

on which the questions are to be written should touch some figures in the soothsayer's book either before or after the questions have been reduced to writing. This book does not show any trace of carbon or any other chemical preparation, and the questioner when he writes does not necessarily make the book his pad, but the facsimile usually appears to have been traced on carbon. In some cases the facsimile does not appear at all, but the soothsayer himself writes on a slate or a piece of paper. In doing so he does not use the book on which the question was laid, and the original writing remains in the hand of the questioner whose language the soothsayer need not necessarily know. But in such cases the words thus developed are unintelligible at first sight, but when a comparison is made with original writing, the very letters, even the dots and strokes are discernible.

One can understand the principles of ordinary astrology. But how is this science based? The data on which it apparently works seem to be too vague. According to *Swarodaya* (science of breath) a man must think of some particular colour or form according to the course of his breath, and it is quite intelligible that by practice one is able to answer questions that fall within the province of this science. But how can the name of a flower or a fruit of a god or certain figures, give the past history of a man or foretell his future events? Again, *Keral*, according to its definition, being a part of astronomy or astrology, which is based principally on calculation of some substantial data, how can one expect to have a correct answer on data seemingly so imperfect, and how does the production of writings fall within the province of astrological calculation?

Many people call the answer the result of pure guess, but from the accounts given of the correctness of the answers in many cases, it seems that guessing has been reduced to a science.

This is a question that is troubling many heads in Simla at the advent of a young Brahmin named Pandit Radha Kissen who calls himself a professor of the *Keral* science. He earns a good deal by his profession, and as the report goes has satisfied even some of the sceptics, though not those that are obstinate and are wilfully blind. I may mention here that the Brahmin is a *Tantric*, but he assures his visitors that he has nothing to do with *pisachas* and elementals. He does not profess to possess the power of thought-reading, but his achievements in the production of the very words of the questioner is wonderful, and people at first sight take him to be a thought-reader. The only argument that can be advanced against him is that he knows the secret of certain chemicals by which he can instantaneously transfer the writing of the questioner to the book, and he then either copies it or traces it on another paper as circumstances permit. But then he scarcely looks at the book after it has been used by the questioner.

K. C. M.

ॐ

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. VIII. No. 95.—AUGUST 1887.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

RE-CLASSIFICATION OF PRINCIPLES.

IN the *May Theosophist* (1887), I find the first part of a long explanatory article, by Mr. Subba Row, in which the able author has gone to the trouble of dissecting almost every thing I have written for the last ten years, upon the subject under review.

My first thought was, to leave his "answer" without reply. Upon reading it carefully over, however, I have come to the conclusion that perhaps it would not be safe to do so. The article in question is a manifesto. I am not allowed to labour any longer under the impression that it was only an apparent disagreement. Those members and ex-members of our Society who had rejoiced at Mr. Subba Row's remarks were consequently right in their conclusions, and I—wrong. As I do not admit—in our case, at any rate—that "a house divided against itself" must fall, for the Theosophical Society can never fall so long as its foundation is very strong, I regard the disagreement, even if *real*, as of no great or vital importance. Yet, were I to fail to answer the strictures in question, it would be immediately inferred that I was silenced by the arguments; or, worse, that I had expounded a tenet which had no basis.

Before I say anything further upon the main subject, however, I must express my surprise at finding the learned author referring to me continually as his "critic." I have never criticized him, nor his teachings, whether orally, or in print. I had simply expressed regret at finding in the *Theosophist* words calculated, as I then thought, to create false impressions. The position assumed by the lecturer on the Gita was as unexpected as it was new to me, and my remarks were meant to be as friendly as I could make them. Nor am I actuated even now by any other feelings. I can only regret, and nothing more, that such new developments of ideas should occur just now, after nearly seven years of *tacit*, if not actual, agreement.

