUCIFER, August, 1894. In these notes it was pointed out that the addition of the well-known Hindu figures representing an age, a year and a day of Brahmâ gave *pi* to several places of decimals. The present writer makes the addition of other sub-divisions representing hours, minutes, seconds, and so on. This does not appear to make the result much closer to *pi* (3·1415927). We do not quite understand why the *most accurate* value of *pi* should be given in the article as between 3·1415926 and 3·1415942, seeing that there is no question in mathematics as to its true value, which can be obtained to any desired degree of accuracy, short of its absolute value. The subject is however of interest, and possibly the writer of the paper may discover some further properties which will make the curious calculations of the Hindu cycles intelligible.

Theosophy in Australia contains an article on "The Growth of the Soul," really a paper on national karma, showing how "the powers that be" may use great men for the working out of their plans. Copious extracts are given from Colonel Olcott's historical sketch of the Society, and the number concludes with the usual questions and answers and activities.

Le Lotus Bleu begins a translation of Mr. Leadbeater's "Invisible Helpers" this month, and continues that of "Dreams." The issue includes an exceptional amount of original matter, "Anikéta" writing "Karma Carmen," a bright and chatty paper on philosophy and literature, treated in a somewhat flippant manner. The article on "Dreams" is followed by an account of a Yogin, Subhapaty Swâmi, and a paper, "The Decisive Step," by M. Gillard, taking as its text the Swâmi's life. We are afraid that our colleagues are not acquainted with the "Meditation Hall" at Bombay over which the much betitled Swâmi presides. M. Guymiot writes on the broad subject of man, and Dr. Pascal on "Pantheism" and "Theosophical Prayer," the latter article being an answer to a criticism in a Parisian review on *l'A. B. C. de la Théosophie.*

L'Isis Moderne, opens with a translation by M. Burnouf of an Indian story. The articles on the oracles and the Gnostics are continued, and Mme. Brunnarius gives an adaptation of a German paper by P. Braun on the power of thought.

M. Jules Bois contributes an article to *La Revue Hebdomadaire* for Feb. 27th, on the after-death states of man, according to Spiritualism, Catholic and other mystics, and Theosophy. The paper, which is entitled "The Pilgrimage of the Soul" is naturally somewhat scrappy as it goes over so wide a ground, but it presents the different views in a clear and sensible manner. *Le Bulletin de la Presse* for March 10th, gives a list of periodicals devoted to "Neo-Spiritualism," in which it has included some Theosophical magazines. The list is, however, very imperfect and would require a much larger supply of names to make it complete. *La Paix Universelle*, a small fortnightly Spiritist journal, gives a long article on "Spiritism in the Theatre," dealing largely with M. Sardou's recent efforts to bring the subject before the public by the aid of Mme. Sarah Bernhardt. Another Parisian play, however, *Kermaria*, at the Opéra Comique, treats of spiritistic matters, so that there are at the time of writing two plays going on simultaneously in Paris dealing with matters more or less occult. *L'Hyperchimie*, for March, opens with an article on the "Principles of Hermetic Science," consisting largely of quotations from M. Pernéty, illustrating the Hermetic ideas of physics. The journal does not deal solely with alchemy,

as commonly understood, but endeavours to discover all kinds of curious connections between apparently detached facts. The concluding paper, on chemistry, points out among other facts that the mean temperature of the blood is also a temperature which plays a prominent part in some physical experiments. Probably, however, most other temperatures would be found to have nearly as many phenomena connected with them.

Sophia for March continues its useful series of translations and also reproduces Mr. Keightley's article on animal reincarnation. The paper on the dates of Indian literature is concluded. *Nova Lux* for March contains the conclusion of the translation of Mr. Kingsland's "Higher Science." In the sketch of the present day movement in the direction of occultism a good deal of information as to various societies and their leaders is given, but the grouping of the bodies is somewhat peculiar.

Lotus Blüthen, for March, reprints a series of short extracts from von Eckhartshausen of ethical and mystical import, and follows this with an article on the teachings of the *Bhagavad Gîtâ*, a new German edition of which is promised. The papers on Karma, which had been discontinued for several months, are now again continued. A little variety in the matter of the articles would be no disadvantage, as the same pious views are repeated at length in each contribution.

Die Zeit, a Vienna weekly journal, publishes in its issue of March 6th, an article from an Indian contributor on "Indian and European Spiritualism." Spiritualism is used, as explained, in an oriental sense and not in the one familiar to us. Theosophy is mentioned in the somewhat scoffing manner usually associated with the degree of knowledge displayed by the writer. When Mrs. Besant's *Reincarnation* is described as a translation of an old Indian book one wonders why the writer should have been tempted to publish his lack of information. We have also to acknowledge the receipt from Vienna of the *Theosophische Rundschau*, in which we are somewhat surprised to note that Mr. Harrison's *Transcendental Universe* has been translated into German by a member of the Theosophical Society. The *Metaphysische Rundschau*, of Berlin, translates Mrs. Besant's "Occult Chemistry" and reproduces the diagrams, the first article is mainly of interest because of the mysterious letters following the pseudonym of the author: "Kama, Censor of the R.O.O.o. S.B.a.S." The paper on argon and helium is concluded.

Theosophia, our Dutch journal, opens with a paper by Afra on a text from the Gospel of John speaking of the love of God for humanity. A translation of the Chinese "Classic of Purity" is also given and some further selections from *The Vâhan*. The *Teosofisk Tidskrift* and *Theosophia* come from Sweden. The former contains articles of general Theosophical interest, and also translates Mrs. Besant's "Culture of the Soul," and Mr. Leadbeater's "Dreams."

We have to acknowledge the receipt from America of *The Metaphysical Magazine*, with one or two psychic stories; *Theosophy*, with an article entitled "A Student's Notes and Guesses," having some ingeniously developed ideas; *Notes and Queries*, containing a smaller allowance of curious facts than usual; *The Theosophical Forum*; *Child-Life*; *The Literary Digest*; *Current Literature*; *Food, Home and Garden*; and *The Pacific Theosophist*. Also the receipt of *Modern Astrology*, with its usual series of astrological articles and notes; *The English Mechanic*; *The Vegetarian*, which is making excellent progress in its contents, a story by Mr. Crockett being included; *To-Morrow*; *Sborník pro Filosofii | Mystiku a Okkultismus*; *Ourselves* and *The Irish Theosophist*.

A.

Women's Printing Society, Limited, 66, Whitcomb Street, W.C.