

ful and well-known "Zanoni,"* especially the piano incident. But for our present purpose the most significant episode in the book is that on which the doctor (the good genius of the tale), in order to restore life to one of the hero's victims, who has been brought into a London Hospital in an apparently dying condition, manages to transfer some of his own "nervous force" to the patient, and so excite a more rapid circulation of the same in her system, thus reviving her, when every other known expedient had been tried and failed. This singular operation he conducts by means of the usual apparatus, electric battery, etc.; but, on making the circle, he sets the whole thing going by sound! (i. e., vibration—occult again). A tuning fork is sounded,—by *mirabile dictu*—a violin bow, and the former at once applied, in a state of intense vibration, to the electric apparatus:—When, hey presto! the thing is done, and the patient revives! *Chambers' Journal* discusses the *Divining Rod* again, and Max Müller, in the December 1889 number of *The New Review*, is the writer of an article which he entitles "What to do with our old people," giving an account of a Brahmin's mode of life at the remote period of history, when social life in India was regulated by the laws of Manu; the point emphasized is the retirement of old people into places apart from the cares of worldly life for silent meditation, and final assumption of the station of Sannyasi ("one who is free from all fetters which bind him to earth"). As a modern instance of this ancient custom, the writer cites the case of Gaorishankar Udayashankar, c. s. i., late Prime Minister of Kathiawar, who, after a life of hard and most important work as administrator and politician, retired into solitude of meditation, subsequently becoming a Sannyasi. He writes thus to Prof. Max Müller:—"My health is failing, and I have made up my mind to enter into the fourth order, or Asrama. Thereby I shall attain that stage in life when I shall be free from all the cares and anxieties of this world, and shall have nothing to do with my present circumstances. After leading a public life for more than 60 years, I think there is nothing left for me to desire, except that life, which will enable my Atma to be one with Paramâtam, as shown by the enlightened sages of old. When this is accomplished, a man is free from births and rebirths, and what can I wish more than what will free me from them, and give me the means to attain Moksha?"....."My learned friend," he continues, "I shall be a Sannyasi in a few days, and thus there will be a total change of life. I shall no more be able to address you, and I send you this letter to convey my best wishes for your success in life, and my regards, which you so well deserve." Truly we may say, what a complete and striking contrast to the Western ideal—"to die in harness"!

Lectures on Theosophic subjects attract large and attentive audiences, more particularly when Mrs. Besant speaks. The *Leicester Post* of Jan. 27th gives a most interesting report of a lecture by that lady—well-known as one of the most eloquent and gifted speakers of modern times. She took at the outset the axiom of Feuerbach, that "Only that which is real is sensible." Space forbids a full account of the lecture, but the reporter concludes by saying that "Mrs. Besant closed with a most eloquent peroration, and at the termination of the lecture answered a large number of questions from persons in the audience."

A. L. C.

* A. C. apparently meant to say "Strange Story."—Ed.

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. XI. No. 127.—APRIL 1890.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

SUMANGALA MAHA NAYAKA.

OUR illustrious friend and colleague, H. Sumangala Thera, has just had conferred upon him by the Chief Priest of Malwatta Vihara, Kandy, the distinction and authority of "High Priest (Maha Nayaka) of the Low Country of Ceylon." In the time of the Kandyan king, the incumbents of the two great monasteries at Kandy, the Malwatta and Asgiri, were Royal priests, outranking all others in the order, as the Archbishop of Canterbury does all others in the Church of England. To them, all questions affecting the discipline of the monks and the interpretation of the Buddhist Scriptures went on final appeal, the king alone having the right to override their orders.

In the Buddhist Monastic Order rank goes by seniority, and in all associations of priests, say in walking along the roads, partaking of food, assemblages for ordination, instruction or preaching, and public functions of every sort, this rule of precedence is strictly observed. It is not any question of superior ecclesiastical or personal sanctity or merit, but only that of seniority in the universal brotherhood of the Bhikshus. In the Pali language the chief of a monastery is called Nayaka; the chief of a sect is Maha Nayaka. In Sumangala Thera's case, he was already the Nayaka of the Monastery of Adam's Peak (the Ceylon Holy Mountain), and of the Priests' Normal College (*Parivena*) at Colombo; by Government commission, he was also High Priest of Galle as well as of Adam's Peak. But now the High Priest of the Royal Malwatta Vihara of Kandy has appointed him to the long vacant dignity of Maha Nayaka of all the low country (the Maritime Provinces, as

distinguished from the Kandyan mountain country), which makes him rank above all priests of the *Siamese sect*, in the Colombo (Western) and Galle (Southern) Provinces. Of the Siamese sect, be it observed, and as there is great ignorance upon this question, a word of explanation will be timely.

In ancient times Ceylon was converted to Buddhism by Mahinda, son of the Indian Emperor Dharmasoka (*circa* 300 B. C.), who, of course, ordained the monks of the Island. The monastic succession ran with greater or less vicissitudes, as there happened to be peace or war in Lanka, and Buddhist or Hindu dynasties on the throne, for about 20 centuries, until the time of King Kirti Sri Rája Sinha (A. D. 1747), when the priesthood had become degraded and almost extinct. The reigning monarch, deploring this fact, determined to ask the King of Siam to send him some pious and learned monks to rehabilitate the Order and restore Buddhism to its former purity and dignity. Readers of Indian History will recall that a similar course was adopted by a king of Bengal when he imported from Canouj several learned Brahmans—ancestors of the modern great families of the Mukerjis, Banerjis, Chatterjis, etc.—to restore Sanskrit Literature and Hindu Shastras in his kingdom. The account of this religious act of the Sinhalese King Kirti Sri Rája Sinha will be found in chapter C. of the *Mahavansa*—just splendidly translated for the Government of Ceylon by L. C. Wijesinha Mudaliyar, F. T. S.* It is so quaint and suggestive in various respects that a few extracts will be interesting in the present connection.

“And because that the king desired the prosperity of religion, it grieved him much to see that though, among the priests and novitiates who had aforetime been received into the church when the priesthood yet continued in the Island of Lanká, there were some who feared evil and respected the good Law and lived a life of purity and discipline, there were others who made light of sin and led sinful and wicked lives, maintaining families and devoting themselves to worldly business. And these men busied themselves with the practice of astrology and medicine and other callings that were not proper for priests. And when the king had heard of the doings of these shameless monks and had learned the truth thereof duly, he chose from among the priests that behaved themselves well, the famous novitiate Saranánkara, who was a priest of great piety. * * * moral, and virtuous and wise, and skilled in Grammar and in the words of the Supreme Buddha.”

Taking counsel of this excellent man, the king reformed abuses and warned offenders against continuing in their evil courses, which were bringing shame upon the priestly Order. Then there came to his mind the recollection that in former times kings had sent their ministers to foreign countries to bring priests thence to Lanká to aid in reviving the purity of the Buddhist religion, but had failed in their attempts. For his part he was determined to succeed. So he

“sent ministers with divers presents and offerings and an excellent letter to the noble city of Ayojjha (in the kingdom of Siam) for the purpose of bringing priests therefrom, in the two thousand two hundred and ninety and third year of the Parinibbána of Buddha ... And those ministers took charge

* The supreme value of this historical work is now universally acknowledged for the light it throws not only upon the history of Ceylon but also upon that of ancient India.

of the king's letter and other presents with great ceremony and respect, and departed hence in a ship with the Dutch people who were charged with the protection of (the sea coast of) Lanká.”*

The embassy was most cordially received by Dhammika, King of Ayojjha, who “was astonished to hear of the decay of Buddhist religion in Lanká,” whence Siam herself and Burma had derived it in ancient times. So he convoked the monastic body, and

“chose a chapter consisting of more than ten priests, at the head of whom was Upali, an elder distinguished for moderation and contentment, and endued with gentle manners, and of an upright behaviour.”

These he sent to Ceylon with

“books of the Dhamma and the Vinaya, such as were not to be found in the island of Lanká, and also an excellent royal letter, with divers presents, by the hand of the royal ministers of Ayojjha. And the stately ship that was thus sent thither with the image of gold and the other presents made the voyage across the deep sea, that abounded in terrors and perils, and arrived in perfect safety at the post of Tikonamala (the modern Trincomalee) in the beautiful island of Lanká.”

Great rejoicings followed and a royal welcome; the Siamese priests were lodged “in the beautiful monastery that was adorned with a tiled roof, built in a beautiful place at Puppháráma (the Malwatta monastery). The ministers of Siam were also suitably lodged and entertained.

The Mahavansa then goes on to state that in the 2299th year of Buddha's Parinirvana, the sixth after the dispatch of his embassy to Siam—the Sinhalese monarch convoked the priesthood in the Uposatha (ordination) hall of the Malwatta Vihara, for the ceremony of ordination. What the embassy was doing all this time in Siam, or the return embassy in Ceylon, is not stated. However, at last the convocation was held. The “Great Upáli,” and “the second great elder also, Ariya Muni,” presided, and, by command of the king, conferred the rite of ordination upon the principal Samaneras (novitiates), who had been proved worthy. When the number had become large enough, the king chose from among them “such priests as were diligent in observing the doctrines and precepts of religion, and who deserved to fill the office of teachers, and ordained that they should receive instruction from the priests who had come from Ayojjha.” Out of the whole number one, Saranánkara of Malwatta Vihara, who excelled all in merit and capacity, was appointed by him Sanga Rája, that is, Royal High Priest. Within the next three years seven hundred persons were admitted to the monastic fraternity, and the pious king made every provision for their support and that of their various monasteries. Within the same period “three thousand persons of good families” were admitted as novitiates. It was, in short, an aristocratic Order, and such has been the spirit of this “Siamese Sect” down to the present day. A majority of the priests are, I believe, of the (Hindu) caste of Vellala, a very res-

* The wily Hollanders, whose policy towards the sovereigns of India, Ceylon, Burma, Siam and Japan appears from history to have been one of pretended abject obsequiousness while they were waiting their opportunity to get permanent foothold and, if possible, dominion in those rich Eastern countries, humbugged the Kandyan king into the notion that they were simply his coast-guards, to protect the Island from invasions by the Portuguese and English.

pectable section of the cultivator grade of Sudras, who at a remote period emigrated from the main land and early became the landed gentry of Ceylon.*

The revival of Buddhism, effected as above explained, did not prove any more permanent than had several preceding attempts, made by Sinhalese kings upon driving out Tamil usurpers, who had crossed over from the Indian Peninsula and had destroyed Buddhist temples, burnt the sacred books, and extirpated the priesthood. The Portuguese, Dutch and English had between them, in one way or another, done it great harm; the Portuguese by bloody persecution and violence, the Dutch by crafty and repressive legislation, the English by favouring missionary propagandism. A time arrived when the Siamese priesthood had grown corrupt, the temples were falling into decay, and profitable "conversions" to Christianity, occurred by tens of thousands.† But there came a revival of interest, and men of less aristocratic castes than the Vellallas applied for ordination. Being refused—contrary to the letter and spirit of Buddha's teachings—they sent a committee to Burma, and in due time these obtained the coveted ordination at the hands of the Chief Priests of Amarapura; after which they returned home and laid the foundations of what is now known as the "Amarapura Sect." Between them and the Siamese sect, however, there is no doctrinal difference whatever, nor can either now boast of a single living Arhat, or adept in esoteric science; though in ancient times many such perfected men existed in the Island and occupied Viharas, still shown to the traveller. In both sects are priests of great learning and burning zeal, along with a host of inferior persons who waste their time in frivolous disputes and polemics about petty details of monastic discipline, and even of social rank—caste—an abominable offence in priests.‡ The Amarapura sect sprang up in reality as a protest against the alleged professional laxity, the worldliness, and un-Buddhistic snobbishness of the genteel Siamese sect; but in its turn it has been upbraided for its moral deterioration by a fresh body of schismatics headed by my friend, the late Ambagavatti Thera, who gave his protestant sect the name of Ramanuja Nikaya. Among them are ascetics who spend part of each year in the forest depths in meditation, or yoga, as it is called in India.

By common consent, Hikkeduwe Sumangala, our great friend and ally, is regarded as the most erudite living monk in Ceylon: his moral character is also blameless and his unselfishness well-

* In India they are Sivaites, hence believers in the Monistic philosophy. Of course, it was comparatively easy for these emigrants to Ceylon to accept Buddhism, whose philosophical basis is so much akin to theirs. Two of the highest groups of the Indian Vellallas are termed Mudaliyar (or Moodelliar) and Pillay. It is a coincidence that in Ceylon the highest rank among the Native headmen is that of Mudaliyar.

† For full particulars as to the falsity of the pretended "conversions," see the Official reports of the Missionary bodies in Ceylon; especially the Jubilee Report of Ceylon Missions, issued about six or seven years ago. The cause of this hypocrisy was simply that they found it paid to be Christians and cost much to remain Buddhists.

‡ With what biting scorn does not Lord Buddha lash the backs of such fighting-cock pandits!

known. Succeeding governors of Ceylon have ever held him in respect, and his opinion is asked in all public questions affecting the welfare of the Buddhist community. When, some years ago, a Council of the Priesthood was held at Ratnapura to verify the Canon, he was chosen its President, and to him Colombo owes the foundation of the Parivena, or Normal College for Priests, that is so well known throughout the world. The Kings of Siam, Cambodia and the ex-King of Burma honor him and have sent valuable gifts to his College; the Government of Bombay, at the instance of the ex-Governor of Ceylon, gave him some of the Sopara relics of Buddha; the Japanese sects have sent a number of clever young priests to be educated under him in Sanskrit and Pali; he scrutinised and gave his imprimatur to the *Buddhist Catechism*; and his influence has been freely given us during the past ten years, to spread education, revive religion, and foster a love of vernacular literature among the Sinhalese masses. What is his acuteness in metaphysics will be inferred from Mr. Fawcett's report of our recent discussion with him at his College. Such is the personage upon whom his superior, the Chief Priest of the Malwatta Vihara—the highest dignitary of the Order in Ceylon—has just conferred the high rank of Maha Nayaka, or High Priest (of the Siamese sect) in the low country. The office has been vacant fifty years, and was last occupied by the late Maliyagaspe Maha Thera. Were there a king in Kandy the Malwatta High Priest would be the Sangha Raja, and there would be no Amarapura sect to dispute Sumangala's supreme ecclesiastical supremacy in questions of discipline. As things stand, the latter sect hold something of the same attitude towards the ancient established branch of their Order as do the dissenters in Great Britain towards the Establishment. It will be a bright day for Ceylon when abuses shall disappear from both sects and a brotherly union be effected between all sections of the order of the Yellow Robe; whose Founder set the example to all mankind of the supremest virtues allied to the greatest wisdom and the divinest teaching that man ever gave to man.

H. S. O.

PSYCHOLOGY AND NEO-MATERIALISM.

NOT the least noteworthy outcome of recent controversy is the discredit into which the theories of the old materialism have fallen. The sweeping generalizations of a Diderot or d'Holbach and of their innumerable XIX Century disciples no longer command the obeisance of Science. Indeed, the two phases of that particular type of negationism are beginning to experience the throes of a not altogether too premature dissolution. *Sub-judice lis est* is a plea which the materialist of the old school must not expect to advance with any hope of success. The suit against him is to all intents and purposes decided. It may certainly be objected that the views in question still obtain credence in numerically influential quarters. Unquestionably this is the case. No amount, however, of "mob-backing" will suffice to secure them from the imputation of representing mere survivals. They are entitled to a niche in the palæontological museum of philosophy. They have done their work, as an Hegelian would say, as necessary momenta in the evolution of thought. More than this it is now impossible to concede.

The first of these phases, the identification by the extreme materialist left of *psychosis* with *neurosis*, of mental states with their neural concomitants, was, of course, too crude a conception to withstand any determinate analysis. Now-a-days in default of suitable sponsors, it subserves the useful, if humble, function of a target for the missiles of the dilettante metaphysician. Theologians, also, are wont each and all to fling their stone at the tempting mark, not averse perhaps to the opportunity of winning an easy victory before the eyes of an all too sceptical generation. The second phase assumed by materialism was until recently of far more serious import and carried no small dismay into the heart of the spiritualistic* camp. Recognizing as unquestionable the phenomenal contrast of mind and body, it proceeded to annul the force of this admission by regarding the former as the equivalent of so much transmuted motion; in short, by postulating *neurosis* as the cause of *psychosis*. The prospect thus opened up of unifying all phenomena as links in a chain of mechanical causality was destined to be rudely shattered. It was pointed out that the physical automatism implied by the theory deprived the origination and evolution of consciousness of any *raison d'être*; that, in addition to the inconceivability of the passage of *neurosis* into *psychosis*, the motion so glibly 'transmuted' is "otherwise employed" in coursing through the highways of the brain. Last, but not least, it became obvious that any such transmutation would involve a continuous destruction of motion in the living organism and hence necessitate the rejection of the Conservation Doctrine—a step that no materialist is under any circumstances prepared to take. Under the stress of these and other objections the scientific negationist had no resource but to abandon the sinking

* To avoid any possible misapprehension, let me state that I am employing this word in its strictly philosophic sense, *i. e.*, as the system which derives consciousness from a source independent of matter.

ship and trust himself to another and sounder craft. It is in consequence of this general change of front that the "Monistic" doctrine of the new psychology has acquired so high a degree of importance.

The term "Monism," as applied to this doctrine, can scarcely be said to represent a triumph of nomenclature. It is misleading and ambiguous. So far as expression is given to the fundamental distinction between a single-substance doctrine and psychological dualism, its utility is obvious. But in this particular sense the old materialism which it is designed to supersede, is equally a "Monism." Both it and its fashionable successor are, in fact, types of a *mechanical* (as opposed to an agnostic, pantheistic or theistic) *Monism*, in that they agree in referring mental phenomena to a physiological basis. They differ, it is true, in their explanations of the relation of *neurosis* to *psychosis*, but their fundamental postulates are identical. The favoured compromise in fine is, exactly what Dr. Bain has himself termed it, a "guarded materialism."

Now this self-styled "Monism" (or neo-Materialism) may be fairly regarded as the only surviving rival of the spiritualistic cult. Unlike the old materialism, it aims at excluding the idea of cause from its theory of the relationship of body to mind. States of consciousness do not cause cerebral changes nor *vice versa*. These two groups of phenomena are to be regarded as simply the subjective and objective sides of the same thing—as obverse and reverse of one medal. Thought and its molecular concomitant are explicable as the double-sided function of the brain. "The one substance," writes Professor Bain, "with two sets of properties, two sides, the mental and the physical—a doublefaced unity—would appear to comply with all the exigencies of the case."* Such is also the stand-point of Mr. Herbert Spencer in his "Principles of Psychology," of Dr. Romanes in his masterly work "Mental Evolution in Man," of M. Taine in his sparkling pages. "On Intelligence," and of most of the exponents of the new physiological psychology in Germany. It is the most finished and elaborate product of anti-spiritualist polemics. We shall, however, find that it is vulnerable at several points, and in no sense constitutes that ultimatum of accurate thinking which some of its more enthusiastic advocates have represented it to be. Gracefully as it has steered past the rocks on which the older negationism split, it has failed to weather a fringe of sunken reefage beyond. Indeed, on close inspection, a compact assemblage of fallacies reveals itself. Some of the more prominent of these it now falls to my lot to indicate.

An initial element of confusion is introduced into the subject by the remarkably inconsistent language of certain of the thinkers who have marked this "Monism" for their own. There is no difficulty in recognising its suitability to supplement a mechanical system of evolution such as that of Mr. Herbert Spencer. The objective reality of organism and environment once conceded, consciousness may not improperly be derived from the 'mental side'

* "Mind and Body," p. 196.

of a physiological basis. But what shall we say of the attitude of those who range themselves on the side of Professor Bain and M. Henri Taine? If with the distinguished author of the "Senses and the Intellect" we deny the existence of an independent external world, what becomes of the "guarded materialism" elsewhere so zealously proclaimed? Unless we are prepared to house our psychology and metaphysic in two separate and water-tight mental compartments, it is absurd to reduce mind to a mere attribute of brain, while maintaining that brain itself is a phenomenon only of mind. Strange, however, as it appears, this fundamental inconsequence colours the whole of Prof. Bain's thought. A similar blending of the irreconcilable extremes of Idealism and guarded materialism is attempted by M. Taine, to whom matter is a phantom of consciousness, and consciousness the obverse of molecular mechanics! How the great German transcendentalists Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel would have marvelled at this philosophical hybrid.