Nor do I find on page 450 of the April *Theosophist* in my footnote anything that should imply, even remotely, least of all "probably," that I endorse the views that "a slur was thrown on the original teaching." I had said that "some (Theosophists) argued that it looked like a slur." As for myself, I have too much reverence for the "original" TEACHERS to ever admit that anything said or done, could ever be "a slur" upon their teachings. But if I, *personally*, am made out "the original expounder," there can be no slur whatever. It is, at the worst, a disagreement in personal views. Every one is free in the Theosophical Society to give full expression to his own ideas,—I among the rest; especially when I know that those views are those of *trans-Himalayan* esotericism, if not of *cis-Himalayan* esoteric Brahmanism, as I am now told squarely—for the first time. The words written by me in the footnote, therefore—"Of course those who do not hold to the old school of Aryan and Arhat adepts are in no way bound to adopt the septenary classification"—were never meant for Mr. Subba Row. They applied most innocently, and as I thought liberally, to every and each member of our Association. Why my friend, Mr. T. Subba Row, should have applied them to himself is one of those mysterious combinations—evolved by my own *karma* no doubt—which pass *my* comprehension. To expect a Brahmin, a Vedantin (whether an occultist or otherwise) to accept *in their dead-letter* the tenets of Buddhist (even if Aryan) adepts, is like expecting a western Kabbalist, an Israelite by birth and views, to adhere to our Lord Buddha instead of to Moses. To charge me on such grounds with dogmatism and a desire to evolve "an orthodox creed" out of tenets I have tried to explain to those who are interested in Buddhist occultism, is rather hard. All this compels me to explain my past as well as my present position. As the second portion of Mr. Subba Row's *reply* can hardly contain stronger charges than I find in the first, I ask permission to state that:—

(I.) Neither the original "Fragments of Occult Truths" nor yet "Esoteric Buddhism," were ever meant to expound *Brahminical* philosophy, but that of the *trans-Himalayan* Arhats, as very correctly stated by Mr. Subba Row in his "Brahminism on the Seven-fold Principle in Man"—"it is extremely difficult to show (to the profane H. P. B.!) whether the Tibetans derived their doctrine from the ancient Rishis of India, or the ancient Brahmans learned their occult science from the adepts of Tibet; or again, whether the adepts of both countries professed originally the same doctrine and derived it from a common source..... However that may be, the knowledge of the *occult powers of nature* possessed by the inhabitants of the lost Atlantis, was learnt by the ancient adepts of India, and was appended by them to their esoteric doctrine taught by the residents of the sacred island (Shambhala). The Tibetan adepts, however, have not accepted this addition to their esoteric doctrine"... Thus, the readers of the *Theosophist* were told from the first (in 1882) that they "should expect to find a difference between the two doctrines." One of the said "differences" is found in the *exoteric exposition*, or form of presentation of the seven-fold principle in man.

II. Though the *fundamental* doctrines of Occultism and Esoteric philosophy are one and the same the world over, and that is the secret meaning under the outward shell of every old religion—however much they may conflict in appearance—is the outcome of, and proceeds from, the universal WISDOM-RELIGION—the modes of thought and of its expression must necessarily differ. There are Sanskrit words used—"Jiva," for one—by *trans-Himalayan* adepts, whose meaning differs greatly in verbal applications, from the meaning it has among Brahmans in India.

III. I have never boasted of any knowledge of Sanskrit, and, when I came to India last, in 1879, knew very superficially the philosophies of the six schools of Brahminism. I never pretended to teach Sanskrit or explain Occultism in that language. I claimed to know the esoteric philosophy of the *trans-Himalayan* Occultists and no more. What I knew again, was that the philosophy of the ancient *Dwijas* and Initiates did not, nor could it, differ *essentially* from the esoterism of the "Wisdom-religion," any more than ancient Zoroastrianism, Hermetic philosophy, or Chaldean Kabbala could do so. I have tried to prove it by rendering the technical terms used by the Tibetan Arhats of things and principles, as adopted in *trans-Himalayan* teaching (and which when given to Mr. Sinnett and others without their Sanskrit or European equivalents, remained to them unintelligible, as they would to all in India)—in terms used in Brahminical philosophy. I may have failed to do so correctly, very likely I have, and made mistakes,—I never claimed infallibility—but this is no reason why the seven-fold division should be regarded as "unscientific." That it was *puzzling* I had already admitted, yet, once properly explained, it is the right one, though, in transcendental metaphysics, the quaternary may do as well. In my writings in the *Theosophist* I have always consulted learned and (even *not* very learned) Sanskrit-speaking Brahmans, giving credit to every one of them for knowing the value of Sanskrit terms better than I did. The question then is not, whether I may or may not have made use of wrong Sanskrit terms, but whether the occult tenets expounded through me are the right ones—at any rate those of the "Aryan-Chaldeo-Tibetan doctrine" as we call the "universal Wisdom-religion." (See *Five years of Theosophy*, 1st note, to Mr. Subba Row's "Brahminism on the seven-fold Principle in Man," p. 177-9).

IV. When saying that the seven-fold classification of principles is *absolutely* necessary to explain *post-mortem* phenomena, I repeat only that which I had always said and that which every mystic will understand. "Once we pass from the plane of pure subjective (or metaphysical, hence purely *theoretical*) reasoning on esoteric matters to that of practical demonstration in occultism, wherein each (lower) principle and attribute has to be analyzed and defined in its application...to *post-mortem* life (that of spooks and *pisachas*), the seven-fold classification is the right one." These are my words, which every spiritualist will understand. Vedantin metaphysicians, denying as they do objective reality or importance even to our physical body, are not likely to lose their time in dividing the lower principles in man, the compound *aspects* and nature

of the phantom of that body. Practical occultism does; and it is one of the duties of those Theosophists who study occultism to warn their brethren of the dangers incurred by those who know nothing of the real nature of those apparitions: to warn them that a *shell* is not "*spirit*." This statement of mine I find qualified as "simply absurd." Having never regarded as *absurd* anything said or written by Mr. Subba Row, I could not retaliate even if I would, I can only pronounce the epithet, let us say—*unkind*, and demur to the qualification. Had the author to face "practical demonstration" in spiritual phenomena and "*materializations* of spirits," so called, he would soon find that his four principles could never cover the ground of this kind of phenomena. Even the *lower aspect* of the principle of *manas* (physical brain, or its *post-mortem* auric survival) and of *kama rupa* are hardly sufficient to explain the *seemingly* intelligent and spiritual principles (*bhut* or elements) that manifest through mediums.

V. It is not consistent with fact and truth to charge me, "the original (?) exponent herself" with changing my conceptions about the nature of principles. "I have never changed them, nor could I do so." In this I claim my right too, as Mr. Subba Row does, to my evidence being "the best and the most direct evidence available as regards *my own states of consciousness*." I may have used wrong Sanskrit expressions (and even wrong and clumsily put English sentences, for the matter of that)—while trying to blend the Arhat with the Brahmanical occult tenets. As to those conceptions, my "four principles" have to disintegrate and vanish in the air, before any amount of criticism can make me regard my ten fingers as only four; although *metaphysically*, I am fully prepared to admit that they exist only in my own *mayavic* perceptions and states of consciousness.

VI. Mr. Subba Row, taking hold of "Esoteric Buddhism," the "Elixir of Life" and "Man," is pleased to father all their sins of omission and commission on the "Original Expounder." This is hardly fair. The first work was written absolutely without my knowledge, and as the author understood those teachings from letters he had received, what have I to do with them? The *Elixir of Life* was written by its author under direct dictation, or *inspection*, in his own house, in a far way country, in which I had never been till two years later. Finally "Man" was *entirely rewritten* by one of the two "chelas" and from the same materials as those used by Mr. Sinnett for "Esoteric Buddhism;" the two having understood the teachings, each in his own way. What had I to do with the "states of consciousness" of the three authors, two of whom wrote in England while I was in India? He may attribute to the lack of *scientific* precision in the "original teachings," there being "a jumble." No one would accuse Mr. Subba Row's *Bhagavat Gita* lectures of any such defects. Yet, I have already heard three or four intelligent persons among our members expounding the said three lectures (those which have already appeared)—*in three different and diametrically opposite ways*.