Needless to say that the general status of "Monism" remains unaffected by such incidental considerations. The theory must stand or fall on its merits. Its unwarrantable appropriation by any particular school of thought is a matter which has no direct bearing on the question of its intrinsic validity. Such an inconsequence as that just noticed is, however, sufficiently striking to merit something more than a casual comment. A mechanical Monism in psychology is nothing more nor less than a fiction when tethered to an idealist theory of perception. *Mais revenons à nos moutons.*

The unification of mental and physical as two sides of one process reads at first sight like a revised version of the Leibnitzian "pre-established harmonies." The distinction is, nevertheless, clearly defined. Neo-materialism postulates a parallelism not of two independent groups of phenomena, but of functions of a single material basis. It declares that *neurosis* subjectively regarded is a mental state. Now surely the purely verbal nature of this explanation must arrest attention. If the contrast of mind with body is for knowledge a fact which cannot be transcended; if with the advent of consciousness the opposition of self and not-self starts into so sharp a relief, what is the justification for merging this contrast, this opposition, in a "fundamental identity"? To effect this theoretical result, the *sphere and results of conscious knowledge must be abandoned in toto*. Where knowledge is present, the contrast of mind and body is *present also*. Consequently the "fundamental identity" argued for cannot be logically posited by any conscious being, for no sooner does mind put in an appearance than it proceeds to testify to that sundering of Ego and Non-Ego so insisted upon by Dualists. The neo-materialist explanation is therefore wholly verbal, seeing that it endeavours to transcend admitted distinctions by the employment of a mere phrase.

It is noteworthy that the neo-materialists are unanimous in regarding the above-mentioned contrast as the deepest known to us. Body is made up of the attributes of extension, resistance, shape, mobility, colour, etc., all of which are absent from mind. Order in time and degree are the only two attributes these exist-

ences possess in common. Who has more forcibly dwelt upon this point than Professor Bain? Nevertheless, in the teeth of his definition of substance as "the most fundamental attribute or attributes" (Logic), this eminent thinker goes so far as to unify these utterly contrasted groups of attributes—the mental and the physical—as facets of *one substance*. About the nature of this latter, as conceived by Professor Bain, there can remain no doubt, inasmuch as he characterises the line of thought adopted as "guarded materialism." Now, even according to his own definition of substance, Mind and Body are not amenable to this off-hand mode of treatment. Rather ought we to acknowledge that the precision of metaphysical analysis serves to bring out explicitly a distinction between the two which is implicitly given in consciousness. In attempting to override this said distinction by limiting it to the sphere of phenomena alone, the neo-materialists have landed themselves in a veritable controversial ditch.

Take the special case of extension. If an extended phenomenon, "molecular motion," is subjectively regarded a "feeling of pain," the "law" of contradiction must be henceforward accepted with a reservation. For unless it is really subject to exceptions, nothing is more absurd than to characterise one process as *extended and non-extended at the same time*. Either neo-materialists are wrong in believing that psychosis and neurosis differ 'by the whole diameter being,' or they are averse to recognising the full consequences of their admission. In point of fact their verbal solutions of the problem approximate so closely to those of the tabooed school of Dr. Büchner, that the difference is occasionally far to seek. It often seems to hang on a choice of phrases. Doubtless the protagonist of German materialism expresses himself in a less finished fashion when he affirms the identity of thought and moving matter; he will not even hear of a provisional contrast of the two sets of *data*. But though the new doctrine notes this contrast, it takes good care subsequently to rescind the admission by blending all distinctions in the illogical synthesis above criticised. The upshot, indeed, of the "monistic" compromise is, as we have seen, the negation of that primary "law" of thought, the formula of which runs *A is not B*.* It asserts that a process is itself and yet not itself at the same time! This strange supposition is best brought home to us by the special instance of absurdity just cited, viz.,—that one thing is to be regarded as "extended" (molecular motion) and "non-extended" (a mental state). If anything does grate upon the ear of so-called commonsense, it is the supposition that anything can both occupy, and be independent of, space. Probably what neo-materialists really have in view is the old Leibnitzian thesis, which, though discarded in theory, still continues to colour their thinking in such a manner as to veil the otherwise obvious contradiction.

The question of causation next demands notice. Neo-materialists expressly deny the existence of any causal relation between motion

* This so-called primary "law" which Hamilton and others have regarded as intuitive flows from the General Law of Relativity or Contrast conditioning all mental processes.

and mind. They dismiss as preposterous the *materialist* dogma embodying this notion, and in virtue of this repudiation believe themselves freed from the implication of teaching ANY causal control of psychosis by neurosis. But how is this attitude consonant with practice? To begin with, it is clear that an hypothesis which reduces mind to the obverse only of motion, places all mental evolution at the mercy of the physical basis. Accordingly all stimuli to the activity of neuro-psychical processes must on such lines come *from the side of the physical*, seeing that mind is *ex-hypothesi* nothing more than the "subjective face" of a mechanism. If, therefore, mental facts never put in an appearance except on the occasion of certain material stimuli, the need of expressing this relation in some terms of cause and effect appears irresistible. "But"—the neo-materialist may urge—"in postulating a parallelism of neurosis and psychosis, the co-existence in time of the two is also assumed. Does not causation imply succession, and, if so, how can Monism be convicted of evading its conclusions?" To this plea a ready reply is forthcoming. The contention of Sir W. Herschell to the effect that cases occur in which the effect is coincident in time with its cause will not be forgotten. It is true that this apparent simultaneity of occurrence may, as remarked by Mill, be due to the imperfection of our senses. For instance, the raising of one end of a lever may not really be—and probably is not—synchronous with the depression of the other. Putting aside all such disputable cases, we may with perfect justice avail ourselves of the monistic parallelism of Mind-Body as a theoretical illustration of the "law." For on the lines of the monistic theory mental processes, though *ex-hypothesi* coincident in time with cerebral changes, stand in a *strikingly dependent position as regards the latter*. Given certain molecular disturbances in the cortex, certain states of consciousness must accompany them as their "obverse;" *the "double-sided activity" thus manifest being always controlled from the side of the physical*. We now discover that the ascendancy of the physical is complete; consequently that Neo-materialism does, despite its protestations, imply a relation of cause and effect between body and mind, though this causation is only of the hypothetical type suggested by the genius of a Herschell.

The piecing together of a mosaic of coherent thought by a nervous basis presents a very formidable difficulty. How is a teleologically working mind to be regarded as the obverse or "otherness" of an ateleological atom-complex working like Haeckel's Nature "without aim, without design."

Prof. Du Bois Reymond and Dr. Tyndall agree in denying to the atoms any interest in their own motions, and Neo-materialism, which repudiates any conception involving the control of mind by matter, has no option but to accept this view. The mechanical transformations of energy are all that can, on its lines, affect the conduct of matter. Yet the *Logical* has been somehow evolved. Can it have been as the "subjective side" of the *Alogical*? Is the "one process" intelligent and blind at the same time? Surely all notions inculcating a fundamental identity of the rational and irrational border on the ridiculous. The possible reply may be that a mechanical

Natural Selection has so modified the cerebral machinery as to have endowed *neurosis* with a pseudo-teleological mode of working now reflected in its "obverse" *psychosis*. It is enough to retort that so thoroughgoing a "monist" as Mr. H. Spencer is convinced of the inability of such a cause to explain the genesis of the higher mental phenomena. I may here remark *en passant* that this author's reliance on the complementary factor "inheritance of *functionally produced* modifications" surrenders all that some spiritualists care to battle for. It is, indeed, quite arguable that such "modifications" were induced by the plasticity of *neurosis* under the sway of a guiding *psychosis* functioning through the æons of geologic time. But into that question I cannot now dip.

To the individual who consciously associates ideas and analyses complex or obscure concepts, mental processes never present themselves as mere "concomitants," but as a subjective experience which has its *raison d'être* solely in itself. This is an important fact; and one that militates as strongly as any empirical truth well can against the supposition that organism is alone responsible for the drift of mental determinations. Then, again, we have to take into consideration the—to put it mildly—probability that, as von Hartmann argues, organic evolution has the origination and elevation of consciousness *as such* as its 'objective.' Needless, however, to remark that no mechanical theory of the "Origins" can accommodate such a doctrine. Moreover, at this stage of our inquiry, a further issue is opened up. Suppose that spiritualists were to concede *argumenti causâ*, that in the development of our cerebro-mental equipment mechanical causes have reigned supreme, what Monism would still have to account for is the *accompaniment of the physical side of the evolution by intellectual advance*, seeing that a *mere chaos of feelings* void of coherence or meaning would have done duty equally well, so far as 'adaptive adjustment' to environment was concerned. If all organisms are automata, whence comes the adventitious appendage of a rational *self-conscious* Mind? As long as the physical machinery does its work aright, what call for any evolution of coherent ideation out of the primal blur of mere feelings? This is the sort of *crux* which philosophic negationists would do well to solve.

That consciousness is of positive use in adaptive adjustment to environment is testified to by its vivid phases in connection with novel or complex actions. All habitual ones, on the other hand, tend to dispense with its presiding influence. These are facts of very considerable significance.

Touching on the domain of pure psychology, it deserves note that the necessary rejection by Monism of an Ego distinct from states of consciousness constitutes to many an insuperable bar to its acceptance. I am not desirous in this connection of laying stress on the contrast between theory and the language of exposition noticeable in the tomes of Mr. Spencer and Professor Bain, tempting though the opportunity undoubtedly is. I will content myself with advancing the provinces of reflective thought, of the "constructive imagination," and of volition as indicative of the reality of such an Ego. Doubtless, also, the important distinction

formulated by Dr. Romanes between "recepts" and "concepts" in his latest remarkable work will occur to many in this connection. Dealing with the "two orders" of generalization, he writes:—

"...A *generic* idea [recept] is generic, because the particular ideas of which it is composed present such *obvious* points of resemblance that they *spontaneously fuse together in consciousness*;* but a *general* idea [concept] is general, for precisely the opposite reason—namely, because the points of resemblance which it has seized are *obscured* from immediate perception, and therefore *could never have fused together in consciousness but for the aid of intentional abstraction or of the power of the mind knowingly to deal with its ideas as ideas.*"†

I fully agree with the acute author in regarding as vital this distinction between the "purely automatic grouping" of percepts and their "intentional" blending with effort. But how Dr. Romanes is able to rest in the folds of his "Monism" after such an admission—how he still sees his way to discard the "Ego" after thus supplementing the working of the laws of association—escapes my comprehension.

To pass once more out of the realms of pure psychology—how deficient is the explanation of abstract thought as the obverse of neural processes interpolated as links in a chain of *sensori-motor* reflex action. It needs scant observation to detect the fact that the highest efforts of the human intellect have only an abstract value for consciousness. The study of philosophy, science and literature, when divorced from all pecuniary and other inducements imposed by the struggle for existence, is largely useless so far as adaptation to the environment is concerned. Knowledge pursued for its own sake may be said to be wholly so. How, then, can such thoughts as build up its fabric be quietly disposed of by inclusion in the supposed list of "obverses" of automatic *neuroses*? Such ideas considered as the subjective facet of motions intercalated between a sense-stimulus and a motor response are utterly gratuitous. Useless and indeed prejudicial to many men in the struggle for existence, they are simply inexplicable on the lines of a physiological Monism. If they mean anything, it is that the soul is asserting its presence and actively intervening in order to inaugurate a flow of abstract or imaginative thought which mere 'adaptive response' could never from its nature awaken. Thus the production of Homer's 'Iliad' or Kant's 'Critique,' if these are regarded as the "mental side" of the "hesitancy periods" in a series of reflex actions, is assuredly a mystery; when they are seen to be the outcome of an inspiration flowing from the innate spirituality of the Mind, the craving for explanation is satisfied. The conscious marshalling of ideas into the fabric of fancy, or into groups out of which by abstraction and generalization a scientific psychology is to emerge, suggests the handiwork of a spiritual Ego, not that of moving atoms which oscillate according to the law of the equivalence of forces. What holds more impressively true of the higher

* The italics are mine.

† "Mental evolution in Man," p. 68. The italics are mine;

phenomena of thought is valid of all experience. "The conversion of successive feelings into an experience," wrote the late Prof. Green, "implies a subject consciously relating them to itself..... rendering them a manifold (which in themselves, as successively vanishing they are not) and unifying this manifold by means of that relation. Such a subject has or is the unity which under the name of our understanding enables us to find community of function in the elements of the sentient organism, and which thus renders it, derivatively, one for us. To imagine an "evolution" of the subject from the gathered experience of the sentient organism—an evolution of the unifying agent from that which it renders one—is the last form which the standing *ἡστέρον πρότερον* of empirical psychology has assumed."* We have now completed our survey of the more vulnerable points of the neo-Materialist thesis. The result has been to show that this successor to the old materialism is little better than a verbal explanation bristling with contradictions. Nevertheless, on this foundation of sand some of the most imposing systems of modern thought have been deliberately erected.

Neo-materialism has also been welcomed by science with open arms. It gave promise of steering a happy mean between a discredited iconoclasm and the uncongenial conceptions of the spiritualistic thinker. It has however, in practice, proved unworthy of the encomiums so freely lavished upon it. Cold analysis detects a rotten core which the plausibility of a fair exterior at first served to veil. Not that its supremacy in the domain of psychology appears to be at present seriously threatened. The prejudice against spiritualism and its implications in the direction of religion is far too strong. Agnostics and the empirical school generally fully realise that their case stands or falls with the theory. It is idle, therefore, to expect that the key to the main position of constructive philosophy will be yielded without a struggle. Meanwhile it speaks little for the tact of spiritualist champions that the present 'conspiracy of silence' in the face of this neo-Materialism should have lasted so long. The attacks on the obsolete systems of Dr. Büchner and others of similar persuasions are no longer opposite; they are attempts to 'annihilate the slain.' Unless we are to incur a risk of seeing the rising generation accepting the assumptions of the new psychology as unchallenged truths, it is high time that the scene of controversial battle should be shifted and the real stronghold of modern negationism invested. The paper now concluded will have fulfilled its object if it succeeds in any way in drawing attention to this important need.

E. DOUGLAS FAWCETT,

* "Contemporary Review," 1878.

WILL AND ITS RELATION TO CONSCIENCE.

THE much vexed question as to the nature of the human will has divided the thinking world from the earliest times, and the problem seems to be now as difficult of solution as ever. But there is nothing to warrant the belief (entertained by some) that the difficulty is insoluble. Each new attempt to throw light on the subject may not make it quite clear, but it may, I should rather say must, bring us nearer the truth even though the progress made be almost inappreciable. The obstacle before us is not insurmountable; and if it is anything short of that we need not despair of getting over it.

To approach this question in the right way, we must take man and his powers in their relation to that vast assemblage of forces which we call the universe. To do otherwise would be a fatal mistake. All creation is one articulate whole, comprising an infinite multiplicity of objects, but of which no individual member is independent of the rest. To have a complete knowledge of the branches of a tree you must know the trunk and the roots also; because they are as intimately connected that any one of them must lose its true character if separated from the others. The position of man in this world is the same. To a very great extent he is what he is because of his surroundings: if you do away with the environment he is nowhere. Man's existence is bound up with that of other beings, and for an adequate treatment of the subject we must recognise this relation. An explanation of man's powers, in order to be in the least satisfactory, must therefore be found partly in himself, partly in things outside him.

Having indicated the life of enquiry to be adopted, we must see what a man is, before we attend to what he does. The question is too large to be dealt with in all its parts; but we shall here concern ourselves with just as much of it as has a direct bearing on the present subject. To begin with, we must set aside the view that things are mere appearances; that beasts and plants and houses and other things around us are so many unsubstantial ideas floating about; and that man himself, whether observing or observed, is another delusive phantom. There may be an element of truth in the above view, but we know that this is not all. Every normally constituted man has a clear consciousness of himself as a reality, having some power over the world in which he lives and acts, and believes, not without good reason, that he is in the midst of beings having a like power to influence his destiny. But in discussing this question, which is more or less of a practical nature, it is not at all necessary to put forward any arguments in proof of this position, and we may take for granted that it is so. Let us, therefore, adopt the more sensible view that every man is a reality possessing certain powers. On a little consideration, however, it will be evident that these powers have a common origin. They are in fact not different powers, but different aspects of the same power. This power is self. It is not a collection of distinct forces, but one (if I may be allowed to use the word) many-sided force. The unity of self is not a mere abstraction: it is the recognition

of a force which, though manifesting itself in an endless variety of ways, is in reality one.

Let us now see how this force regulates its action, as well as how it affects and is affected by other natural forces. The question, in its comprehensiveness, involves the whole working of this most intricate machine, the universe, and is too great and complicated to be easily settled; but here again we shall confine ourselves only to those principles which have an immediate connection with the subject in hand. These principles which we shall consider here, are 'attraction' and 'repulsion.' In one way or another and under different names, they seem to be busy with all forms of existence, and go a great way to explain them. Take, for instance, a piece of chalk. You press it with your hand and find that it is hard. What does that mean? The particles of chalk do not speak; but they make you understand, in a manner not to be mistaken, that they will keep together and resist you as long as they can. The deep-seated animosities among animals point to the same principles. Out of many cases that can be cited, let us take that of two bullocks eating from the same pile of grain. They eat as much and as fast as possible, and try every now and then to gore each other's sides with their pointed horns. Examples like these may be multiplied indefinitely, but the two given above will serve to illustrate the working on a very grand scale of these two principles in nature.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the two principles imply each other; that they do not and in the nature of things cannot work in separation. The principle of attraction may help to bring things together and to form combinations, but these must inevitably keep out and oppose other things and combinations of things, thus to carry on that perpetual strife which forms the main feature of all existence. Returning to our subject, we find that human beings also, like the rest of their fellow-creatures, are subject to these laws. In their case the said principles take the form of desire and aversion, turning in most cases into pursuit and avoidance. Governed by these laws, every man tries to get the largest possible share of the good things of life and to remove all causes of misery. When we go beyond the individual we see that these principles find their way to the family also. Further, countries under different Governments bring together all their parts, and by preserving internal harmony, enable them to enjoy the blessings of peace; but the union is effected also with a view to make their united strength felt and respected by their neighbours, and to make common cause against foreign foes whenever there should be an occasion for it. But all does not end here. As we proceed further and rise above mankind to contemplate the working of these principles in their most comprehensive aspect, we find that this huge earth with all the animals and plants suckled at her ample breast, is drawn towards the sun, and has at the same time a tendency to fall away in the opposite direction; and for aught we know to the contrary there may be an analogous relation between our solar system and other like groups of heavenly bodies spinning and moving in space.

I must say in passing that the principles of attraction and repulsion cannot explain *all* human actions: they only apply to his nature as self-regarding. There is a higher principle which belongs to the nobler side of his nature, and which, instead of making him run after certain things and flee from others, draws him towards the totality of existence, and inclines him to acts of disinterested sympathy. The foregoing observations will, however, be of some use in discussing the nature of voluntary activity in man. It may be objected that this is only external evidence; but it is not to be despised on that account. Spectators can sometimes understand a game much better than those engaged in it. It is also to be understood, however, that when we avail ourselves of this kind of evidence, it is not denied that there are other sources of inquiry open to us. The testimony of consciousness on this point is not to be ignored; but when it does not lead to a satisfactory conclusion, we are justified in supplementing it by what we can gather from the outside world.