This will do, I believe. The *Secret Doctrine* will contain, no doubt, still more *heterodox* statements from the Brahminical view.

No one is forced to accept *my* opinions or teaching in the Theosophical Society, one of the rules of which enforces only mutual tolerance for religious views. Our body is entirely unsectarian and "only exacts from each member that toleration of the beliefs of others which he desires...in regard to his own faith."

Most of us have been playing truants to this golden rule as to all others: more's the pity.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

KAIVALYANAVANITA
OF SRI THANDAVARAYA SWAMYGAL.
PART II.

(Continued from page 616.)
The Clearing away of doubts.

31. "(An ordinary person) will by *Vāsana*¹ repeat (in *Jagra*) the old story dreamt in a dream that has passed away.² So also will he, who, investigating (the true nature of self), has attained to real knowledge, express himself, and still will never become *Chidābhāsa*.³ He who has become a celestial being will nevertheless be called 'man' till the (causal) body⁴ that has already died (by the

1. *i. e.*, Aroma or smell. Just as the ordinary mortal, fully knowing that the dream is not a reality, repeats it when he comes back to the conscious waking state, so the *Gnāni*, to whom the *Jagra* or the waking state is a dream, will tell the story of his dream when he is in *Turiya*.

2. The Tamil word rendered 'that has passed away' also means 'inactive.' Hence this may also be translated as 'in a dream where (all the organs but the *Manas*) are inactive.'

3. *Chidābhāsa* is the reflection of *Chit* or *Atma* in the *Karāna Sarīra*, which is the vehicle of ignorance. It is otherwise called *Jiva*. The ordinary mortal is *Chidābhāsa*, while the *Gnāni* is not, though he expresses himself like the former, for they differ in many points. The one forgets the world when *Sushupti* or profound sleep supervenes; the other, when serenity of intellect resulting from indefatigable investigation ensues. To the one the scenery in dream is *Swapna* or unreal; to the other the sights of *Jagra* are illusory. In the case of the one, it is a momentary dream; in that of the other, it is a continued dream (for the idea that the phenomenal world is illusive is constant in his mind). The wakefulness of the one is ignorance or *Agnānam* and that of the other is wisdom or *Gnānam*. The dream of the one takes place when he forgets himself; that of the other, when he forgets without forgetting. The one relates the dream when he wakes up as the phenomenal world; and the other, when he wakes up as the absolute *Chit*. The one repeats it as *Mood'ha Vinod'ha* (*i. e.*, wonder through ignorance; *i. e.*, without understanding it); the other, as *Gnāna Vinod'ha* (*i. e.*, wonder with the full knowledge of how it comes about). Hence *Jivatma* cannot be attributed to the *Gnāni*.

4. This is how the commentator renders this sentence. The reading in the text is merely: "The celestial being will be called 'man' till his body that has died is burnt up," which will also mean that the real *Mahatma* is not and cannot be seen by common people who always view the body as the real entity; hence so long as the body remains, the real *Mahatma*, whose body has already died, *i. e.*, whose physical activities have ceased and who does not cleave to the body as self as common persons do, will be called 'man.' But the commentator says that the body here must be taken to mean the *Karāna Sarīra* and not either the *Sthūla deha* or *Sukshma deha*. For if the *Sthūla deha* is meant, every one must become a celestial being when he dies and his body is burnt; and if the *Sukshma* is meant, all *Jivas* must become divine beings during *Sushupti* and cosmic sleep, both of which are absurd and not true.

birth of *Pragna*) is completely consumed (by the predominant fire of wisdom).¹ Hence, till the *Chidibhāsa*, that has begun to perish (the very instant of knowing himself to be *Chit*), entirely passes away² (like *avidya*), the *vivakāra* will continue."