We have now to consider personal activity as it appears in consciousness. It is a matter of general agreement that consciousness discovers the fact of control over our activity; opinions only differ as to the nature and source of this control. Libertarians contend that the ego or self possesses a power to direct its activity and that it is free in the exercise of this power. Given a single motive, I may or may not act upon it as I please. If there are several motives present to the mind, these, instead of necessarily fixing a particular line of action to be adopted by me, only give me an opportunity to choose one of them. Motives influence me in my choice of them; but they do not determine my conduct. It would be absurd to suppose that while these motives struggle for supremacy within my breast, I only stand by and watch them, until at length one of them overcomes the rest, and then following up the victory, catches hold of me and drags me into action. Necessitarians, on the other hand, declare that there is an invariable sequence between motive and action. Given a motive, the action necessarily follows. If, however, a motive fails to work it is because it is counterbalanced or outweighed by some other motive. When there are several motives clamouring for fulfilment at the same time, the strongest motive prevails over the rest and leads to action. The relation between motive and volition is that of cause and effect. Given all the motives in a particular case, we can predict the action with as much certainty as we can predict physical effects when physical cause are known to us, which, however, would be impossible on the free-will hypothesis.

The above is but a very imperfect view of the two opposite currents of thought, but the limits of this paper do not permit of more than a cursory glance at them. It is equally impossible here to do justice to their respective merits, and with a few general remarks I pass on to my own humble view of the matter. Necessitarians, I think, occupy a very strong position, but then they attempt too little. No voluntary actions can be performed without a motive. This the Libertarians do not deny; indeed it would be impossible to do otherwise. All personal actions must have a beginning, and

that beginning in the motive.* And again, when there are conflicting motives tending in different directions, what can be more reasonable than to suppose that the one which ends in action is the strongest. This is a very safe position, and so long as motives are compared in this way, it will be difficult to drive Necessitarianism from its stronghold. What we require, however, is a classification of motives determining their relative strength irrespective of the result in any particular case. If motives derive their strength from any peculiarities in the individual or in the external circumstances in which he is placed, those peculiarities must be pointed out. But this is not done, and Necessitarianism accomplishes its object by a surer and easier method. While motives exchange blows, the Necessitarian looks on: he can afford to wait; and when the struggle is over and victory has declared for one of them, he points it out to you. But the real difficulty does not lie here, it is connected with the nature of the motive itself. What then is a motive? Bain, Mill, and others of their way of thinking, tell us that it is either an ideal pleasure or an ideal pain; that we pursue the one and avoid the other. But in the face of so much diversity in the nature of pleasures, giving rise to such an infinite variety of pursuits, it is not worth much to say that every person does what gives him most pleasure, positive or negative. It would be as well to say that every individual does what he does, for reasons best known to himself. Necessitarianism in its present form gives only a very inadequate account of personal actions, though it cannot be denied that the theory, so far as it goes, rests on solid ground. It is, however, to be borne in mind that so long as human actions have not been divided into well-defined classes, a philosophy of personal actions cannot be constructed.

Let us now turn to Libertarianism. To begin with, the term 'freedom,' as applied to voluntary activity, though appearing to have a positive form, contains in reality a negative idea. It only means that the will, unlike all other natural forces, obeys no fixed, invariable laws. Now considering the complex nature and the vast variety of human actions, there is no wonder that the intellect should get confused and bewildered, and fail to discover the principle or principles which underlie such actions, and bind them in spite of many seeming irregularities into a harmonious system. The task is no doubt one of great difficulty, requiring a breadth of view which should embrace an infinite multiplicity of facts so dissimilar in nature. But we have no right to presume that the will is absolutely free and amenable to no laws, simply because we do not find them. It would be regarding our thoughts as the measure of all existence: it would be exalting our ignorance into omniscience. It may, however, be said on the other side that considering the reign of law in all other parts of the universe, if we are to presume anything, we must presume that the will *is* subject to laws, only we have not yet got at them. The problem as

* A large proportion of our actions come from surcharge of nervous energy. This tendency to "do" something expands itself along the line of least resistance, viz., in actions that are habitual and have become almost automatic; anything like true motive, which implies desire and calculation, is absent in these cases, which probably out-number our really motivated ones.—Ed.

to the nature of the will must remain an open question, until the laws regulating its exercise have been ascertained. Ascribing absolute freedom to will is no solution of the difficulty: it is only a confession of failure and must be treated accordingly.

It will not be out of place here to consider briefly some of the arguments advanced in support of the free will theory. It is alleged that we have power to choose motives on which to act; that they do not of necessity determine us to any particular course; and that this choice of motives to which consciousness testifies, proves, beyond doubt, that the will is free. Now what is a motive? Mr. H. Calderwood tells us, it is a tendency to act. Quite true. But is it a tendency in the abstract? Or does it imply some *thing* tending to act? I have no doubt the latter alternative will be accepted as the more reasonable explanation. But what is this something which tends to act? The only answer that can be made is that it is *self*. A motive may thus be defined as a tendency in self to move or act in a certain direction. From this it is quite obvious that self and motive are not two separate things, but are related to each other as matter and form. When out of many possible motives, one starts into actual existence, the indeterminate self becomes determinate, and assumes a definite shape which it did not possess before. It is not, however, necessary that the motive should pass into action. It may dissolve and melt into the formless self, which may immediately after assume other forms, and thus several motives may arise in consciousness; but as long as each motive lasts, it modifies and gives form to self and is not determined by it. When an action follows a motive, it is only a continuation of the motive, and is a further determination of self in its activity. But how is such a thing as choice of motives possible? In order that the ego should exercise such choice, it must disengage itself from the motives and establish itself as a distinct entity. But however logically distinguishable, motive and self are in reality inseparable, and choice by the one of the other is out of the question. Choice by a person of a book or a pen is quite intelligible, because they have separate, independent existence; but choice by a being of its own form is inconceivable.

How pure self passes into a motive is, and must ever remain, an impenetrable mystery—at least so long as we retain our present mental constitution. Whenever we know self, we know it as modified in some way. Let there be motives or any other mental states, and in all of them there must of course be a clear consciousness of self, but of self as limited. What the pure unmodified self does, or the process, if any, by which it assumes the shape of a motive lies beyond the ken of consciousness. It is only when self becomes determinate and conditioned that it emerges from unknown depths and makes its appearance before us; but then it is not the determiner, but the determined; it has acquired a form, and the form circumscribes and limits it.

Another argument generally put forward in support of Libertarianism is that all persons can exercise control over their attention; that the use of this faculty shows most unmistakably that the will is free, and points out the way in which perfect moral freedom

may be attained. Motives, it is said, may be self-originated or may arise independently of the will; but their continuance in consciousness as well as their influence on the will depends upon ourselves. Given a motive to do wrong, it is quite possible for us to neutralize and destroy it by withdrawing our attention and fixing it on some other object. If motives gain strength, it is because we feed them with our attention: let us do otherwise and we can very easily overcome and get rid of them.

Now there can be no doubt that we exercise some control over our attention, and weaken or strengthen our motives by so doing. But is this power unlimited? Are there no laws regulating its exercise? Is it possible for us to attend to anything or turn our attention from it at pleasure? By no means. It is quite *conceivable* that a person should have perfect control over his faculties and employ them in any direction he pleases; but the question is, can all men, or even a very small proportion of them, *actually* do so? The facts of real life would give an emphatic denial to the assertion. Men may pretend to believe—and the belief though wrong, may still be honest—that they can with equal ease attend to one thing or to another; but a close and careful observation of human life, as it is, shows that we can exercise this power only within very narrow limits. It is quite easy to transfer our thoughts from one object to another, and again from the latter to the former, if we are indifferent to both. Let there be, however, an object in which we are deeply interested, and it would be no easy matter to divert our attention from it. Let a man have his son attacked by a wolf, or his house set on fire, and tell him to think of something else. I fear the advice will be quite thrown away upon him. Attention is the steady flow of mental activity in any direction, but the course which it takes in any particular case, is determined by laws as rigorous as any other. Whatever the degree in which this power may exist, it always falls in with the settled tendency of the individual mind. There may at times be a slight deviation from the path thus marked by nature; but it cannot last long. A miser may for a short time make an effort to think of the sufferings of a near relation standing before him and appealing to his sympathies; but before long he finds his beneficent intentions thrust out and replaced by thought of gain and the consequent unwillingness to render assistance where it is so much needed. On the other hand, a man who has all his life practised the virtue, benevolence, will find it extremely difficult to forego the luxury of doing good and causing happiness to others where he has the power to do so. I do not therefore mean that the human mind is powerless only on the wrong side, when struggling against evil propensities: it is sometimes equally powerless on the side of virtue, when trying to depart from the right course. Circumstances external and internal provide channels for the discharge of mental energies; and the channels so prepared mould the course of life. Some men may be desperately wicked; others may be incapable of wrong; and between the two extremes may be found persons possessed of different degrees of moral perfection: but all are confined within

limits which nature has assigned them, and power of control over attention in the sense of ability in an individual to overleap these natural barriers, change his destiny, and give any turn whatever to his life, is only a fiction.

But let us see how the mistake arises. The error, I think, is due to a misinterpretation of the testimony of consciousness, arising from a superficial knowledge of the facts to be examined. A more intimate acquaintance with mental phenomena and a deeper insight into the general relations of things must, however, dissipate all doubt and uncertainty as to the nature of the will, and pave the way for a satisfactory solution of the difficulty. It is said, and with truth, that we have a clear consciousness of being free in performing our actions. Mr. H. Calderwood in criticising Mr. Mill observes:—"Mr. Mill says, 'To be conscious of free-will must mean to be conscious, before I have decided, that I am able to decide either way.' No, that would not be consciousness of free-will, but only conviction of possessing such a power. To be conscious of free-will must mean to be conscious in deciding that I am deciding." Now there is no denying the mental fact stated, but it does not prove that the will is free. It is of course I who decide; but am I in so deciding independent of all laws? Could I have decided otherwise? We must have sufficient evidence before we can answer these questions; but evidence there is none beyond our own ignorance: we can only say that the laws, if any, are not known to us.

On the other hand it is quite easy to account for the absolute freedom which we seem to enjoy. Exercise of will is connected with the active side of self: it is self as acting. And this activity, as seen in consciousness, must appear to be free; because there is only one force at work unopposed by any other. We lose our sense of freedom when we are aware of some other force operating against us. Tie a man's hands and legs, and he is not free to walk; because the rope resists him. But where there is no conscious restraint imposed from without, a sense of freedom must prevail. Such is the case with will: its exercise, when not interfered with by some other force, must appear to be free. But the question to be settled is: Does the will, considered in itself, and independently of any external forces, obey no laws? It may be argued that there are no such laws, since we do not feel our subjection to them, and are not constrained in our actions. But it need not be so. The reason why we look for such proofs is that we are so familiar with artificial laws made by the Government under which we may be living. We feel our subjection to such laws, because the rulers and the ruled are separate beings, and we carry these ideas to an explanation of natural laws. But laws of nature do not exist independently of the forces which they govern: they are on the contrary inherent in them. So also with will. The natural laws which regulate its exercise cannot appear as external restraints or mar our sense of freedom, because the laws work in and through the will itself.

IKBAL KISHEN SHARMA.

(To be continued.)

THE PROPHECY OF THE BHÁGAVATA AS TO THE FUTURE RULERS OF INDIA.

(Continued from page 334.)

DOWN from the family of Yudhisthira up to the Andhras, the Bhágavata Purana gives the names of the various kings who belonged to each family. It does not, however, give the names of the kings of the seven families beginning from the Abhiras and ending with the Mannas. After the Mannas it again begins with individual names. Does it mean that the intervening families are all of foreign extraction? I have now rapidly passed over a period of 2,147 years from 320 B. C. to 1827 A. C. Before passing on to the future, I should like to say a few words about the period which intervened between Yudhisthira and Chandragupta. The present year 1890 is the 4337th year of Yudhisthira's era. Says Varahamihira:—

"2526 added to the current of the era of Salivahana gives the era of Yudhisthira." This is the 1811th year of the Saka era, and hence the $(1811+2526=4337)$ year of the era of Yudhisthira. King Chandragupta is now $1889+320=2209$ years old. Hence Yudhisthira ruled 2128 years before Chandragupta. This period, according to the Bhágavata Purana, was covered by the Nandus, the Shishunagas, the Pradyotas, the Magadhas, and the family of Yudhisthira. The Nandus are said to have ruled a 100 years. This takes us to 420 B. C. The Shishunagas take us to 780 B. C. The Pradyotas take us to 918 B. C. The remaining two families are said to have ruled each for a 1,000 years. The Magadha kings are 24 in number, and those of the family of Yudhisthira 28. For the former we get an average of about 40 years for each king, and for the latter even less. This is by no means against human probabilities, and there is no reason why the Bhágavata should not be telling us a simple truth in this particular. It is rather hard to disbelieve the testimony of concrete names, and who knows if there might have been more names in these families who were not real kings in the estimation of the highly metaphysical author of the Bhágavata? We must therefore take it for certain that the interval of 1,530 years from Pradyota to Yudhisthira was covered by these two families together. The family of Yudhisthira ended in 1448 B. C. with Kshemaka, that of the Magadhas in 918 B. C. with Ripunjaya.

Dismissing these families with this rather brief notice, I now go to the future. The present rulers of India are, according to the Bhágavata Purana, the Mannas. Their reign begins in 1827, and will terminate in 2127 A. C., 238 years hence.

I remember having been vaguely told by some Pandit, while I was yet a student in Lahore, that the Sanskrit word for an Englishman was *Manna*, and that the English (Mannas) were spoken of in our sacred books as the present rulers of India. At that time I received the information with a sort of indifference, which it is needless for me to attempt to define. But the fact was brought to my notice again about a year and a half back. This time it was in

a way which could hardly fail to carry conviction. I shall mention the occasion as it is sure to be interesting to some at least of my readers.

There is in Meerut in the possession of a Brahmin, one of that class of works which in the *Theosophist* have been called the Nadigranthams. The book is named BHRIQU SANHITA. It appears that the Sage Bhrigu wrote a book on astrology, and that one of the chapters of this book was the Kundilyádhyaya, the chapter on Horoscopes. This chapter contained, by way of illustrating the laws laid down in other parts of the work, a good number of possible human figures with a full description of the life of the owner of that Figure. It appears moreover that after Bhrigu, the students of Bhrigu's book—under the guidance of hereditary teachers of course—used as a rule to forecast a number each of possible Figures, and describe fully the life of the owner. In course of time the chapter on illustrative horoscopes swelled into an enormous volume, containing, as tradition says, a lakh or more of horoscopes. Some of these horoscopes are decidedly later than 320 B. C., using as they do the word *nanda* as equivalent to nine.

It is the chapter on Horoscopes only that is now popularly known as the Bhrigu Sanhita. The rest of the book appears to have been lost; at least I have never yet come across a man possessed of the remaining portions.

Now the amount of astrological skill which this book shows is simply marvellous. If any particular man's horoscope comes out of the enormous heap of horoscopes which now constitutes the Bhrigu Sanhita, we find it giving, with marvellous precision, 1. The time when the man first hears the words of Bhrigu; 2. Whether he himself is the first to hear it or a friend of his, or of his fathers, &c.; 3. Whether the owner of a horoscope is a man or a woman; 4. To what caste does the owner belong? &c. &c.

The Bhrigu Sanhita holds that a man born during the first *five trutes** (out of the 60 trutes of a vipala) is a Brahmin; during the second *five trutes* (6 to 10) a Kshatriya or a Káyastha; during the third *five trutes* (11 to 15) a Vaishya; during the fourth (16 to 20) a Sudra; &c. &c.

As yet I have seen only two horoscopes of Englishmen. One of them was born at 28 trutes, the other at 27. I do not as yet pass any opinion on these astounding facts. The facts, however, are there. I took the greatest possible precaution with regard to every horoscope I saw in the Bhrigu Sanhita. I have come to see several horoscopes in which the positions of the planets being the same, there was only a difference of one or two seconds in the time of birth. And yet the history of the owner of the one differed from the other! So much for the book. It was in this book that I tried to see if I could find the horoscope of an Englishman. This gentleman was born in India, and nothing was known of his horoscope except the time of birth. The present owner of the book knew nothing of the gentleman. The horoscope, however, when it came

* 60 trutes = one vipala; 60 vipala = 1 pala; 60 pala = one ghati; one ghati = 24 minutes; 1 pala = $\frac{2}{3}$ m.; 1 vipala = $\frac{1}{5}$ m. = $\frac{2}{3}$ second; 1 trutes = $\frac{1}{36}$ second.

out of the book, told me that the owner was a *Manna*. Since that day I doubt not that the word *Manna* means English, although it is quite possible that it might mean European. This cannot be ascertained unless a number of other foreigners born, if possible, in India (because I do not know if birth in India be necessary for a man's horoscope to be found in the Bhrigu Sanhita) come forward with the time of their birth to see if the Bhrigu Sanhita makes any mention of them.

So far, however, as I can see, the word *Manna* denotes no other nationality except the English. The Bhágavata groups into separate families those foreigners who have come *separately* as rulers into India. Thus from the Slaves to the Lodis it groups all of them into the *Turushkas*. None of the intervening families came from without. The Moguls however came *separately* into India. They are therefore spoken of as a distinct family—the Gurundas. In the same way the Mannas must represent one family of the present rulers. There is thus no doubt that the word *Manna** means English. The Bhágavata makes their reign to begin in 1827 A. C. Now the fact of Lord Amherst having made in that year the formal declaration spoken of above, is a very strange coincidence. The following is a quotation on this point from Lethbridge's Introduction to the Indian History:—

"In 1827, Lord Amherst went to Delhi, and solemnly informed the King of Delhi (the representative of the old Mogul Emperors, who at this time was in receipt of a pension from the British Government) that the English were now the paramount power in India. Up to the period of this declaration the representative of the Mogul Emperors had been regarded as nominally Lord Paramount of India, though his power had long before really passed into the hands of the British."

The English will reign, says the Bhágavata, for 300 years, up to 2127 A. C.

When these are gone the kingdom will pass to the KILAKILA family. Five of these kings will reign for 106 years. This takes us to 2233 A. C. After this are mentioned the names of kings and families, but no period is allotted to them. We are thus brought to the contemporaneous kings of *Avante*, Kashmir, Sindhu, Chandrabhájá, &c.

Nothing is said of the rule of these families from Parikshit to the four contemporaneous families of the Andhras (7 kings), the Kanshalas (7 kings), the Vidurapatis and the Nishadhas, except in a

* It is always very difficult to find out the history of a proper name. Why should the English be called *Mannas*, and England *Manna desha*? Has the word any connection with MAN (The Isle of) and the MENAI (Strait). In the ISLE OF MAN is spoken Manx. Is it not possible that the tribe which speaks this dialect, might have at one time been the head and leader or the predecessor of the other Celtic tribes? England during the dominion of the Kelts, or at some time before that, might have been the land of MAN just like the Isle of MAN.

The old name of the Island of Anglesea was MONA, the chief sanctuary of the Druids, and the straits which connects this island with the main land is called MENAI. One can hardly resist the conclusion that the word *Manna* (Sans.) is the same as the Western *Man*, *Mona*, MENAI. Apparently there was a time when the ancient Hindus knew of England as the land of the people who now speak *Manx*, a tribe of the Kelts, whose priests were the Druids of MONA. In after times they applied the word generally to every tribe who afterwards occupied England. England remained to them always *Manna desha* (the country of the Mannas), and the inhabitants thereof, the MANNAS.

general way that, after the departure of Krishna, virtue will decline in the land. Of Puranjaya of Magadha, however, who comes a little after or about the same time, it is said that he will establish three new classes of men instead of the Brahmins, the Kshatriyas, and the Vaishyas. These classes will be respectively named Pulinda, Yudu, and Madraka. For this act of his King Puranjaya is honoured with the epithet of *durmati*, a fool.

If, however, we adopt the second reading given above, the translation would be a little different. It would run as follows :—

“Another Durmati will establish the Varnas, Pulinda, Yudu, and Madraka; and the majority of his subjects will be out of the Brahmanic pale.” In that case the king will not be Puranjaya but another. Durmati might be his name, or a mere epithet.

After the Bahlikas, various parts of the country are given to various rulers, and these rulers are made to possess all the vices of kings.

“These rulers will be Sudras, Vratyas, Mlechchas”.....
 “They will be given to vice and falsehood, giving little charity, having easily excitable tempers, the slayers of women, children, kine and Brahmins, given to adultery and the appropriation of other people’s wealth. They will go as soon as they come, they will have little strength, and will be short lived, they will be impure, doing no good acts.....Thus will thy subjects (O! Parikshid) be troubled and destroyed by their kings, and people will learn their ways of life, and will become a source of trouble to each other.”

This carries us a very little way through the Kaliyuga. After this the Bhāgavata passes over in silence a period of about four lakhs of years, and then gives us a very brief sketch of what will be the condition of humanity immediately before the advent of Kalki.

It will be for our children of the seventh generation to see if another gifted seer records for them in the meanwhile the events of another five thousand years or so. The Bhagavata evidently finishes the first chapter of its XIIth Book with one of such minor cycles.

Humanity always moves upwards and onwards. Each new cycle is marked by a fresh wave of spiritual force, from the centre of the ocean of life we call *the Universe*. This wave tending to spiritualize and purify humanity, begins by driving out the seeds of animality, toil and trouble. Thus while the heart of humanity is being purified, the sufferings which the flesh is heir to, are coming to the surface to disappear. The spiritual influx in the beginning of minor cycles is always of lesser strength than that in the beginning of a larger cycle. Thus the wave of a *Satya Yuga* is far more powerful than the minor waves of a cycle of 5,000 years or so. The greater the strength of these waves, the greater is the amount of evils which they drive out to the surface in order to evaporate and leave humanity so much the purer. The character of these *superficial* evils is of course always the same, but they reach their culmination in the end of a Kaliyuga.

The forces which are now acting on Indian society (and humanity in general) are sure to drive out in some comparatively small measure the vices noticed in the end of the first chapter, and the beginning of the second chapter of the XXIIInd Book. Thus the second chapter says :—

“Then will day by day come to destruction virtue—truthfulness, cleanliness, mercy and kindness—the length of life, strength and memory, by the force of Powerful Trial. Wealth alone will in the Kali age be the index of good qualities, good manners, and good birth. Force alone will be the chief factor in the administration of Law and Justice. In marriage the only guiding principle will be fancy. (People will not take into consideration good family, &c). In trade deceit will be the principal factor. The only object of womanhood and manhood will be sexual intercourse; the only indication of Brahmanism will be the sacred thread. Caste-marks only will denote the āshramas; justice will become difficult of obtaining without signatures and seals: *too much talking* (? power of speech) will mark learning. Poverty will be the chief mark of wickedness and outward polish of goodness. Mere contract will constitute marriage, and a bath will be the best adornment. Distant waters will become seats of pilgrimage; the keeping of hair will be considered beauty. The procuring of food will be the only end of human life; and *consistency* the only marks of truth. Cleverness will consist in supporting one’s family successfully, good works will be done for the sake of fame.

When the earth will be covered by such bad men, &c., &c., then will men fly to jungles, will be destroyed by hunger, thirst and death of men, &c., &c.... The highest limit of age will be 20 and 30.”

First of all I shall examine that part of the prophecy which speaks of our kings five hundred years hence.

We are at present being ruled by the *Mannas*, and the one great effect of this rule upon our political life will be that we shall learn the art of self-government. “As is the king, so are the subjects,” is a well-known Indian proverb. The English coming into contact with us as rulers cannot but teach us the value of their institutions, and cannot but instil in our hearts the love of political freedom which is so very dear to themselves. It is one of the simplest and most universal laws of nature, and its operation is always resistless. The signs of this political education are already visible, and sooner or later the signs are sure to become the things signified. The forces which nature puts forth are never withdrawn, until and unless they have had their fullest manifestation on the physical plane. The attempts at manifestation may be for some time unsuccessful. Nature, however, is never despairing; it never sits silent over its failures; but comes back with redoubled force. By the time the *Mannas* leave us—2127 A. C., we shall have learned the art of self-government. We have now to see what is likely to be the effect of this force of self-government when the *Mannas* are gone. As long as they are here and our Rajas and Maharajas are kept in salutary check, we may hope for undisturbed peace. But when they will be going, our ruling princes are sure to be let loose. The same drama which was played when the Moghul dominion was being wrecked into pieces is sure to be played again. But this time is sure to be introduced another and a more powerful force. That force is the People’s Spirit of British Self-government. For a time this spirit is sure to receive a check. Some brief respite will be secured by King Bhutananda and his im-

mediate successors, and then it is but natural that various leaders of armies should become kings of various parts, independent of the fact that they are Sudras, or Brahmins, Kshatriyas or Vaishyas or Mlechchas. These men having never tasted royalty before, are sure with power to degenerate into vice. Adultery, short life, the appropriation of other people's wealth, are the natural results of such a state of things. But the people whom the English will have taught the art of self-government will never rest satisfied with this sort of rule, and may we not hope that out of all this chaos, confusion and vice, will emerge 5 or 600 years hence the glorious rule of an Indian Parliament? The article is already assuming big proportions, and I must therefore dismiss all my remarks upon these points as briefly as possible. I therefore come to the next point in the prophecy.

"In marriage the only guiding principle will be fancy." "The only object of womanhood (or wifehood) or manhood will be sexual intercourse." "Mere contract (*swikára*) will constitute marriage." Now the chiefest vices of marriage system have been for sometime past.

1. The giving in marriage without the least regard to personal or mental beauty, or more properly what the bride and bridegroom might think to be beauty.

2. An aggravated form of the same, *i. e.*, charging some money for (or which is the same thing, selling) generally daughters and sometimes sons.

These evils must be got rid off in the interests of humanity. The human soul is the freest of the free, and has an innate dislike of this sort of slave trade. The presence of the spiritual wave which is to drive these evils out, is already visible in the generally prevalent ideas of freedom, which are making their way even to the fair sex. The form which the protests against this system take indicate very clearly the road we are travelling on. The reactive force introduced by this wave of freedom is sure to carry us for some time a little beyond the desirable point. Fancy alone will take for sometime the place of all other considerations. But mere fancy is very sure to be discovered to be an inadequate factor. All other consideration will slowly but surely regain their place. Fancy too will then take its proper place and will then be named regard for personal and mental beauty, and the feeling of the pair. The inauguration of the new cycle will thus be marked by a reform in the marriage system.

Now, something about marriage by contract. I have translated the word *swikára* by "contract." The ordinary meaning of the word is acceptance, and as there can be no acceptance without a proposal, both the elements of a contract are present, and *swikára* means a contract of marriage. The element of contract is already present in Hindu marriage, but it has been almost crushed out of existence by the sacramental element, which again has degenerated into a meaningless sham. The Brahma Marriage Act is sufficient to show the direction in which the wind is blowing. All the world over there is a tendency to sweep off the religious element in marriage, and substitute for it pure contract. When this

is done, its inadequacy will soon be discovered, and in the next cycle will have both contract and sacrament in proper and desirable proportions.

It is needless to examine other heads of the prophecy minutely. The most superficial observer of the signs of the times can see that the prophecy is, and is likely to prove true to the letter, and that out of these evils is sure in the end to come desirable good.

RAMA PRASAD.

AN INSTRUCTIVE CASE.

IT is not generally considered a very wise thing to cut off your nose to spite your face. Still, strange to say, our missionary friends are sometimes guilty of that extravagance, and a somewhat striking instance of it is afforded by the treatment meted out to our friend and brother Mr. A. E. Bultjens, B. A. (Cantab), F. T. S., by the orders of the Lord Bishop of Colombo. Happily it is not Mr. Bultjens himself who has suffered, but *only his name*; for, fortunately, in these days citizens are safeguarded from personal ecclesiastical ill-treatment by the law, and all that the most intemperate and venomous Churchman can do is to find something belonging to the offender to vent his spite upon. Some people find it soothing to kick about the hat of an enemy who is beyond their reach, and doubtless the good missionaries of Colombo experience a similar relief for their feelings in sponging out a name, the owner of which is protected from their malice not only by the law in this case, but also by his blameless life and honorable record.

The College of St. Thomas is the most aristocratic institution of learning in Colombo, the pet of the Lord Bishop of that ancient town. To graduate there is to ensure valuable patronage in life's struggle in Ceylon, to be converted there from Buddhism or Hinduism to Anglican Christianity, a passport to worldly advancement. Smiles, posies, diplomas, future snug official births—an inviting prospect, indeed! *Vice versa* what? Frowns of the aristocratic, social ostracism, obstruction in the public service? Naturally, for that is the way re-actionaries of all sects try to prevent progress: a base, cowardly, selfish way; and pursued by none more ruthlessly than by our Hindus, with their caste boycottings long after caste has ceased to mean substantial human differentiation. However, caste is an acknowledged part of the present Hindu religion, and in observing it the pious Hindu is guilty of no violation of his religious duty. But with Christianity the case is confessedly the opposite; and in punishing, or trying to punish and crush, young men who think to the bottom of Christian theology, and come out beyond as Freethinkers, Agnostics, Mussalmen or Buddhists, the agents belie the profession of their Church that all men are equally children of God, created by him, hence irresponsible for the intellectual convictions to which their thinking may bring them. Nevertheless, it is useless

to argue about so confessed an inconsistency as that between the preaching and the behaviour of Anglican Bishops and smaller clerics. Nor need we feel surprise at the petty persecution that follows the young graduate of St. Thomas' College who abandons Christianity openly, honestly. Our present facts relate to the case of Mr. A. E. Buultjens, F. T. S.

Among the clever youth who had passed through the Bishop's educational mill, this young Burgher, born a Christian, descendant of the doughty Hollanders who once ruled in the Maritime Provinces of Ceylon, was one of the cleverest. Judge from the following list of his honours and prizes :

- 1880. Junior Local Cambridge, Class II, in Honours.
- 1881. Calcuta Entrance Examination. First Class.
- 1882. Rajapakse Prize Rs. 100 for Classics.
- 1882. Senior Local Cambridge, Class III, in Honours and distinction in English.
- 1883. Rajapakse Prize of Rs. 100 for Classics.
- 1883. Senior Local Cambridge, Class I, in Honours, and distinction in Physical Geography.
- 1884. University Scholarship of £150 a year for four years.
- 1887. Graduated in Honours at Cambridge University.

Of a scholar so successful, an intellect so bright and so highly trained, the College might well be proud ; and if a youth like that ever needed pushing—which none ever did, for he could *compel* Fate and snatch success from the very thorn-bush of adversity—it would be no more than natural to expect the Lord Bishop and his entire 'Tail' of followers to join shoulders behind the boy's back and shove him ahead. But what weaker word than dastardly should one use to characterise the attempt to break down a young man who may have found Buddhism a better religion than Christianity, because a reasonable and scientific one, and have manfully said so to the public? If the pervert be wrong so much the worse for him, and he might well be left to the Christian God to deal with in his own way and time, without episcopal interference. And if he be wrong, that will not obliterate his collegiate record or cancel his classical successes. The Lord Bishop of Colombo seems to have thought otherwise, for, upon Mr. Buultjen's turning Buddhist, accepting the Headmastership of our Buddhist English High School in Colombo, and succeeding Mr. Powell as Editor of our organ, *The Buddhist*, he did a very foolish thing, a thing to make even a Vestry Clerk blush : it was this. The academical career of Mr. Buultjens was so brilliant that it had been emblazoned on a shield, or tablet, and hung up on the College Library wall, to be seen and envied of all students. The graduate had reflected distinction upon the Alma Mater whose bosom had nourished his budding brains. What the poor Lord Bishop did in his despair, when the awful fact of Buultjens' perversion to Buddhism came to his knowledge, was—to scratch out the inscriptions on that shield ! Exactly the childish pettiness of the French revolutionists who tear down street signs, monuments and buildings, as though they could thus obliterate the records of French history !

Of course this stupid meanness arouses indignation. But, after all, is not Mr. Buultjens to be congratulated rather than condoled with ? He transferred himself from Christianity to Buddhism, and the record of his academic triumphs has followed him from the walls of the missionary school to those of the Theosophical one. Surely such a transfer is a promotion, just as his own change of faith is a progress. There is another thing ; so long as his name remained emblazoned in the Christian school, the missionaries could claim a kind of proprietary right to share in his triumphs, but now they have made us a present of that right, and nothing remains to them but the painful consciousness that everyone who looks at the Buultjens shield which now hangs on the walls of our school, will smile as they think of the impotent spite of the Colombo Bishop and of the victory won and the prize secured by Theosophy.

We think that the Bishop of Colombo has established a dangerous precedent ; for, if we read the signs of the times correctly, Mr. Buultjens is not the last of his distinguished young men who will give up Christianity and come over to us ; and if the Missionaries erase the names of all those who desert them, in a few years their walls may be very bare indeed of names in any way worthy of mention.

H. S. O.

NERALAMBA-UPANISHAD OF SUKLA-YAJUR-VEDA.

Translated by the Kumbakonam T. S.

(Continued from p. 235.)

I SHALL relate in the form of a Catechism whatever should be known for the removal of all miseries that befall these ignorant creatures, viz., men.

(1.) What is Brahm (neuter) ?

It is the Chaitanya (consciousness) that appears as Karma and Gyana (wisdom) by means of this vast mundane egg, in which are contained Mahat' Ahankara (I-am-ness), and the (five) elements, earth, water, fire, air and akas—that is secondless—that is devoid of all Upadhis (vehicles)—that is full of all Saktis (powers personified as females or matter)—that is without beginning and end—that is spoken of as pure, beneficial, peaceful and guna-less, and that is indescribable.

(2.) Who is Eswara and what are his characteristics ?

Brahm having assumed through Prakriti (matter)—its Sakti (power)—the name (of Eswara or Logos), having evolved the worlds and having pervaded them, becomes the ordainer of Buddhi and Indryas (organs of sense and action) of Brahma and others. Hence he is named Eswara (Lord).

(3.) Who is Jiva ?

Eswara by assuming the names and forms of Brahma (masculine), Vishnu, Rudra, Indra and others, falsely thinks "I am the gross body." Hence he becomes a Jiva. Even though he is one, he

(1). Cosmic ideation or Universal World-soul corresponding to Eswara (vide Secret Doctrine, pages 16, 45, &c.)

appears as several Jivas through the force of Karma which originates the body.

(4.) What is Prakriti (matter) ?

It is that Sakti (power) of Brahm, which is of the form (or nature) of Buddhi,—which (power) is able to produce the many motley worlds by virtue of the presence of Brahm.

(5.) Who is Paramatma ?

It is Brahm alone that is Paramatma, as he (the former) is (param) far superior to bodies and others.

(6.) Who is Brahma (the creator) ?

(7.) Who is Vishnu (the preserver) ?

(8.) Who is Rudra (the destroyer) ?

(9.) Who is Indra ?

(10.) Who is Yama (God of death) ?

(11.) Who is Surya (Sun) ?

(12.) Who is Moon ?

(13.) Who are Devatas (Gods) ?

(14.) Who are Asuras (Demons) ?

(15.) Who are Pisachas (female evil spirits) ?

(16.) Who are men ?

(17.) Who are women ?

(18.) What are cows, &c. ?

(19.) What are the fixed ones or the immoveables ?

(20.) Who are Brahmins and others ?

(21.) What is caste ?

It (this word) cannot be applied to the skin—to the blood—to the flesh, nor the bone. There is no caste to Atma. (The word) caste is only conventional.

(22.) What is Karma ?

Karma is the action performed by the Indryas (organs of sense and action) and ascribed to the Atma as "I do" (viz., agency being attributed to it).

(23.) What is Akarma (non-karma) ?

Akarma is the performance,—without any desire for the fruits—of daily and occasional rites, sacrifices, penances, austerities, gifts and other actions which are associated with the egoism of the actor and the enjoyer, which are of the form of bondage and which are productive of birth and others.

(24.) What is Gyana (wisdom) ?

It is the realisation by direct cognition of the fact that in this ephemeral universe there is nothing but Chaitanya, that is Consciousness, that is of the form of the seer, and the seen, that is pervading all things, that is the same in all and that is not subject to changes, as water, jar, cloth, &c., are—which (realisation) is brought about by means of the subjugation of the body and the Indryas, the serving of a good guru, the hearing of the exposition of Vedantic doctrines, the reflection thereon and their realisation.

(25.) What is Agyana (non-wisdom) ?

It is the illusory attribution of the diverse bodies of the devas, beasts, men, the fixed ones, &c., to Brahm like the illusion of a

snake in the rope that Brahm which is secondless, which is all-permeating and which is of the form of all.

(26.) What is Happiness ?

It is the remaining in (or enjoying of) the supreme bliss, having cognised through experience the form (or reality) of Sachithananda (or that which is Be-ness, consciousness and bliss.)

(27.) What is Sorrow (or misery) ?

It is the thinking about the objects of sense (pertaining to mundane existence) and is the opposite of happiness.

(28.) What is Swarga (heaven) ?

It is the society of Sat (either good men or the union of one's soul with Brahm which is Sat).

(29.) What is Naraka (hell) ?

It is the association with that which brings about this mundane existence which is Asat (false).

(30.) What is Bhandas (bondage) ?

Such conceptions as "I was born," arising from the affinities (or force) of Agyana (non-wisdom), which has no beginning, form the bondage (of Atma).

The thoughts proceeding from Agyana about the mundane objects and producing the conception of "It is mine," in such as father, mother, wife, child, brother, lands and house, form the bondage.

The egoistic conceptions of actor, &c., are bondage.

The aspiring for the development in one self of the eight (higher) psychical powers, such as¹ (anima), laghima and others is bondage.

The desire of propitiating the favor of the Devas, men, &c., is bondage.

The desire of going through the eight means of yoga practice, Yama², &c., is bondage.

The desiring of performing the duties of one's own caste and order of life is bondage.

The thought that command, fear and doubt are the qualities of (or do pertain to) Atma is bondage.

The thoughts concerning the knowledge and performance of sacrifices, penances, austerity and gift is bondage. Even in the desire of Moksha (emancipation) alone there is bondage. By the very act of thought, bondage is caused.

(31.) What is Moksha (emancipation) ?

(1). These are the 8 higher Iddhis (or Siddhis) as distinguished from the lower ones as stated in the "Voice of Silence." (1) Anima (the power of becoming minute as an atom); (2) Mahima (the power of becoming so great as a mountain, (&c.); (3) Laghima (the power to render one self so light as to float in air like cotton); (4) Prapti (the power to extend the organs so unlimitedly as to touch from one's position sun, moon, &c.); (5) Prakamyan (irresistible will which finds no resistance from entry into earth, &c.). These five conquests are obtained over the gross properties; (6) Vāsītva (the power of subjecting elements, beasts, &c.); (7) Isītva (the power of one having control over the primordial forces of nature, Nirmulaprakriti, &c.); (8) Kamavasyatvam (the power of endowing qualities at will).

(2). They are—Yama (forbearance), Nyama (religious observance), Asana (posture), Pranayama (restraint of breath), Pratyahara (subjugation of the senses), Dharma (concentration), Dhyana (contemplation), and Samadhi (meditation). For full explanation of these vide Sandilya Upanishad.

Moksha is that state in which through the discrimination of the eternal from the non-eternal, all thoughts relating to the transient mundane existence, and the objects pleasure and pain and all love towards the objects of the world vanish.

(32.) Who is fit to be adored?

That Guru (Spiritual Instructor) who enables (one) to attain to Brahm—the Chaitanya—which is in all bodies.

(33.) Who is the Sishya (disciple)?

The disciple is that Brahm which remains after the consciousness of the universe has been lost in him though Brahmagyana (Brahmic wisdom.)

(34.) Who is the Pandit (the learned man)?