32. "But, O Sir! O Master! everything visible is unreal; are not therefore the various *Vivakāras* (done with regard to visible, unreal things) painful?³ Will they afford the same state of transcendental bliss that *Gnānam* yields?⁴ Is it not that it will be well only when (the *Vivakāras*) completely pass away? But ought not we then to practise contemplation (*i. e.*, *Nishtai*, in order to put down those *Vivakāras*)?⁵ Now if a person practices contemplation that leads to the realization of self, how can you maintain that he is free from action?"⁶

33. "O my intelligent son! all (worldly) *Vivakāras* come to an end in the beginning.⁷ *Samādhi* which is capable (of rendering one's self conspicuous) and *Vivakāras* (connected with it)—are not these actions on the mental plane?⁸ Is it therefore likely that those

1. The *Karana Sarira* or *Avidya* only begins to be powerless when *gnānam* dawns on the horizon of one's intellect, but does not pass away at once. It is only after considerable practice that *Sahasa Samādhi* is gained when *gnānam* shines with the splendour of the noon-day sun, nay crores of such suns all at once, preventing the mental sky from being overcast with the clouds of ignorance, doubt and perversity. It is then that *Avidya* is completely burnt up, and with it the reflection vanishes and the *Logos* shines forth by itself. In stanza 78 of Part I, we read that the *Samādhi* of the disciple did not continue for ever (as that was only his first practice), but that his *Manas*, though after a long time, externalized, and he perceived the outward world.

2. Till he wins the perfection of a *Vasishthan* or attains to *Vidēha-mukti*. The purport of this stanza is that, though he says "I do," still he is free from all action, because he does not refer the action to himself. But even these *Vivakāras* will come to an end when he becomes a *Vasishthan* or *Vidēha-mukta*.

3. The disciple says: "I understand why sages will not carry on *Vivakāras* on the physical plane. All visible things are unreal; therefore all *Vivakāras* in connection with such objects, *i. e.*, the phenomenal universe, will give pain, for their results must necessarily be impermanent, and non-continuity of anything agreeable is painful. Pain being a hindrance to achieving perfect isolation, absolute bliss cannot be attained. Hence it is that sages will not do *Vivakāras*, but will work to subdue them. But this they can do only by practicing contemplation—meditating on the Divine essence—and contemplation, so far as I can understand it, is an action. Therefore your assertion that they are *Krita Kritya* or free from action must be accepted with certain reservation; that is, they are free from all other actions than this particular one of meditation. If so, why can you not plainly say so instead of using the general term *Krita Kritya*, which means free from all actions generally."

Understand the disciple to say after the first interrogatory sentence "Yes. They are."

4. No. They cannot.

5. Yes. Just so.

6. This is the question to which the Chela now seeks an answer.

7. *i. e.*, when the practice of *Sravana*, &c., mature and the Chela undergoes the first initiation. It is only when the activities on the physical plane cease, that the disciple is initiated. The Master therefore says, "I do not at all refer to worldly *Vivakāras* when I say that the adept is *Krita Kritya*, for the very fact of his having been admitted within the sanctuary is a proof that they have already come to an end."

8. Yes. They are actions—and actions taking place within the mind. I specially had this in my mind when I said 'They are free from action, *i. e.*, they are free from even these actions.

who have become the Absolute Being shining forth as the *Turiya* will do any other action (than stand solely as the Self)?¹ If a person practices the rare *Samādhis*, surely he is no adept (*Arūda*).

34. "If thou dost ask: 'O my excellent Master! why do some among such as are adepts and free from even a single action still perform *Dhyana*³ and similar things which are capable of subjugating the mind?'⁴ Remember I have already told thee that the emancipated will be of many different kinds according as the varieties of *Prarabha* occur on earth."⁵

35. "Hear further, O my good son! Save that the *Vivakāras* that *Gnānis* do are only for the benefit of humanity, there is not the least advantage or distinction they gain (to their own selves) nor does vexation or ignominy accrue to them thereby. Behold! the merit and demerit resulting from many works, such as mighty creation and so on, fall not to the lot of *Iswara* who showers down blessings on all!"⁶