It is he who has cognised the true form (or the reality) of his own consciousness which is latent in all.

(35.) Who is the ignorant one?

He who has the egoistic conception of body, caste, orders of life, actor, enjoyer and others.

(36.) What is Asura (the austerity of an asura)?

It is that Tapas (austerity) practised by one inflicting trouble on the Atma within through Japa (inaudible mutterings of mantras and Agnihotra (performance of the worship of fire) and attended by cruel desire, hatred, pain, pride and others—he having abstained from food through the desire of acquiring the powers of Vishnu, Brahma, Rudra, Indra and others.

(37.) What is Tapas?

Tapas is the act of frying—through the fire of direct cognition of the knowledge that Brahm is Truth and the universe a myth—the seed, (viz.), the deep-rooted desire to attain the powers of Brahma, &c.

(38.) What is the Paramapada (the Supreme Seat)?

It is that eternal and unconditioned seat of Brahm, which is far superior to Pranas (vital airs), Indryas, Antahkarnas (the internal organs of thought, &c.), the gunas and others, which is the nature of Sachithananda and which is the witness to all.

(39.) What is fit to be taken in (or understood)?

Only that reality of absolute consciousness which is not conditioned by space, time or substance.

(40.) What is not fit to be taken in (or understood)?

The thought that this universe is truth—this universe which is different from one's reality, and which being subject to Maya (illusion) forms the object of (cognition to) Buddhi and Indryas.

(41.) Who is a Sannyasi (ascetic)?

A Sannyasi is an ascetic who having given up all the duties (of caste, orders of life, good and bad actions, so on), being freed from the egoistic conception of I and Mine, and having taken his refuge only in Brahm roams at large, practising Nirvikalpa Samadhi and being firmly convinced of "I am Brahm" through the realisations of the meaning of such sacred (Vedic) sentences as "That art thou," "all this is Brahma" and "There is no variety even in the

(1). That state in which the mind (manas) of a person does not require any object to meditate upon and is destroyed, and he is one with his own reality.

least degree." He only is an emancipated person. He only is fit to be adored. He only is a Yogi. He only is a Paramahamsa.¹ He only is an Avathutha.² He only is a Brahmagyani (viz., a person having Brahmic wisdom.)

Whoever studies the Niralamba³ Upanishad becomes pure like Agni (fire). He becomes pure like Vayu (air). He is not born again. He is not born again, nay he is not born again. Such is the Upanishad.

ELOHISTIC TEACHINGS.

VI.

THE PROBLEM SUBMITTED BY NATURE TO MAN.

(Continued from page 310.)

THOSE who believe in evolution by natural selection and the survival of the fittest see that the aim of an evolution so carried on must be, through a perfectible, to produce a perfected and perfect nature, while restoring all failures, as so much surplus material, to the source from which that material was originally derived.

This aim they perceive to be attained, this restoration they recognize as being accomplished in and by the three alternative issues of the evolutionary course of spirit at the close of its incarnational career.

These issues, which await spirit when it relinquishes its ultimate embodiment in the human form, suggest the three alternative modes of life open to man, by following either of which he unconsciously selects the necessary outcome of his life, and determines the state to which the disembodied self will inevitably pass at death.

The three alternative issues to the evolutionary course of spirit, at the close of its incarnational career, are:—

1. *The personal condition* of personified Being, gained by the divinized spirit of man through regenerative transformation into the human soul.

2. *The impersonal condition* of substantialized existence, accorded to the spiritualized spirit of man when duly purified and refined.

3. *The elemental condition* of materialized subsistence, allotted to the animalized spirit of man when fully degraded.

These three issues are respectively gained, accorded or allotted, as the necessary outcome of the several modes of life whose termination they await.

The three alternative modes of life are:—

1. *The natural*, leading to the personal condition of Divine Impersonation in the Divine-Human.

(1 and 2). Of the six classes of Hindu ascetics, Paramahamsa is one who goes about in red cloth, leaving all worldly concerns and supporting himself on food obtained on alms from five houses. Avathutha is one who being naked and motionless, is always engaged in the direct cognition of one's own reality.

(3). Lit: without support.

2. *The spiritual*, inducing the impersonal condition of absorption into and by the Divine substance of the Unknown Deity.

3. *The animal*, ending in the elemental condition of latent force.

The three alternative states, to which these several modes of life respectively lead, are:—

1. *The Divine*, awaiting the divinized (humanized) human.
2. *The Spiritual*, gained by spiritualized humanity.
3. *The Material*, proper to animalized man.

The entrance into either of these three states, which are final as regards the present order of manifested nature, is, to the self of each individual human being, the closing act of its evolutionary career.

The states themselves are respectively, those of active enjoyment, of passive happiness, and of absolute deprivation of the one and the other.

The perfect type of either of the three modes of life is, perhaps, seldom reached, owing to the mixed character of the influences actuating the career of man: but a preponderating tendency in a given direction soon shows itself, often from infancy, always at the dawn of reason; and this tendency is aided either by natural, spiritual or animal impulses, as the case may be, by the instinctive following of which, in its uses of life, the self prepares itself for the state it will at death be duly fitted to enter.

But, even after the preponderating tendency has shown itself, the subordinate tendencies remain, and continue to exercise more or less influence over the life, and—aided by the several inclinations proper to each and the conflicting working of the impulses they generate—induce a struggle in the individual, which is prone to continue, with more or less violence, for an indefinite period, in some cases even until the close of the individual career.

This tripartite struggle has hitherto been interpreted as a bipartite conflict between the tendencies to good and evil; and the so-called "Good" has been held to be the outcome of the actuating spiritual, the "Evil"—then ranked as "Sin"—as the product of the inciting animal impulses.

Hence the spiritual impulsion was approved as good, the animal condemned as bad, respectively. And then, the spiritual having come to be considered as a superhuman, a supernatural, *the animal was regarded as the natural life*: upon which it was imputed to the natural that it was bad in itself, and therefore to be shunned.

In this way the conflict going on in man came to be viewed as a simple and uncomplicated struggle between the human and the superhuman, the natural and the supernatural—interpreted as the tendencies to good and evil in the individual: and this has led to the direct condemnation of the natural, as contrasted with the spiritual mode of life, and the requirement that the one should be absolutely renounced in favour of the other.

This has been a most unfortunate misinterpretation, for it has caused the vast majority of mankind to wholly misapprehend the relations and underrate the value of the natural, and in great part to believe that the animal instincts of man are to be resolutely

resisted until completely paralyzed, his spiritual inclinations to be solely followed.

But incarnation is animalization: is the clothing of spirit with an organized body in virtue of which it becomes an organized being—an animal.

Now man is an organized being: a being the continuity of whose existence depends upon the continuous exercise of his organic functions—for he must breathe, as well as eat and drink, to live.

Hence, as an organized being, man, whether viewed as a spirit clothed with flesh or a mere animated body, is an animal, and, owing to his organization, will continue to be an animal as long as he lives. For him to cease to be an animal, to cease to exercise his organic functions, would be to cease to live.

There is this difference, however, between him and other animals, that he has a knowledge of good and evil, is capable of doing the one and avoiding the other.

Man is therefore an advanced animal—an animal seeking a motivated basis or reason for his instinctive impulses—an animal capable of doing good and avoiding evil on reasonable grounds.

The character and capabilities of the advance in man are denoted by his form, and expressed by the special faculties accruing through it.

In this form, through its special faculties, the advancing self has gained the power of humanizing and so of ennobling the animal in the human.

Now the natural instinct of the animal is to put the well-being of self before all—and this man's special faculties have led him to recognize as the root of all evil.

Hence he has learnt the lesson that to humanize the animal in the human is to become unselfish: to cease to be indifferent to the sufferings of others; to put their well-being before the well-being of self. And it is in the habitual doing of this that the goodness suggested to man, to be reached through the life, should consist.

The lesson submitted to man, in himself and by his surroundings, is a very simple one, as an animal he necessarily has animal appetites. As a man he acquires spiritual appetencies. These he finds to be in conflict with each other. Hence, as a human being he must bring either or both under control.

He cannot live without submitting to animal needs, giving a measure of indulgence to animal appetites. Hence over indulgence is what he has to guard against.

He can live without giving way to his spiritual inclinations. Hence these are not indispensable to the preservation of his life.

These considerations compel him to ponder on the whole position, and suggest the question. In what does goodness—to be attained through an animal organization—consist?

The answer to this question is in reality not far to seek. The root of badness, of so-called evil, is, as already indicated, reckless self-seeking, all the evil in the world results from this. Could animated life become self-forgetting, goodness would reign supreme—badness be absolutely unknown.

But had animated life been self-forgetting, progressive evolution would have been impossible—for a reckless indulgence of appetite, which sacrifices all to the well-being of self, has been the instrumentality through which animal advance has been gained, and the human form, with its faculties and capabilities, attained.

Hence, that which has been the incentive to so great a good, and has at the same time become the source of evil—of evil in man, (for compensations in nature, unperceivable from his restricted standpoint, may reverse the apparent conditions here)—cannot be evil in itself, and should, therefore, in him be subjected to such influences as would cause it to lead up to yet greater good.

This is evident from the anomalies of the case. The human spirit has, by its process of evolution, been unavoidably constituted a self-seeker, and in so far has the root of evil innate in itself, and is, therefore, a potential doer of evil.

Now the self-seeker is a self-indulger. An indulger of appetite. An indulger of appetite at the cost of others. An indulger of appetite who, by so indulging, from being a potential becomes an actual doer of evil.

But to sustain life the indulgence of appetite is necessary.

Hence the indulgence of appetite without the commission of evil constitutes the problem submitted by nature to man—a problem, the right solution of which would furnish a trustworthy guide for his uses of life.

The requirement of the conditions involved in this problem evidently is—the control of appetite by the avoiding of over-indulgence, and especially by guarding against indulgence at the expense of others. This is the aim of nature in man. Hence the working of the natural in him should differ from and reverse the working of nature in the subordinate animal world: should differ from and reverse that working in this, that whereas the animal is, in its uses of life, a self-seeker, the human should, in his uses thereof, be a self-forgetter.

Now the animalizing man, who passes his life in gratifying his animal appetites, reckless of the consequences to others, is a self-seeker.

But so also is the spiritualizing man: for he makes self his first object, the salvation of his own soul, or the development of a supersensuous self, the aim of his life. He is, moreover, a self-seeker who, upon occasion, recklessly sacrifices others (through the natural affections), the more effectually to indulge his own spiritual appetites.

And yet if so—and the desire to spiritualize one's being, or save one's soul, is undoubtedly a selfish appetite, whose incentive is self-seeking—then the natural inclination, that which is to become the natural inclination in the human, should be intermediate between these two opposing instincts—an equilibrium of the two.

But then, equilibrium between these two implies the subordination of both to the humanizing uses of life.

Thus the first step towards the natural should withdraw man from the control as well of the spiritual as of the animal, and make the self the controller of both.

The necessary consequence of a life passed under the control of a nature so ordered would inevitably be, the gradual change of appetite into desire, which would gain its expression as love—whose tendency would be to the inclining of inclination to the inclination of the beloved, in utter forgetfulness of self.

The animal impulses of man resist this control, and, urging him to the indulgence of appetite, initiate the first moral struggle.

His spiritual impulses seek to take him beyond this control, and invite him to the renunciation of desire—that is, of desire which has its roots in the animal side of his nature, and is, therefore, only a transformation of mere animal appetite, which it would replace by a spiritual appetency for things spiritual, at the cost of things animal.

But, in so seeking, his spiritual impulses require man to attempt the impossible—to cease to be an animal.

Thus while the animal side of his nature calls upon him to animalize, the spiritual side thereof urges him to spiritualize self.

Now the animal and the spiritual are combined in, and constitute the nature of man, and, as far as his passing life is concerned, are to him the natural. The inference therefore is, that they are so combined that they may be inseparably united in a future state, when both, now permanently one in the harmony of equilibrium, will reap the fruits gained through the control exercised over its life uses by the self.

Under this aspect the animal and the spiritual act in harmonious combination in the natural, the one counteracting and so preventing the excessive action of the other, that, by this conjoint action in the human, they may ennoble the animal side of the nature of man, and so prepare and fit him to pass, as the divinized human, to the soul-state.

From this point of view, the natural, which represents the balance of harmony and the equilibrium of contrasts, occupies an intermediate place between the animal and the spiritual—a condition which the duly balanced counteraction of these is required to produce.

Hence the struggle going on in man is between the animal and the spiritual, in which either only overcomes the other at the cost of the natural, which disappears in this unnatural ending of the conflict—for it is only in the equilibrium of the natural that the spiritual and the animal find the balance of equipoised and harmonious life.

It is not necessary that the individual should understand the meaning of the conflict going on within himself, since that conflict is only a part of the final process of a long course of functional evolution. In ignorance of what lies before him each will lead the life most consonant with the tendencies of the developed self which, in his personality, has passed into the human. Teaching will seldom enable that self to overcome these tendencies, and this is why the members of any and every religion seldom act up to their professed belief: but when teaching is resorted to, it should be addressed to those in whom a preponderating tendency exists—whether to animal or spiritual self-indulgence; and should be in the form of a recall from either of these to the natural uses of life.

Hence the test of the truth of any doctrinal teaching is the extent to which it is a recall to nature.

The difficulty the advocates of this recall have to contend with is, the marked character of the conflict that is going on.

This is due to the seductive development of the spiritualizing influences, on the one hand, and the sensualizing impulsion of the animalizing inclinations, on the other.

Owing to this the natural has been identified with, and condemned in and as the animal, and the effective struggle has been supposed to be between the latter and a more or less preponderating spirituality.

This is well shown in the course taken by the conflict, as it can be still traced, in the Hebrew SS. Here the Elohist represents the natural, with which the spiritual, in the form of the earlier Jehovist, enters into contention, and which it finally supplants and displaces only to find itself in antagonism with the more advanced spiritualism advocated by the later Jehovist. After this the struggle is continued between priest and prophet, between bond and free.

Throughout these continuously transforming struggles the natural is absolutely lost sight of—has wholly disappeared in the condemned animal; and a sublime courage would have been needed in him who ventured to proclaim a recall to nature.

But as time went on one endowed with such a courage was not wanting—one by whom the Elohist teachings were reaffirmed; by whom the struggle for spiritual freedom was recommenced.

* * * * *

The conflict traceable in the Old Testament is reproduced in the New; and has been transmitted through its instrumentality down to the present day. Hence, as in the O. T., so in the N., the actuality of this conflict, with the means by which it was carried on, is made manifest by a comparison of the doctrines it unfolds, and a careful study of the mode in which these have been veiled, the one in the other.

In reality the course pursued was a continuation of the method previously followed. The Gospels, like the Pentateuch, consist of an original nucleus of great simplicity, fragmentarily embedded in a developing context, by which a sense was imputed to the thus separated fragments other than they were intended to bear. In this way the synoptic Gospels gradually assumed their present form, and the imputed doctrine thus imparted to them was finally confirmed, and seemingly rendered absolute and made incontrovertible by the last and latest of the four attributed to the Apostle John, whose prolonged life enabled its real author to make it seem possible that it was written by him.

The sermon on the Mount commences with the startling declaration—"Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." *Matt. v. 3.*

The teaching to Nicodemus includes the statement—"Except a man be born of.....the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." *John iii. 5.*

Here the reader is brought face to face with directly opposing doctrines, which evidently embody the fundamental principles of two opposing schools.

But then the teaching to Nicodemus also comprises the remarkable declaration—"The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whether it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit." *John iii. 8.* It does not require much reflection to realize that this statement, removed from its distorting context and restored to its rightful position in the original nucleus of gospel-teachings, gives the reason why the poor in Spirit are blessed; explains why none should seek to be born of the Spirit—because those born of and rich therein *know not whence that Spirit cometh, nor whither it urgeth them.*

This was the doctrine of the *Chrétianoï*, or non-messianizing Christians; and the teaching to Nicodemus (*John iii. 1—21*) is a good example of the system by which the *Christianoï*, or messianizing Christians, messianised the non-messianic doctrine which they were unable otherwise to overcome and cast out. They could not do away with a well known and wide-spread teaching. They therefore embedded it in an interpreting surrounding which veiled and completely transformed its actual meaning, trusting to time to give the ascendancy to their supplanting doctrine; and in this they were not deceived.

The Beatitudes (*Matt. v. 3—12*) embody a series of contradictions to the teachings of Judaism. The Law gave no comfort to those who mourned; assured no inheritance to the meek; acknowledged no righteousness outside the fulfilling of its own precepts; suffered not the showing of mercy—not even by Jehovah, who, for the slightest breach thereof, required the life of the offender, though his vengeance was satisfied by the sacrifice of an innocent substitute; only insisted on a conventional purity of body; imposed a system of retaliation, under which peacemaking was impossible; and persecuted those who set actual before technical righteousness.

Actuated by a sublime courage and urged by a just indignation, the Proclaimer of the Beatitudes, after deliberately blessing those who by life and example contradicted the spirit of the Law, likened his followers to the prophets (*Matt. v. 12*); called them the salt of the earth (*Matt. v. 13*), and the light of the world (*Matt. v. 14*).

The teaching here is equally clear when it is remembered that the prophets were in constant conflict with the priests; and that the Jewish Rabbis—to whom, as rich in the spirit of the Law, was delegated the government of the "Kingdom of heaven" upon earth—were called the "salt of the earth" and the "light of the world."

These—notwithstanding, rather than because of their great learning—were the salt that had lost its savour (*Matt. v. 13*), the lamp whose light was occulted by being placed under the bushel (*Matt. v. 15*) that it might only be imparted to those capable of receiving it, and even so by measure.

The *Christianoï* trod in the footsteps, so to say, of these thus deposed teachers, while professing to hold the doctrine of their Deposer.

The *Chrétianoï* were opposed to these upholders of a deposed doctrine and representers of a suppressed system.

To the *Christianoï* the Proclaimer of the Beatitudes (as interpreted by themselves) was a representer of the *Christos*, their Logos or Word, incarnated or to be incarnated in every spiritualized *Chrétos* (a term which they thereupon, for reasons, adopted as a designation of the accepted initiate) to whom the occulted Light of the CHRISTOS was imparted by measure, after initiation, until in adeptship its full illumination was obtained and reunion with the Logos (or Higher-self) attained by the regenerated and then titular as well as actual *Christos*.

To the *Chrétianoï* the *Christos* they were required to accept dogmatically, by those who had acquired the ascendancy, became the *Chrétos*, the Good shepherd, who by humanizing means still recalled them to the natural, despite the spiritual thralldom in which they were held.

Through constant attrition between the *Christianoï* and the *Chrétianoï* (either of which held a doctrine not believed by the other, though the authority for each was supposed to be drawn from the same Gospels, owing to the ultimate disappearance of the original nucleus or primary Evangel in its supplanting successor) an intermediate form of messianic religion arose—the professed Christianity of Christendom.

The characteristic mark of this—the revealed, as contrasted with the non-revealed, the not openly divulged religions it supplanted—was belief in a supernaturally incarnated Saviour; in a Redeemer promised to Adam after the Fall, whose advent was predicted by the prophets, and who was at length born in Judæa to fulfil the promise and the prophecies.

This Saviour was held to have been the Jesus of the *Chrétianoï*, the *Christos* of the *Christianoï*, and the Jesus Christ of the intermediate faith or revealed religion of Christendom.

The crucifixion of this Saviour was to the *Chrétianoï*, the sacrifice of a life rather than the surrender of a truth. For them, Jesus died to impress his followers with the priceless value of the teaching of the Divine sonship of man; of his direct dependence on his heavenly Father, which no mediation should come between. On account of this teaching—which was News, Good news indeed, because it freed his followers from the trammels of a legally imposed spiritual bondage—he had been called the ‘Son of God.’ Invited to deny the imputation conveyed by the accepted view of the Divine sonship, he would not do so, because, had he disavowed this designation in one sense, it might have been said of him afterwards that he had disclaimed it in another, and so given up the doctrine to the promulgation of which he had devoted his life. But so doing, so maintaining the Divine character of man, he sealed his own fate, and thus voluntarily laid down that life to confirm the faith of his followers.

To the *Christianoï*, the death of the Saviour on the cross was a symbol of the crucifixion of the flesh required by the Spirit, and figured by the final trial of the initiate in his passage to adeptship.

To the *Christians*, his voluntary sacrifice of his own life to con-

firm the faith of his followers became the promised and predicted atoning sacrifice for fallen man.

In the resurrection—not believed in as of Jesus by the *Chrétianoï*—the Risen Christ symbolized to the *Christianoï* the manifestation of the *Christos*, incarnated as the Logos in the individual; whereas to the *Christians* it was a reassuring pledge of a renewed life in the flesh, in another state—in which sense the doctrine was accepted by the *Chrestianoï*.

Under the revealed, or divulged and openly professed, religion of Christendom, conformity of practise, and even of profession, was obtained without unity of belief.

Through it an intermediate body of professing Christians arose, who, from habitual unbelief in the doctrine sought to be imposed by either on the other, gradually developed into the believers without faith who have so long constituted the body of Christendom.

Amongst these, although the meaning of the distinction between the *Christos* and the *Chrétos*, and indeed the knowledge that such a distinction ever existed, has been long lost sight of, revivals arise from time to time—in the one direction, towards the mysticism of the spiritual, in the other, towards the literalism of the revealed; and occasionally, if only by aspiration, towards the simplicity of the natural.

The letter of the Gospels, in their received form, is in reality a veil behind which two opposing teachings are concealed—the esoteric doctrine of the *Christos* and the nature-training of the *Chrétos*: beneath which, after prolonged struggles, they have been entombed.

Of these the teaching regarding the nature-training of the *Chrétos* was once expressed by, and is now hidden in, the designation ‘Gospel.’

This familiar designation is the accepted rendering of the originally as familiar Hebrew word *Basar*, ‘News,’ ‘Good news,’ which also means ‘Flesh.’

This oracular word, as thus used by Hebrews, naturally suggested that the good-news of which it was the bearer was associated with the flesh—that the Gospel was a gospel of flesh and signified the conditions of an incarnation therein.

This incarnation was held by the *Chrétianoï* to be that of goodness through Love, in the *Chrétos*; but by the *Christianoï* as that of the Higher-self, through the Logos, in the *Christos*, by reunion with the regenerated lower self.

The manner in which Paul, the apostle of the Risen Christ, charges the Galatians with having been seduced into another Gospel by those who would pervert the Gospel of the Christ (*Gal.* i. 6—9) is more than suggestive in this regard. What could he have meant when he wrote to them, ‘Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected (or ‘Do ye now make an end’) in the flesh’ (*Gal.* iii. 3)? Unless indeed he was reproving them for passing from his doctrine of the *Christos* to that of the *Chrétos*; with ceasing to be disciples of the Risen Christ that they might become followers of the living Jesus?

HENRY PRATT, M. D.

HEGEL'S VIEWS OF ZOROASTRIANISM.

[The following views of Zoroastrianism are those of the well-known German Philosopher G. W. F. Hegel. They must prove not only interesting, but very useful, to a large number of readers of the *Theosophist*. I commend them also to the attention of those who appreciated my esoteric explanation of the Zoroastrian Doctrine published sometime ago, as well as to that of those whose consciences revolted against that explanation and still revolt against any esoteric interpretation of the Zoroastrian Doctrine.—D. J. MEDHORA.]

(From the *Philosophy of History*).

“THE chief point—that which especially concerns us here—is the doctrine of Zoroaster. In contrast with the wretched hebetude of Spirit which we find among the Hindoos, a pure ether—an explanation of Spirit—meets us in the Persian conception. In it, Spirit emerges from that substantial Unity of Nature, that substantial destitution of import, in which a separation has not yet taken place—in which Spirit has not yet an independent existence in contraposition to its object. This people, namely, attained to the consciousness, that absolute Truth must have the form of Universality—of Unity. This Universal, Eternal, Infinite Essence is not recognized at first, as conditioned in any way; it is Unlimited Identity. This is properly (and we have frequently repeated it) also the character of Brahm. But this Universal Being became objective, and their Spirit became the consciousness of this its Essence; while, on the contrary, among the Hindoos, this objectivity is only the *natural* one of the Brahmins, and is recognized as pure Universality only in the destruction of consciousness. Among the Persians this negative assertion has become a positive one; and man has relation to Universal Being of such a kind that he remains positive in sustaining it. This One, Universal Being, is indeed not yet recognized as the free Unity of Thought; not yet “worshipped in Spirit and in Truth;” but is still clothed with a form—that of Light. But Light is not a Lama, a Brahmin, a mountain, a brute—this or that particular existence,—but sensuous Universality itself; simple manifestation. The Persian religion is therefore no idol-worship; it does not adore individual natural objects, but the Universal itself. Light admits, moreover, the signification of the spiritual; it is the form of the Good and True,—the substantiality of knowledge and volition as well as of all natural things. Light puts man in a position to be able to exercise choice; and he can only choose when he has emerged from that which had absorbed him. But Light directly involves on opposite, namely, Darkness; just as Evil is the antithesis of Good. As man could not appreciate Good, if Evil were not; and as he can be really good only when he has become acquainted with the contrary, so the Light does not exist without Darkness. Among the Persians, *Ormuzd* and *Ahriman* present the antithesis in question. Ormuzd is the Lord of the kingdom of Light—of Good; Ahriman that of Darkness—of Evil. But there is a still higher being from whom both proceeded—a Universal being not attested by this antithesis, called *Zeruane-Akerne*—the Unlimited All. The All, *i. e.*, is something abstract; it does not exist for itself, and Ormuzd and Ahriman have arisen from it. This

dualism is brought as a reproach against Oriental thought; and, as far as the contradiction is regarded as absolute, that is certainly an irreligious understanding which remains satisfied with it. But the very nature of Spirit demands antithesis; the principle of Dualism belongs therefore to the idea of Spirit, which, in its concrete form, essentially involves distinction. Among the Persians, Purity and Impurity have both become subjects of consciousness; and Spirit, in order to comprehend itself, must of necessity place the special and negative existence in contrast with the Universal and Positive. Only by overcoming this antithesis, is Spirit twice-born—regenerated. The deficiency in the Persian principle is only that the unity of antithesis is not completely recognized; for in that indefinite conception of the Uncreated All, whence Ormuzd and Ahriman proceeded, the Unity is only the absolutely *Primal* existence, and does not reduce the contradictory elements to harmony in itself. Ormuzd creates of his own free will; but also according to the decree of *Zeruane-Akerne*; (the representation wavers;) and the harmonizing of the contradiction is only to be found in the contest which Ormuzd carries on with Ahriman, and in which he will at last conquer. Ormuzd is the Lord of Light, and he creates all that is beautiful and noble in the world, which is a kingdom of the sun. He is the excellent, the good, the positive in all natural and spiritual existence. Light is the *body of Ormuzd*; thence the worship of Fire, because Ormuzd is present in all light; but he is not the sun or moon itself. In these the Persians venerate only the Light, which is Ormuzd. Zoroaster asks Ormuzd who he is? He answers: “My name is the ground and centre of all existence—Highest Wisdom and Science—Destroyer of the Ills of the World, and maintainer of the Universe—Fulness of Blessedness—Pure Will,” &c. That which comes from Ormuzd is living, independent and lasting. Language testifies to his power; prayers are his productions. Darkness is on the contrary the body of Ahriman; but a perpetual fire banishes him from the temples. The chief end of every man's existence is to keep himself pure, and to spread this purity around him. It is said, “As man was created pure and worthy of heaven, he becomes pure again through the law of the servants of Ormuzd, which is purity itself; if he purifies himself by sanctity of thought, word and deed. What is Pure Thought? That which ascends to the beginning of things. What is Pure Word? The word of Ormuzd, (the word is thus personified and imparts the living Spirit of the whole revelation of Ormuzd.) What is Pure Deed? The humble adoration of the heavenly hosts, created at the beginning of things. It is implied in this, that man should be virtuous: his own will, his subjective freedom is presupposed.

“The *Fervers*—a kind of Spirit-World—are distinguished from the mundane sphere. The *Fervers* are not Spirits according to our idea, for they exist in every natural object, whether fire, water or earth. Their existence is co-eval with the origin of things; they are in all places, in high roads, towns, &c., and are prepared to give help to supplicants. Their abode is in *Gorodman*, the dwelling of the “Blessed” above the solid vault of heaven.

"The ritual observances of the religion of Ormuzd impart that men should conduct themselves in harmony with the Kingdom of Light. The great general commandment is, therefore, as already said, spiritual and corporeal purity, consisting in many prayers to Ormuzd. It was made specially obligatory upon the Persians, to maintain living existences,—to plant trees,—to dig wells,—to fertilize deserts; in order that Light, the Positive, the Pure, might be furthered, and the dominion of Ormuzd be universally extended."

THE SYMBOLISM IN "YAGNA."

"YAGNA."

"A symbol is ever, to him who has eyes for it, some dimmer or clearer revelation of the God-like. Through all these glimmers something of a divine idea.—*Carlyle*.

"The proofs brought forward in corroboration of the old teaching are scattered widely throughout the old scriptures of ancient civilization. The Puranas, the Zend Avesta and the old classics are full of them; but no one has ever gone to the trouble of collecting and collating together those facts. The reason for this is, that all such events were recorded symbolically; and that the best scholars, the most acute minds, among our Aryanists and Egyptologists, have been too often darkened by one or another preconception; still oftener, by one-sided views of the secret meaning. Yet, even a parable is a spoken symbol; a fiction or a fable as some think; an allegorical representation, we say, of life realities, events and facts. And as a moral was ever drawn from a parable, that moral being an active truth and fact in human life, so an historical real event was deduced—by those versed in hieratic sciences—from certain emblems and symbols recorded in the ancient archives of the temples. The religious and esoteric history of every nation was embedded in symbols; it was never expressed in so many words. All the thoughts and emotions, all the learning and knowledge revealed and acquired of the early races, found their pictorial expression in allegory and parables."—*Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, page 307.

ALL the Christian and Brahmo Missionaries charge the Hindu with being guilty of the grossest crime of offering sacrifice of sheep in "Yagna"—a ceremony which every Brahmin is necessarily required to perform if he wants Nirvana, or Moksha.—Mr. Ramachandra Bose in his "Hindoo Philosophy Popularly Explained," translates the word "Yagna" as meaning animal sacrifices, and hence concludes that such sacrifices were imperatively demanded in ancient times. The highest philosophical meaning which "Yagna" as a spiritual symbol conveyed at the doors of selfish orthodox Brahmins who, instead of catching the esoteric meaning of the noblest symbol which man has ever conceived, and can conceive of, do actually kill or sacrifice sheep in these days, leaning all the while for support on Vedas which never sanctioned this brutal and irrational observance. It is the dead letter interpretation consequent on the loss of the esoteric key of the archaic symbols and the literal action of the orthodox Brahmins that have supplied our adversaries with the weapons of criticism and attack upon this noblest symbol of Yagna. Why do such Brahmins find fault with Mahomedans and others for their killing of sheep and oxen in Kurubani and other religious ceremonies? If

the Brahmin would cite as his authority for the sacrifice of sheep, his Vedas, the Mahomedan would show his Koran and the Christian his Bible as authority for meat-eating. We must judge others as we would be judged by, and if the Brahmins will claim their Vedas alone as the direct revelation of God to hide their many practices and observances revolting to the spirit of philosophy and true advancement, I cannot understand why Christians and Mahomedans cannot claim their Bible and Koran also to justify the innumerable atrocious crimes they have committed in the name of religion.

True reconciliation of religious observances and differences lies in their esoteric explanation and meaning, but not in the dogmatic assertion and belief of the orthodox communities. The Hindoo who shudders at the sight of a sheep being butchered, must have the same sympathetic feeling when he hears the bleating voice of the woolly mother when brought before the sacrificial altar, and if he would plead necessity, "the tyrant's plea," and the ordinance of God as grounds for his brutal conduct, I may boldly assert, without fear of contradiction, that the Vedas never enjoined the literal killing of sheep, but pointed out so many observances of esoteric symbols having close connection with the working of the soul in the inner plane as aiding its progress towards the goal of Nirvana. The saying that "even the devil quotes the Bible," is applicable only to this class of Brahmins who, by their dogmatic assertions and want of esoteric knowledge, supplemented by priestcraft, have deprived the brightest intellects of Aryavarttha of thought and reason, and have made India to run headlong into stupid and irreconcilable theories and practices and thus to run amuck through the noble aggregation of archaic spiritual symbols, which has resulted in splitting the sons of Rishis into so many orthodox conflicting sections.

The real work of sacrifice begins in the chamber of the soul, and philosophy is the handmaid that awaits upon us. The ceremonies and observances which are performed and attended to only externally, are entirely useless and have no meaning whatever unless they indicate, or are attended by, an internal process of purification in the chamber of soul. When once the internal process takes place, the esoteric meaning of the symbols becomes easily understood. Not being able to understand the meaning of symbols, people have dragged them down to minister to their own crooked notions, and have consequently split themselves into so many sects owing to their wordy wars and difference of opinion (possible only in the external or exoteric plane)—a fact which proves that those classes or sects who pretend to teach how to attain divine knowledge, have really lost the internal vital power, and what is left in them is nothing but the external forms founded by priests to serve their own selfish ends. The communities of different religionists who pretend to solve the divine symbols by the supposed philosophical dissertations or ritualistic observances, such as "Yagna" without the necessary action and esoteric understanding, do really deserve contempt as poisoning the moral and the spiritual atmosphere of this world.

Sacrifice in the esoteric plane is not the special privilege of any one nation and country. All those, irrespective of caste, creed and color, who enter into the temple of spiritual truth, and sacrifice at the altar of "Self knowledge" their prejudices, selfishness, Ahankara and other baneful dispositions, will receive the stamp of divinity which will be a passport to the realm of eternity. "Wisdom crieth in the streets," and even then sectarians have wilfully shut their ears and allowed truth and knowledge to pass away from them, and use symbols and forms whose meaning they do not know. It is truly remarked by the sages that "man lives in a world of symbols whose meaning is not yet understood by many. Perfect knowledge of God, of nature and of man, are the three lights upon the altar of truth, illuminating the sanctuary of the temple of wisdom." It is the duty of every right minded man to point out the symbols containing natural verities and make others perceive the truths themselves which are "synthesised" in the symbols by removing the moss by which they were concealed, and restoring them to life. "The day is fast approaching when the living spirit within these symbols will be generally known and the sacred mysteries revealed," and we have the following assurances foretelling the advent of "the Theosophical Society" as the pioneer for the work from the mouth of a Rosicrucian in 1806.

"In this present epoch, which has just begun, will the light appear. Things hidden for ages will become known, veils will be removed, and the truth that exists in and beyond the form will be revealed; humanity as a whole will come nearer to God. We cannot tell you now why this is to take place just in this century; we can only say that there is a time and a place for every thing, and all things in the universe are regulated by a divine law of order and harmony."

Further:—"In studying the hoary texts of Indian philosophy certain important points must not be lost sight of. In the first place we have to remember that words begin gradually to change their meaning, and hence in determining the meaning of certain passages, we have to keep in mind the age of those passages and see what particular significance might have been attached in those times to certain words." The meaning of the symbol under discussion was universally understood at the time when it was introduced, and it must be taken in its true and intended sense according to the age and the intellects that introduced it. "Whoever has studied the law of cycles and of progress, has probably noticed that generally there are three stages of progress and deterioration.

"At first the esoteric significance of the idea, for a time remains intact. Then comes the era of exoteric warfare. People gradually begin to lose sight of the primitive idea, and fight for its shell of external rites and ceremonies. And lastly comes the age of blank negation. Ritualism often degenerating into sensualism, drives a thinking mind to deny the efficacy of every and anything. But this again ushers in the era of intellectual enquiry which finally brings society back to the recognition of esoteric truth. Thus cycles run their rounds, and each nation, following after its predecessors, has sprung up, thrived, and sunk finally into insignificance.

Each had its day of glory, its rise and fall. And if the law of the survival of the fittest be applied to all the nations, the only one that can stand the test is India. She has seen the rise and fall of many peoples, but herself standing yet erect amid their ruins, however worn out she may look."—(*The Theosophist*, Vol. VI, 96-7.)

It is therefore highly advisable that intellectual people should study the theory of cycles and then take into consideration the wandering of the orthodox Brahmins far away from the main source, and should unite together to solve the hidden meaning of the symbolical problem, instead of depreciating a thing from its exoteric aspect and jumping to erroneous conclusions as Mr. Bose has done, and of running into utter negation at the disgusting sight of the awkward position of the orthodox Brahmins, who by their ignorance of esoteric and scientific principles, have degraded both the philosophy and themselves in the sight of the members of their own fold and others; but thanks to the innate goodness of Providence Theosophy has now come in proper time to save society and philosophy from this inevitable fate, with the assurance that

"Knowledge dwells,
In heads replete with thoughts of other men,
Wisdom in minds attentive to their own."

If, notwithstanding the dictates of common sense, the true spirit of occult philosophy, the universal unerring law of nature, and the knowledge in the possession of living adepts, it would be contended that the Vedas teach and forcibly enjoin literal sheep sacrifice, away with it, for it must really call forth feelings of abhorrence from every esoteric student, as it once called forth the reprobation of Lord Buddha:—

"Then, craving leave, he spake
Of life, which all can take and none can give.
Life, which all creatures love and strive to keep,
Wonderful, dear and pleasant unto each
Even to the meanest; yea, a boon to all
Where pity is, for pity makes the world
Soft to the weak and noble for the strong,
Unto the dumb lips of his flock he lent
Sad pleading words, showing how man, who prays
For mercy to the gods, is merciless
Being as God to those; albeit all life
Is linked and kin, and what we slay have given
Meek tribute of the milk and wool, and set
Fast trust upon the hands which murder them.
Also he spoke of what the holy books
Do surely teach, how that at death some sink
To bird and beast, and these rise up to man,
In wanderings of the spark which grows purged flame
So were the sacrifice new sin, if so,
The fated passage of a soul bestayed.
Nor, spake he, shall one wash his spirit clean,
By blood, nor gladden gods, being good, with blood,
Nor bribe them, being evil, nay, nor lay
Upon the brow of innocent bound beasts
One hair's weight of that answer all must give,
For all things done amiss or wrongfully.
Alone, for each himself, reckoning with that,
The fixed arithmic of the universe,

Which meteth good for good, and ill for ill,
Measure for measure, unto deeds, words and thoughts,
Watchful, aware, implacable, unmoved ;
Making all futures, fruits of all the past.

(*Light of Asia.*)

Well, then, if the exoteric meaning is cried down, what is the esoteric rationale? The ever unknowable and incognizable karana alone, the causeless cause of all causes, should have its shrine and altar on the holy and ever untrodden ground of our heart—invisible, intangible, unmentioned, save “through the still small voice” of our spiritual consciousness. Those who worship before it, ought to do in the silence and the sanctified solitude of their souls,* making their spirit the sole mediator between them and the universal spirit, their good actions the only priests, and their sinful intentions the only visible and objective sacrificial victims to the presence. (*The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 280.)

The occultists claim that there are seven senses in man as in nature, as there are seven states of consciousness and are corroborated in the same work, chapter VII (Anugita). The Brahmana speaks in it “of the institution of the seven sacrificial priests (Hotris). He says, “The nose and the eyes, and the tongue and the skin, and the ear as the fifth (or smell, sight, taste, touch, and hearing), mind and understanding, are the seven sacrificial priests separately stationed. (*Ibid.*, Vol. I, page 96.)