36. "If thou dost say, 'O you Master who, being *Iswara* and the formless, have condescended to manifest yourself in the human form! you have said that *Iswara* and the *Gnāni* are equal. How are they equal?' Hear my reply: (*Iswara* and the *Gnāni* are equal inasmuch as they both have renounced the notion of 'mine' and 'I'. This *Gnāni* is *Iswara*, all the *Jivas*, ay, all the world at once!"⁷

37. "O Sir! You have said that this sage is all the *Jivas* together. If so, why do not all the *Jivas* obtain emancipation when the sage himself attains to *Mukti*? If all *Jivas* are different from each other (and have each a separate individual existence), then surely he cannot be all. O you Master that have deigned to

1. No. They will never.

2. He who practises the *Samādhis* (the two kinds, *Sav-vikalpa* and *Nir-vikalpa*) is only an *Abhyāsi* or practitioner, and *Krita Kritya* is not applicable to him. That refers only to the *Arūda* or adept.

3. Contemplation or meditation on the divine essence.

4. And which are therefore quite unnecessary to adepts who have become such only after bringing their mind under perfect control.

5. Vide stanzas 88 and 90 of Part I. They do this simply to set an example to the world. They themselves do not derive any benefit thereby. If we attribute to them the various actions they seem to perform, they will appear as *Abhyāsis*. But when we attribute to them the consummate state they have attained to and view them as such, they are adepts.

6. Because the several bodies, enjoyments and sufferings, &c., all come and go, not at the arbitrary will and whims of *Iswara*, but according to the *Karma* of the individual *Jiva*, or the force set in motion by him in his previous incarnated existence. If not, there is no necessity for him to lay down law enjoining and law forbidding. *Iswara* is not at all blameable for the several inequalities observed among men in the world. These are all due to their own *Karma*. *Iswara* gives the *Jivas* several chances by his works of creation, preservation and transformation to reform themselves by walking in the path chalked out to them in the holy books of all nations and thus enables them to reach the ultimate goal. It is therefore clear that His works are for the benefit of all *Jivas* and not to their ruin. Similarly *Gnānis* practise *Dhyana*, &c., and thus set an example to men and show them the right path. They themselves do not derive any benefit. Thus *Iswara* and the *Gnāni* are on the same level. *Gnānis* are therefore really *Krita Kritya*.

7. As the universal *Jiva*, &c., are not apart from the *Logos*, and as the *Gnāni* is one that has become the *Logos*, he is all these.

explain all the secret meanings (of the Vedas)! now interpret this please."

38. "The *Atma* called 'I' is all-full and one. But as the *Antakkarana Upádhis* called 'I' are innumerable, the *Jivas* are many. (For instance), the moon that cools and refreshes the whole world is one, while the moons reflected in the water are many, for, in the world, (the *Upádhis*, such as) lakes, tanks, pools, pails, jars and pitchers are many.

39. "Now among (the many different *Upádhis*, such as) pails, pitchers, and so on, if one perishes, the moon (reflected in the water) within it, will unite with its original moon hanging (in the infinite space); but the rest will not join it. Similarly the *Jiva* that causes the binding *Upádhi* to perish will blend into oneness with its original cause *Atma*; but those who have not rid themselves of their *Upádhis*² will not obtain perfect isolation (*i. e.*, union with *Atma*)."

40. "But how can this one (*viz.*, the *Gnáni*) be equal to the *Iswaras*³, namely, Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra? For, the three (Gods) Rudras and others perform the operations of creation, preservation and transformation with regard to the whole universe; they moreover know the thoughts of others and the three divisions of time (*viz.*, past, present and future), and are also all-pervading and eternal. But, O Master, abounding in *Tapas*,⁴ I do not in the least find the like powers in this sage."⁵

41. "The water of the tank and the light of the moon—torch⁶—these two—will support the whole surrounding country. But the water of the pitcher and the light of the lamp—these two will profit only one household. O, my son, that hast sought my protection! by *Gnánam*,⁷ *Iswara* and the *Gnáni* are not different. It is by the qualities of the cursed *Máya* that the distinction of 'high' and 'low' has resulted.