In my humble knowledge gained from the study of Sanscrit and Tamil Occult works, the different Yagams or sacrifices are so many stages of the purification of mind and soul of the aspirant after Brahma Gnanam towards his progress to the final beatitude of Nirvana. All the sacrifices mentioned in the Vedas may be brought under the following broad classification—

1. Pasu—Medham.
2. Sena—Yagam.
3. Raja—Sooyam.
4. Aswa—Medham.
5. Nara—Medham.

The first:—Pasu in Sanscrit means an “animal” (See my last article) and “Meedah” killing, and the compound word means the “killing of the animal.” Though man is of Parabrahmic essence, yet owing to his connection with Mayavicupadhi, he has forgotten his original source and identity with it, and is

“Fixed like a plant to its peculiar spot,
To draw nutrition, propagate and rot.”

The first sacrifice therefore means the killing of animal passions or ego in man by the powers of Vivoka or right discrimination. Again, it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that the original meaning of the word “Yagna” is entirely consonant with its etymologi-

* “When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are..... but enter into thy inner chamber, and having shut thy door pray to thy father which is in secret” (Mathew vi). “Our father is within us” “in secret,” our 7th principle in the “inner chamber of our soul perception. The kingdom of heaven and of God “is within us” says Jesus, not outside. Why are Christians so absolutely blind to the self evident meaning of the words of wisdom they delight in mechanically repeating?

cal signification. The word is derived from the root “Yaja,” to worship, and means divine worship by the sacrifice of animal passions. The noblest worship that is required of an aspirant after Brahma Gnanam, or knowing one’s own self, is the rooting out or sacrificing his animalism which is allegorically and technically known as “the animal” in man. It is not, therefore, a difficult position to see clearly how the philosophical and sublimest idea of the sacrifice of one’s own lower animal nature became in course of time so much corrupted as to be made to yield the meaning of literal animal sacrifice itself. The first sacrifice means the separation of the animal nature from the divine essence, and is the first step in the career of an aspirant after complete Brahma Gnanam.

The second is Senayagam:—Senam in Sanscrit means a vulture, and the compound term means the killing of vulture. The Vedas say that if this sacrifice is performed, our enemies will be destroyed, and the Brahmins taking this to mean the advocacy of sorcery in the exoteric sense, do not seem to practise it, though in the esoteric plane, it is essentially incumbent upon everybody, if an ardent aspirant after real knowledge and its practical realization. He must really practice sorcery to exterminate his internal enemies, i. e., passions, karma, krodha, &c. In the first stage the aspirant separates his divine portion from his animal self, and sees that divinity alone is his true nature. This alone is not sufficient. The mind of man is always hunting after shadows and animal appetites like vultures which go in search of dead bodies to the longest distances, even though the best food may be available in their vicinity. Hence in this stage the aspirant should make his mind always bent in the practical pursuit of higher natures and potentialities by killing the vulture-like affinity of the mind in the pursuit of the basest inclinations and natures, even though it (the mind) knows that there is a better and divine nature for it to pursue. Hence the process is known allegorically as “the sacrifice of the vulture.”

The third is Rajasnyayagam, and the exoteric version runs thus. The king wages war with all other kings of the world to establish his undivided and royal supremacy over them, and this forms the chiefest observance in this sacrifice. When once in the second stage the mind has become amenable to, or vehicle of, the higher powers and capabilities, the war is at once waged by the aspirant or the neophyte, against the kings of Kouravas, the passions, ills and woes, and he having thus established his freedom at the overthrow of the kings of the internal enemies, proceeds with the development of superior powers in the psychic plane. But the aspirant is not completely secure, as, for the permanent establishment of his unquestionable reign, he must renew and recruit his forces to guard the kingdom, since the overthrown enemies may again slowly emerge and shake the security of the aspirant. Further the more he rises in the scale of initiation, the higher responsibilities naturally devolve upon him, and he is therefore to be more guarded and proof against dangers, and that work is done in the fourth stage of sacrifice.

The fourth is Aswa-medham, and means the sacrifice of the horse. When the aspirant of divine knowledge scales the steps of spiritual

ladder, the mind must necessarily become completely tamed down as to be made entirely amenable to the influences of the higher powers of nature, and consequently it must be entirely freed from all passions and vithis. What is required is the slow and sure conservation of energy, as undue and too much expansion of it even for the noblest purposes is attended with the consequent exhaustion and dangers. A horse is left free by the king to wander over all the lands and seas, and if any adversary catches hold or takes possession of it, the emperor is at once to wage war against the unlawful possessor and to vanquish him. The aspirant, whose mind has become a fit charger for the battle, now allows his mind to travel throughout and mingle freely to try whether it actually stands proof against temptations and other internal enemies, and whether complete extirpation of the "animal ego" has been effected, and if there lurks one single desire to drag the mind, the aspirant, the king of the internal dominion, at once takes arms against it and extirpates it altogether. In this stage, even the germs of internal enemies are completely burnt down and the spirit become entirely uncrossed by its adversaries, and hence the sole possessor of the universal spiritual realm. When thus the enemies are no more either in thought, deed or work, the mind of the neophite—the noble horse—is entirely sacrificed, *i. e.*, loses its separate function and existence and loses itself in or converts itself into the Athma itself, which is allegorically called the killing of the horse.

The fifth is *Nara-medham*, and means the sacrifice of Nara. Nara is the individuality, and every human being is a "Nara" owing to his detached and isolated existence from the divine fountain. When once in the fourth stage of sacrifice, the aspirant has actually taken complete possession of the spiritual kingdom, without a single enemy even in existence, Narathwam ceases, and Nara is absorbed in Narayana, *i. e.*, the personality is altogether destroyed or the individuality is lost in the totality, or lost in cosmic ideation. He lives neither in the past, nor in the future, but in the eternal.

Thus under the noblest symbol of "Yagna," the different mental sacrifices and the necessary attendant consequences are represented in a most philosophical and practical way. Rama is said to have gone to the abode of "Yama," as a penalty for his having failed to perform Rajasuyam. Rama, the initiate,—who killed the ten headed Ravana—the heads being the ten passions and vices enumerated by Mann, which stand in the way of the aspirant, and Ravana being the fountain—and his inexhaustible forces of "Mula Balam," composed of Rakshasas and Asuras—the woes and ills, the passions and allurements, whom an initiate is likely to encounter and must completely root out to regain, or unite with, Seetha, the Sophia, must have necessarily performed this sacrifice also, if he wanted unmolested possession of his spiritual spouse to achieve adeptship, and this single failure even in the case of Rama necessitated enjoyment of Devachan, through Kama Loca, for a corresponding period, and subsequent re-birth in the objective world.

In some Smrithis it is mentioned that Nara-medham and other sacrifices are strictly prohibited in Kali-yuga. The writers knowing that dead letter interpretation would be attached to esoteric versions and thus that a thousand and one crimes would

be committed in the name of religion, strictly prohibited them for the profane,—as pearls cannot be thrown before the swine, but it was never their idea and wish that these "Yugams" or sacrifices should not be carried on, in the mental plane, as such injunctions are quite against nature and her inviolable laws, and it is unthinkable that "gnanam" is the monopoly of certain Yugams and their people, as the institution of occult brotherhood and the imparting of occult knowledge to fit recipients are going on even in this material age even as they were in all former Yugams.

P. R. VENKATARAMA IYER, F. T. S.

WHO INVENTED ALTRUISM?

THOSE who have read Edward Bellamy's wonderful little book "Looking Backward," would find it hard to say where religion comes in, especially Christianity. He draws a picture of a state of society in which life is certainly "worth living." The thing which is most striking in the composition of the work, and which has given it the extraordinary influence it has in the West, is that the conception is worked out upon purely economic lines, of a civilization in which happiness and comfort is the rule instead of the rare exception. Not only is no appeal made to religion, or to any other super-material motive to action, but no great discovery which would facilitate human progress, is supposed to have occurred between this date and the year 2000, when the story opens. On the contrary, it is by using the opportunities, forces and materials we now possess, according to the obvious dictates of the most elementary common sense, that the whole change is wrought. Insomuch that the sentiment in the reader's mind is not one of doubt about the possibility of the realization of the author's ideas, but one of astonishment that they have not been already realized, and of stupefaction at our present extraordinary blindness and imbecility which prevent us from applying the very obvious methods he delineates for the attainment of a state of society compared with which our present "Civilization" is heartless barbarism.

By applying to the affairs of life, the plainest principles of common sense and those elementary axioms of morality which are continually in our mouths, Mr. Bellamy, by a series of rigidly logical deductions, or rather of simple steps, each of them an apparently unavoidable necessity, as being the natural consequence of the preceding one, arrives at a practical realization of universal brotherhood,—a state of society in which men and nations are friends and fellow-labourers instead of enemies and competitors. The National movement, as in America the agitation for the realization of Mr. Bellamy's ideas is called, is essentially theosophical. Many of our most active and ardent fellows have gone into it with enthusiasm, one of its features which attracts them most being the utter absence in it of the ecclesiastical or so-called religious element. Nevertheless it seems that some of the Christian clergy are entering into the movement with zeal, and they are apparently trying to make it a religious movement. This is just what they did as regards the Temperance movement, a purely secular one in its origin. They claim it, in fact, as an essentially

Christian movement, and they are seemingly trying to capture it in the interests of their cloth. Not long ago a great meeting of the "Nationalists," as Bellamy's followers are called, was held at Los Angeles in California, which was opened by devotional exercises, of which the singing of such hymns as "It is of the Lord's Mercies" and "Lift me Jesus," formed part, and the chief address was delivered by a clergyman, whose principal argument was that the idea of the brotherhood of man was introduced into the world by Christ, and is therefore the peculiar property of Christians.

Now the Rev. A. J. Wells, the clergyman in question, seems from his address, as reported in the *Los Angeles Tribune*, to be a Christian of the new school, and a large-souled and liberal-minded man, but, nevertheless, the claim he makes for his Master and for his fellow disciples of that Master is altogether too large. Granted, that Jesus of Nazareth was an advocate of the principle of human brotherhood, in other words, that he was imbued with the root idea of Theosophy, it is yet an undeniable fact that, for nearly 19 hundred years, that principle has been quite as absent from the religion called by his name, and quite as absent from the hearts of those who called themselves Christians, as from any other religion or from the hearts of any other body of religionists.

It is not in his quality of the predicted Messiah that Jesus can in any way be claimed as the author of the idea of Human Brotherhood. Any claim of that kind made for him now must be founded upon his own individual character and upon the fact of his human nature. He had good instincts and true intuitions, and he was in advance of his time in that he felt a powerful, all-absorbing, and all-determining sympathy with his fellowmen. But that there never was anyone before him who felt these sentiments, is an untenable proposition in view of all the records we possess of their existence long before his day in thousands of men and women, the account of whose lives has come down to us. Equally absurd is it to suppose that those who are imbued with these feelings now are indebted for them to the prophet of Galilee. They are sentiments which belong to man by reason of his human nature, and which come to the surface in his character and in his life, at a certain point in his intellectual and spiritual development.

Their appearance and influence in the world are, in great measure, dependent upon the circumstances in which we find ourselves—upon the stage of civilization we have reached—but their strength varies in different individual natures, and each man's personal character is an important factor in determining whether he will or will not be influenced by the sentiment of the Brotherhood of Man. That Jesus was filled with that sentiment is undeniable, if the biblical accounts of his life and teachings be true, but it is equally undeniable that the same causes which made him amenable to that sentiment may operate, and must operate, upon others quite independently of him; moreover, it is a sad fact that even had he never existed, and had the principle of human brotherhood never been heard of before this century, it would hardly be weaker in the world than it is today. It is not because Jesus or anyone else preached brotherhood, that we feel brotherhood, for the world listened to and mechanically repeated his words during all the

centuries of religious persecution and hatred. It is because we are now developing in ourselves the same ideas and feelings which he had 1,900 years ago, and which nothing but that development of them in ourselves would or could enable us to understand or to appreciate in others,—even in Jesus himself. For, be it noted that, in proportion as Jesus is regarded as the prophet of Human Brotherhood, the qualities of Judge and God and Saviour of the world with which orthodox Christians endow him tend to disappear.

History and our own experience both show that non-Christians can be ardent advocates and splendid examples of Human Brotherhood; they also show that any conception, far more realization, of Human Brotherhood, has for 19 hundred years been singularly wanting in those who professed the Christian religion; and it seems a little strange in these days, when elementary logic is not wholly despised, to find people who claim to be educated, still maintaining that a belief in Christianity is the cause of the sentiment of Brotherhood, and not only that, but its *exclusive* cause.

If many good people, including some clergymen, choose to attribute their allegiance to the principle of Human Brotherhood to the teaching or example of any one man, whether ancient or modern, even be he Jesus or Buddha, we who trace that sentiment in us to a higher and deeper source,—to the source whence those personages got it, our developing divine-human nature—ought not to quarrel with them. But, on the other hand, they ought not to quarrel with us, or to try to monopolize a sentiment which belongs to no place or time, but has been the basis of Theosophy in all ages, of the Theosophy of Jesus of Nazareth as well as that of all the altruists of today, whether they parade under the banner of Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, Mahomedanism, Agnosticism or Atheism.

J. HUDSON MARKAM.

CHRISTIAN THEOSOPHY.

WHAT had to come has come; Theosophy has filtered into the Christian Church and begun to inspire her pulpites. The clergy set their dogs upon us, so to say, when we began to declare that all religions stand upon a common foundation; but now that the truth is becoming known, theosophical ideas are preached very widely without crediting the Theosophical Society with having made them current. Yet there was still another step to take, viz., to frankly organize a Theosophical Society of Christians within Church lines, to help their labouring ship out of the vortex of the present cyclone of free-thought, as one launches a life-boat at the moment of despair. A good, brave, and far-seeing clergyman has taken that step, and we gladly reprint from *Light* his published Prospectus. He is the Rev. G. W. Allen, Curate of St. Nicholas Cole-Abbey, whose lecture upon "The Relation of Christianity to Theosophy," summarized in last month's *Theosophist*, the writer himself heard delivered from the Abbey pulpit last November. Our readers should note the honest confession of Mr. Allen that many good people hope by offering Christian truth in the Theosophical light to prevent the present adherents of that religion from "abandon-

ing Christianity as effete and looking elsewhere for Divine help and guidance." The tone of some of the most important addresses delivered at the recent Church Congress was strikingly pessimistic, and it would seem that the step now taken by Mr. Allen and his worthy friends was at the very nick of time. That Theosophy is the vital spark of the Christian, as it is of the Hindu, the Zoroastrian and the Buddhist religions, cannot be denied. As Gnosticism, it ensouled Primitive Christianity and made it a conquering social impulse. When that soul was driven out, coincidentally with the downfall of the early esoteric sects and the attainment of ecclesiastical supremacy by the gross exoteric formalism which survives to our day, Christianity became a mere ambulant corpse, kept from disintegration only by the cohesive forces of self-interest and ignorance. If the old life can ever be reimparted to it, it will only be by the help of the ancient wisdom, Theosophy, which all true saints and sages have known and taught, but which is caviare to the wearers of the scarlet beretta and the triple tiara of gold. But let our clergyman speak :

"A society under the name of the Christo-Theosophical Society has just been formed, not at all to pose as an opposition to the already existing Theosophical Society; but for the purpose of studying Theosophy upon definitely Christian lines. It will be perfectly open to earnest truth seekers, who are willing to join a society which bases its position upon the Christian apprehension of God as the Father of all humanity, and Christ as the Manifestation of the Father to His children; and who further recognise that the one end of the knowledge of the True is to enable man to do the Good.

It appears to the founders that such a society will meet a very serious want of the present day. There is a growing consciousness in many earnest minds that the ordinary Christianity of the day is demonstrably devoid of power to solve the pressing social problems that are forcing themselves upon the attention of the world. This arises from the fact, not that Christianity has no word to speak upon these problems, but that its real significance is so little understood by those who profess it; and who, while they say the words, entirely fail to appreciate their practical meaning.

Many others, too, are feeling that the view they have been taught to hold of Christian truth is now inadequate to satisfy either the conclusions of their reason or the perceptions of their intuition, or else is proving itself devoid of power to raise and ennoble their lives, and enable them to master self and live up to their own ideals.

Many of those who are beginning to feel thus are inclined to abandon Christianity as effete, and look elsewhere for Divine help and guidance; but it is believed that before doing this they would gladly listen to and consider a presentation of Christian truth which, being more spiritual and central, might be able to accomplish that which an external and often sectarian apprehension cannot. It is with this view that the Christo-Theosophical Society has been formed. Its founders would shrink from nothing so much as being thought to want to pose as teachers; they seek not for disciples, but for fellow students. And they are persuaded that if a number of earnest, intelligent, and spiritually minded people would unite in a sincere and open-minded study of the actual significance of the life and teaching of Christ, they would be rewarded by the finding of the truth which makes free both from powerlessness to help the world, and from powerlessness to live themselves more ideally.

The Society meets every Thursday at 4-15 p.m., in the drawing-room of the St. Nicholas Club, 81A, Queen Victoria-street (near the Mansion House station). All who sympathise with the objects of the Society are invited to attend. A list of speakers and subjects for discussion for the next quarter, and any further information, can be obtained from the Rev. G. W. Allen, 3, Featherstone-buildings, High Holborn, W. C."

We wish it success.

H. S. O.

Reviews.

LITERARY NOTICES.

A veritable "Guide to the Perplexed" reaches us in the shape of "A Working Glossary" for Theosophical students, which hails from the *Path Office*. This excellent little compendium has of course very modest pretensions, as the Preface frankly enough indicates. Its mission, indeed, is simply to seize upon and explain "the many Sanskrit and other strange words found so often in books and writings published and written by members of our Society."

In carrying out their self-imposed task to so successful an issue, the compilers have earned the heartfelt thanks of those embryonic Theosophists who have just launched their barks on the troubled sea of Eastern thought. For the most part the renderings are notably clear and concise, while the general get up of the pamphlet is unexceptionable.

The price—50 cents—places it within the reach of the humblest votary of Mysticism.

"Dreams and Dream Stories," by the late Dr. Anna Kingsford, ought to appeal to lovers of the "eerie." Some of these whisperings of Morpheus are of a really weird character, prominent among the series being the "Doomed Train," "Steepside," and "A Haunted House Indeed." Touching on the vivid character of her experiences, the authoress remarks: "On more than one occasion, the scenery of the dream has accurately portrayed characteristics of remote regions—city, forest and mountain which, in this existence at least, I have never beheld, nor, so far as I can remember, even heard described."

It is worth noting that the great majority of these dreams occurred towards dawn or after sunrise. Their eminently psychical character was probably due to this circumstance, which gave scope for the reflection of the ideation of the "Higher Manas" on to the plane of the ordinary cerebral consciousness. However this may be, the book has a very strange flavour about it, totally unlike that of any other of the same type with which we are acquainted.

In the "Woman Clothed with the Sun," we have one of Dr. Kingsford's most suggestive contributions to the literature of mysticism. Tedious as are the repetitions, irritatingly vague as are portions of the matter of this strange book, there remains much to repay research. Many of the passages in the seeress's work rise to a high level of force and eloquence; witness the really brilliant outburst regarding the Poet on pages 172—173. So far, however, as concerns psychology and spiritual philosophy, there is little or no advance on the "illuminations" which constituted the basis of the "Perfect Way." Indeed, Mr. Maitland would have done well to reduce the proportions of the text and present the several contentions of the work in a more summarized form. Now-a-days, let it be remembered, all books which seek to gain the ear of the cultured public must combine both terseness and lucidity. Had these conditions been observed, there can be no doubt but that the influence of Dr. Kingsford on her generation would have been far more marked than it was in actual fact.

Mr. S. Liddell MacGregor Mathers' "Key of Solomon the King" is a well got up work, embellished with various mysterious but tantalizingly incomprehensible plates. Apart from other considerations, there is a literary interest in the republication of this famous magical work. "The Key of Solomon," says Mr. Mathers, "save for a curtailed and incomplete copy published in France in the seventeenth century, has never yet been printed, but has for centuries remained in manuscript

form, inaccessible to all but the few fortunate scholars to whom the inmost recesses of the great libraries were open." Seeing that the Key has been regarded as the "fountainhead and storehouse of Qabalistical Magic," we advise our adventurous readers to make the most of it. Certain, however, it is that the search after its "inner meaning" will prove exacting. We know of a good many "Keys" to occultism—the difficulty is to find the lock.

A useful little book anent the crimes of the Church against Freedom is Theo. Spencer's "Struggle for Religious and Political Liberty," issued from the offices of the Truthseeker Company, in New York. Those who are apt to condone the vices of the early and mediæval Christian churches would do well to peruse it. It is not too much to say that every great advance in scientific knowledge or liberal philosophic thought has met with hostile reception at the hands of this lethal organisation.

"*Thoth, a Romance*," by the author of a "Dreamer of Dreams" (Appleton and Co., New York) is a curious occult story harking back to the time-honoured age of Pericles. A few days before the Plague breaks out in Athens, a company of wealthy merchants of the familiar "mysterious stranger" type put up in the city. Unlike other aliens, they continue to reside there even after the dread pest has wrapt the fair town of Athens in its lethal robes. Finally, however, they depart in peace, giving ample evidence of their good taste by inducing 30 of the fairest of the Athenian maids to accompany them. Among these figures the beautiful Daphne. Those who care to trace her lot and that of her companions with Thoth and the occultists—for such the *sot-disant* Egyptian merchants prove to be—will garner a harvest of "sensation" for their pains.

Every stickler for realism who pants after a vivid description of the emotions of a typical man of the world sick unto death, should read "The Death of Ivan Ilyitch," contained in a collection of Count Tolstoi's stories published by Crowell of New York. The delineation is wonderfully vivid and impressive. Zola himself has produced nothing comparable to this analysis, which is absolutely free from the less savoury incidentals favoured by the great French novelist. The whole series of tales contained in this volume is worth reading.

It is doubtless news to most of us to learn that Buddhism is the foundation of all the religions in India. Such, however, is the title of the first chapter of Hargrave Jennings's book on "The Indian Religions," recently brought out by Mr. Redway. "Brahminism is the world-adaptation of the great—otherwise incomprehensible—elements of Buddhism to states and peoples" (p. 5). "Buddhism, or the religion of Buddha, appears to have originated in India, about a thousand (?!) years before Jesus Christ. We do not yet certainly know whether it is a reformation of Brahminism, or whether, in its actual form, it is not of prior date(!)" (p. 11). These, and other statements which we might cite, do not promise well, but Mr. Jennings becomes more instructive when subsequently he drifts off into his own peculiar subjects. Curiously enough, the greater portion of the text has very little connection with the "Indian Religions"—a fact which will no doubt conduce to its readability, though scarcely to the justification of the title page.

Those who admired the acuteness of the speculations in "Posthumous Humanity" may possibly wish to peruse the results of M. d'Assier's meditations in other fields of thought. In "Le Ciel," "La Terre" and "L'Homme" (Librairie, Baillieret fils, Paris) will be found a clear summary of the inductions of modern science regarding the Evolution of the Earth and its multifiform organic habitants. Though nominally a Positivist, the author does not hesitate to override Comte's

dicta as to the limit of philosophic inquiry, notably when he comes to deal with the problem of the "Origin of Species." His "Cycle of Organic Evolution," 25 million years, "of which 15 millions have already elapsed," is hopelessly inadequate to account for the results, and in conflict with the whole evidence of geologic science. Fifteen millions of years would certainly not carry us back beyond the time of the deposit of the later Mesozoic strata.

Cynics are apt to look somewhat askance on works which profess to indicate "The Coming Creed of the World." The world has never yet luxuriated in the bliss of any uniform creed, and probably never will. It goes on its way rejoicing, leaving the prophets to shift for themselves. It has, moreover, a singular contempt for any one-sided stereotyped phase of belief. Objections, however, apart, the work issued by Frederick Gerhard under the above name (Thompson, Philadelphia) is characterised by no inconsiderable merits. The author runs a vigorous tilt against Christianity on the one hand and Materialism on the other. The alternative religious faith proposed is somewhat nebulous, while the standpoint taken up regarding Theism is based on arguments verging on the puerile. A great deal of vapouring would be avoided, if all would-be writers on such topics would acquaint themselves with the rudiments of a philosophic culture. Our author, excellent in the role of "bible smasher," cannot be said to shine as a metaphysician.

Under the title "Les Origines et les Fins" (Librairie Carré), a suggestive little work on occult metaphysics, has made its appearance. There is nothing novel in its contents, but its style is forcible and pleasing. The origin of the document here published was suggestively "spookish," three "*merès de familles lyonnaises*" having obtained it by mechanical writing after the usual fashion. It is, however, far above the usual level of such mediumistic communications, the usual characteristic of which is a mere rapid verbosity.

Correspondence.

THEOSOPHY IN WESTERN LANDS.

[From our London Correspondent.]

SINCE the last news reached you from me, two fresh Theosophical centres of work and energy have been started. A new Lodge has been formed at Newcastle, under the presidency of Mr. F. Bandon-Oding, who has done so much for the cause in Newcastle. Also another Lodge in the south, to be called the "Exmouth Lodge." The formation of the latter is due entirely to the energetic co-operation of Mrs. Passingham, late President of the Cambridge Lodge, but who has now left there and is carrying on actively the Theosophical propaganda at Exmouth. Needless to add, Mrs. Passingham is President of the Lodge gathered together by her personal exertions. Another important item of news is the fact that a printing press has been procured for, and is shortly to be set up at, No. 17, Lansdowne Road (our Head-quarters). This will be of immense help in carrying on the heavy labour which falls mainly upon the few volunteer hard-workers who live there.

The "Transactions" of the Blavatsky Lodge—which will form a most invaluable help in the study of the "Secret Doctrine"—are now in the press and will shortly be issued in parts. All students should possess these "Transactions"—which consist principally of H. P. Blavatsky's answers and explanations, given upon difficult points in the S. D. presented to her notice by various members of the Lodge, as the result of a systematic consecutive study of that wonderful work.

Mrs. Annie Besant has a most able and comprehensive article in this month's issue of *The Universal Review* on "Hypnotism"—a subject upon which she is entitled to a specially attentive hearing—having gone very deeply into its experimental workings, of late, and being, by her long scientific training, exceptionally capable of forming a just estimate of its practical bearing upon present modes of thought and action.

The pages of the *Contemporary Review* contain, too, an article which, if it does nothing else, at least shows the interest felt by the general public in Buddhism and other kindred subjects. Sandberg, however, has compiled his elaborate and absurdly inaccurate treatise, from the point of view of one who would *combat* that interest—and open the eyes of a too credulous public! To those who know anything of the true teachings of Buddha, the only result of a perusal of his article will be wonder as to where—except from his own exuberant fancy—he could possibly have obtained his amazingly incorrect ideas of the great religion of the East. He has the temerity to entitle his article "Philosophical Buddhism in Tibet!" Presumably, in a spirit of irony, for it contains little of the true *philosophy* of Buddha and scant knowledge of it, as practised in Tibet.

A controversy which has been raging in the columns of the *Birmingham Daily Gazette*—as to whether or no Mr. Edison (of electrical fame) is a fellow of the Theosophical Society, has terminated in the production (on the part of the Secretary of the British Section, Theosophical Society) of a copy of his signed acknowledgment of membership—but the following extract from a "conversation with Edison," quoted from *Harper's Magazine*, will be sufficient to show that—even were he no fellow of the Theosophical Society—he has at least the true *spirit* of Theosophy in his heart,..... "I do not believe," he said, "that matter is inert,

acted upon by an outside force. To me, it seems that every atom is possessed by a certain amount of primitive intelligence. Look at the thousand ways in which atoms of hydrogen combine with those of other elements, forming the most diverse substances. Do you mean to say that they do this without intelligence? Atoms in harmonious and useful relation assume beautiful or interesting shapes or colours, or give forth a pleasant perfume, as if expressing their satisfaction. In sickness, death, decomposition, or filth, the disagreement of the component atoms immediately makes itself felt by bad odours. Finally, they combine in man, who represents the total intelligence of all the atoms."

"But where does this intelligence come from originally?" I asked.

"From some Power greater than ourselves."

"Do you believe, then, in an intelligent creator, a personal God?"

"Certainly," said Mr. Edison. "The existence of such a God can, to my mind, almost be proved from chemistry."

Another new comer has entered the already crowded ranks of magazines, periodicals, etc., etc., which flood our libraries and bookstalls—bearing the ambitious title of "The Review of Reviews"! I mention it because an article contained in the first issue, called "Wanted a New Reformation," shews, indirectly, how orthodoxy is breaking up in every direction—unable to stand the combined action of the numerous analytical minds brought to bear upon it—in the various churches and sects. For the writer of the article collates the utterances of divines of various denominations—as called from the current magazines and periodicals—as an instance, an Anglican minister in Australia wants to found an Australian Church—in whose services modern poetry may be read (as well as the ancient poetry of the Jews). Another writer proposes Dante as the prophet of the New Reformation, because the fundamental idea of his "Divine Comedy" is the precept—"Love thy neighbour as thyself."

Indeed, I may say, that hardly a new book, or monthly magazine, or review, can be opened without lighting upon *some* article—or sentence—or leading idea—which, directly or indirectly, questions the efficiency of some one special form of religion.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* for February 17th contains a short notice of a new Theosophical Society, "which.....has been constituted under the title of the Christo-Theosophical Society," but, as I suppose, you know all about it, I shall not go into particulars here.

The following—from the columns of the *Daily Graphic*—shows an encouraging liberality of view. The paragraph is headed "Heathens in Christendom," and contains a notice of what the writer terms the "strange obsequies" of Lung Chung, a Chinaman who died in an opium den and was apparently cremated. "There is something strange," he continues, "in the idea of this Christian land of ours harbouring mosques, temples, pagodas, and joss-houses, strange enough to make some of our forefathers turn in their graves. Yet Buddhism, Brahminism, and Mahomedanism constitute the faith of three-fourths, of the human race. The worship of the Deity by their votaries, each after their own fashion in our very midst, should have an educating influence upon ourselves. It should disabuse Puritanical minds of the idea that all worships which differ from their own are mere Mumbo-jumboism."

News reaches me from Cambridge that the cause is advancing there steadily; great and increasing interest and enquiry being manifested in matters theosophical.

I cannot let this go to post without adding news (which I feel sure you will all be glad to learn) of the improved health of our beloved H. P. Blavatsky—who has just returned from Brighton, much benefited

by her long stay there. Another matter must be touched upon in connection with her name—although the subject is a painful one—and that is, the review of her "Voice of the Silence"—in these pages—for February. It would be, I think, almost impossible to over-state the extremely strong feeling that has been evoked here, by such an ill-timed, ill-judged, and altogether tactless notice of the work, to say nothing of the want of appreciation displayed—both from a literary and a *theosophical* standpoint of its unique style, and of the unparalleled and rare grandeur—of its subject matter.

A. L. C.

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS.

DEAR SIR,—Over two years ago my attention was first called to Theosophy, through a desultory reading of "Esoteric Buddhism." My interest in the book at that time was simply born of curiosity and not caring to comprehend it thoroughly, I failed to understand almost all of it.

Since then I have seen articles and books, from time to time, which touched upon the subject more or less.

Not long ago a friend talked with me for some time about Theosophy and lent me "The Wilkesbarre Letters on Theosophy." I read them and then took up the "Esoteric Buddhism" again. This time I was earnest in my efforts to command a complete understanding of the book and think I was as successful as I could hope to be. Of course I have planned another and yet more thorough reading.

There are some points which have occurred to me, and which are not dealt with in this book, upon which I would like a little light. They are as follows:

(1.) At what time, during its development, does the foetus receive the Ego? In other words, when does it become a human being?

(2.) How do the adepts regard capital punishment? First, as regards the immediate future of the Ego; second, as regards the justice of preventing the Ego from continuing this life; third, what is the reaction upon those who cause a man to be *legally* (in the common sense of the word) put to death?

(3.) Fourth, is it better or worse for the Ego eventually?

(4.) Sinnett in speaking of Dhyan Chohan says, "They cannot deny to any man * * * the right to do evil if he prefers that to good. Nor can they prevent evil, if done, from producing suffering."

(5.) This and the whole tenor of the religion shows that a certain sort of prayers, so common among Christians, are of no avail whatsoever. He speaks now here of prayer. Yet are there not prayers for help in time of need of guidance—call them "cries" if you will,—which are heard by some protecting and watchful being? For instance, I was out one day near Plymouth, Mass., in a sail boat. I went seven miles out to sea, and did not return until evening had fallen. I had never been out before after night-fall, and once inside the mouth of the harbor (to which I was guided by a light house), I did not know which way to steer. The wind was light, the night inky black, and I did not know the lights upon the shore. I was two miles away from our camp. I could tell the town proper easily enough, but beyond that the lights were strung along the shore in such a way as to prevent one from tracing out the similarity between the view by day

and by night. Having passed through several experiences during the day which had made me nervous—I was much worried and, at last, uttered a prayer—a cry—for help. The boat was drifting slowly and turning round in the breeze. In a few moments something impressed me with the feeling that the boat was at that instant headed in the exact direction. The impression was so strong that I held the boat in that course and kept her headed between two lights, nearer one than the other, all the way across the harbour—2 miles! I at last heard the ripple of the water on the beach, and getting into a tender, after anchoring, I rowed to the shore. *There, immediately above me, was our flag-pole.* The variation of a degree in the direction at the start would have thrown one upon the rocks below the camp. The yacht was not a hundred, *not over fifty feet* from its anchorage. I was a Christian at that time and believed my prayer answered. Surely this could not be luck. Luck is not a reality. It might have been the instinct which the homing pigen shows. I would like to know what it was.

(6.) Again—How can our Western life be best made to conform to the Theosophic doctrines? What should we do here in the West? We cannot go to India. We cannot live after an Eastern fashion here. I should like to ask of you, "What can I do for my own good, being as I am." To answer me you would have to know me. I am a young man—22, nearly. I have some knowledge. I love nature. I am ready to accept that which is good, and I have often *prayed* to be led to see what was the right religion. As far as I know it, Theosophy seems better than anything I ever hoped to find. I am married and have a baby. As far as I am myself concerned, I am always contented with my lot. I worry sometimes for my family, as at those times when I have been out of work. I have not much time and less money to spend in the Theosophic knowledge, yet I shall do what I can.

D. W. C.

EDITORIAL REPLIES.

(1.) It would be a mistake to regard any specific time as appropriate to the "reception of the Ego." In the case of the immature foetus or unborn babe, there is no more than an overshadowing of the "Ego" which has to grow a *new personality* out of the stream of feelings which go to make up the consciousness of the future child. Psychology shows unmistakably enough that the idea of a consciousness present at birth is utterly illusory—there is merely a blur of feelings accompanying the mere physical vitality of the organism. To answer the query "When does it become a human being?" it would be necessary to define the exact significance of the latter term. If by "human being" is meant "a self-conscious thinking subject," it is clear that this stage only gradually supervenes parallel with the development of the thoughts, emotions and the will.

(2.) So far as we are aware no opinion has been vouchsafed on the matter. It may, however, be pointed out that the whole tendency of modern inquiry is to regard the ordinary criminal as a product of an imperfect social regime, and in no sense as a really responsible being. The study of Sociology as a science has undoubtedly gone to confirm the supposition. "Crime," said Plato, "has its foundation in the wants of education and in the bad training and arrangement of the state." Professor Benedikt of Vienna regards madness and crime as twins, while the researches of Saure into the causes of mental diseases in prisons prove that there exists a remarkable analogy between criminals and persons of imperfect cerebral organisation. Dr. Bordier of Paris who examined the brains of 36 executed criminals, found that in almost every case the parietal lobes of the brain were disproportionately large in comparison with the frontal. Perfectly healthy brains, accord-

ing to him, are very rare among criminals as a class; a symmetry, prematurely ossified sutures, &c., &c., being characterized of them (Vide the Chapter on "Free Will" in Buchner's "Force and matter.")

It is clear, however, that Society is justified in adopting the most suitable means to protect itself. It has to deal with the logic of facts as they are, not with the abstract question of true metaphysical "responsibility." If it is found that the infliction of the death-penalty really serves as the most effective deterrent from murder, the welfare of the community demands its retention. But the efficacy of this mode of punishment is just the point now most markedly contested.

(3). With regard to the after-effects of capital punishment on the Ego, much will depend on the special karmic factors involved.

In some cases the sudden disincarnation may result in adding a new *conscious* astral to the unfortunate exhuman entities of that ilk who frequent Kama Loka.

Read what is said in "Esoteric Buddhism" anent the lot of the victim, suicide, *et hoc genus omne*.

Nos. (2), (3) raise very complex issues. Regarding these, it will not be out of place to cite that passage in "Light on the Path," which runs "the operations of the actual laws of Karma are not to be studied until the disciple has reached the point at which they no longer affect himself." Meanwhile any decisive answer to the above or any similar questions is out of the question. We have no data.

It has, however, been asserted on high authority that the endurance of any 'unmerited' suffering and injustice is in the long run advantageous to the Ego.

(4). Clearly to override human actions would be to run a universe of mere puppets wirepulled from without. Will, proper, is determined by considerations of pleasure and pain, not by external compulsion.

(5). Consult on the "Objective Efficacy of Prayer," Mr. Francis Galton's "Inquiries into Human Faculty." This distinguished scientist shows in a most striking and conclusive manner the baselessness of the old Christian notion of prayer. Now-a-days, however, it is matter of common note that the belief has almost entirely lost its hold on the cultured classes. It is a mere survival of barbarism.

"Protecting and watchful beings"—whether conceived as Nirmanakayas or what not—would need no selfish supplications to enlist their services. As to providence generally, a glance at the miseries and anguish of life will dispel the fond illusion of benevolent interfering agencies. The Buddhist type of "meditation," which allows the Higher Self to manifest itself in the normal consciousness, is apparently the only mode of "Prayer" conformable to the scientific view of cause and effect. The experience alluded to was, it seems, a species of clairvoyance elicited in all probability by the vehemence of the emotions excited. It is not at all uncommon and has no necessary connection with the verbal device known as "prayer."

(6). There is no cause for our correspondent to revolutionize his mode of life after the Eastern model, which is in no respects the acme of perfection. Cultivate your intellect and live up to your highest moral ideal, that is the sum and substance of all necessary advice. Soul evolution is not the appendage of any one mode of living or any particular climate!

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. XI. No. 128.—MAY 1890.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

THE BARISAL GUN.

II.

LET us now return to the consideration of the most interesting and mysterious atmospheric phenomenon called the Barisál Gun, the discussion of which I began in the *Theosophist* (Vol. IX. No. 108) for September 1888.

Though nearly two years have passed since the Asiatic Society of Bengal issued a circular and organized a system of close scientific observation, the mystery remains as inexplicable as ever. Apparently it will ever remain so to those who confine their research to the theories and methods of physical science. If it is ever to be solved, it must be by the efforts of occult students working on the lines of the theory of the multiple constitution of all Nature.

In the opening essay the several theories of men of science were passed in review, and all pronounced inadequate on scientific grounds. For the information of new subscribers who may not have seen what was before written, let me give a few facts. At the town of Barisál, on the banks of the Beeghaye River, and elsewhere in the Gangetic Delta, have been heard, sporadically and without traceable cause, since time immemorial, loud detonations like cannon-shots. While at Barisál, I heard them myself one evening, and thought them a salvo of artillery, fired within the distance of a half mile or mile. The sound is like nothing else in Nature; it is neither a rumbling, a crashing, or a roaring, hence neither like the sound of thunder, the sea beating upon a strand, the fall of forest trees or buildings, nor the effect of gusts of wind rushing into caverns or through rugged cliffs. They are like gun-fire and nothing else in the world. Like the roar of large ordnance, too, not like the ring of a howitzer or a carronade. I heard seven successive reports with brief intervals between, but