1. *i. e.*, Commonly taken to be the self. The reflection in the *Antakkarana* is *Chidabhása* or *Jiva*. The *Upádhis* of *Antakkarana*, namely *Avidyas*, being different and many, the reflections are also many and different. Vide stanza 26, Part I.

2. *i. e.*, *Avidyas*. The Master has shewn here that the sage is all the *Jivas*, but the *Jiva* is not the sage. Therefore all the *Jivas* cannot and will not attain to *Nirvana*, when the sage obtains emancipation.

3. *i. e.*, The three *Murthis* possessing *Iswartvam*. It is the same *Iswara* that is known by these names according to the works they do. If the *Gnáni* is the same as *Iswara*, he must possess the powers of creating, preserving and transforming the whole universe.

4. Penance, self-abnegation.

5. The disciple has read in *Shastras* that *Iswara* does these things, &c., but he has not apparently seen such powers exhibited by the sage. Hence this question.

6. A sort of blue light generally used on festive occasions. It is a mixture of saltpetre, sulphur, orpiment, indigo, antimony and camphor. The light is so dazzling that it makes night appear as day.

7. In the standpoint of *Gnánam* or *Chit*.

42. "Like the king and *Siddhas*¹ among men, the gods, such as Vishnu and so on, are powerful in *Máya* and are distinguished by great *Tapas*, which abounds in (psychic powers, such as) *Anima*, and so on.² Though the people of this world are inferior by reason of their not possessing those (powers, &c.) still in the standpoint of Brahm, there is not the least difference of 'these' (men) and 'those' (*Devas*). Only think and see.

43. "If thou dost say, 'O you true Master who have helped me to salvation! While we find many *Munis* (or sages) on earth possessing psychical powers of *Anima* and so on, you have said that that wealth is peculiarly *Iswara's*. Graciously explain this so as to be consistent with reason.' Know that (these powers) have successfully accrued to them, though their supplication directed towards the praiseworthy *Iswara* as well as through *Yoga*."³

44. "O you, my divine Master, that are of the form of Siva!⁴ if it is said that rigid ascetics will obtain both psychical powers and emancipation, will not all obtain like those (*Tapasis*)?⁵ We have seen (in *Srutis*) that in ancient times they gained both *Siddhi* and *Gnánam* (at the same time).⁶ Now if these⁷ are called *Gnánis*, how is it that these do not possess *Siddhis*?"

45. "O my son! There are two kinds of *Tapas* on earth, namely, *Kámya Tapas*⁸ and *Tapas* without the least wish for even

1. The king wields temporal authority and is considered to be superior to his subjects; and a *Siddha* possesses psychical powers which are higher than the temporal power of the king which he possesses merely in virtue of his position. The *Siddha* is therefore superior to the king. Just as the king is superior to ordinary men in virtue of his position and the temporal power he wields, and the *Siddha* is higher than the king, owing to his possessing the eminent psychical powers, so these gods are superior to men, for they wield the power called *Máya*.

2. The eight *Siddhis*: *viz.*, 1, *Anima*=the power of reducing one's self to the size of an atom; 2, *Mahima*=the power of increasing one's bulk illimitably; 3, *Laghima*=levitation; the power of rendering one's self or other things very light and buoyant. 4, *Garima*=the power of rendering anybody immaterial so as to penetrate matter; according to others, the power of increasing the weight of one's self or other things without limit; 5, *Prápti*=the power of obtaining the fulfilment of every desire; 6, *Prákámya*=the power of overcoming natural obstacles: such as passing through solid material things and going anywhere; 7, *Isita*=superior dominion over animate or inanimate nature; the power of making every thing act or move according to the will of the possessor; 8, *Vasita*=the power of assuming any form and the attributes peculiar to that form; the power of enchanting or changing the course of nature.

3. The Master says this only of those that possess merely some psychical powers without *Gnánam*.

4. The true Guru is himself Siva.

5. *i. e.*, Is there any exception? If all ascetics gain them, how is it that these are also ascetics who possess *Gnánam*, but in whom we do not find these powers?

6. *i. e.*, We read in many works that the *Munis* of ancient times, such as Agastyar, Bhogar, &c., possessed both these wonderful psychical powers and *Gnánam* at the same.

7. *i. e.*, The sages of modern times; for we do not find them exhibiting any powers; if they possess them they will surely show them. Perhaps the disciple does not know that sages make use of their powers only when there is a necessity for it and not indiscriminately. Hence his question.

8. *i. e.*, Penance done with a wish to secure objects of desire, rites performed with a view to future fruition.

a single object of desire,¹ which yield respectively *Siddhi* and *Gnānam*. Whoever performs one of these (two kinds of penances) will obtain only the one (result) pertaining (to that kind). This is conclusive. The sages of those times performed the two kinds we have spoken of.

46. "O my non-egotistical son! Janaka, Mahabali, Baghirata and others,—did these (I say) ever study *Siddhis* except that they obtained only *Gnānam* for securing emancipation?² Some aspired to sweet *Siddhis* alone,³ while some exerted themselves for both, (namely, *Siddhis* and *Gnānam*). The *Siddhis* of Munis will merely afford pastime (and excite wonder), but will never yield emancipation.

47. "If thou dost ask, 'If *Gnāna-yoga* by itself will afford *Mukti*, why have sundry *Jivan-muktas* lusting after *Siddhis* apart, subjected their body to physical torture (and thus performed rigid penance)?' (then tell me:) Is it not by experiencing *Prārabda Karmas* that occur as objects of enjoyment (and suffering) that they must die away?⁴ Hence know that those *Siddhis* will be classed with *Prārabda*."

48. "O gracious Master! You who have favoured me (with the exposition of the secret doctrine) reinforcing it (with quotations) from thousands and lakhs⁵ of *Srutis* and with logical demonstration,⁶ in order that my *Manas* may be strengthened and remain unshaken! My mental delusion passing away, I have completely cleared up. Nevertheless there can be no harm if we cleanse and polish again and again an already clear mirror. Surely the nectars⁷ that you, divine Lord, who have dispelled my misery, speak of never cloy.

1. *Niskkāmya Tapas*. He who does this penance will not be allured by the *Siddhis*, that will incidentally accrue to him, and then make a dead halt there, viewing them as all in all, but will proceed till he is crowned with *Gnānam*.

2. *i. e.*, These kings strove exclusively for the ultimate *Gnānam* and did not in the least desire to acquire *Siddhis*. These became adepts and not mere *Siddhas*.

3. Which can be very easily acquired, but which cannot save one. The Master here alludes to those who dazzle the world with thaumaturgic feats they have acquired by observing certain postures, fastings, &c., but who do not possess wisdom.

It is not meant that *Gnānis* are devoid of these powers. The *Siddhis* will naturally accrue to them when they practise *Gnāna-Yogam* or *Raja-Yogam*. Only they will consider them as incidental results, and will never exercise them for purposes other than the spiritual welfare of humanity. It is a mistake to infer from this stanza, as many do, that one can be a *Gnāni*—a real practical *Gnāni*—without possessing psychical powers.

4. Yes. They believing in their previous incarnated existence that extraordinary powers could be acquired by subjecting themselves to physical pain, desired and strove to obtain them by that method. Hence they do it now, in order to exhaust that force.

5. *i. e.*, Simply many.

6. The Tamil word is *Yuham* or *Yukti*, *i. e.*, Reason.

7. *i. e.*, Nectar-like words. I am never loath of the ambrosia-like words that you speak to me.

49. "O Lord! O Master ruling over me by means of your grace! Will the *Shastras* make false statements?¹ How am I to decide² between the statement that the actions done³ will never quit (men), whoever and whatever they may be, unless they experience (the fruits of those actions), and the statement that the puro fire of *Gnānam* will burn so as completely to consume the *Sanjita Karma*, (the seed of) rebirths?"⁴

50. "O my son! The varieties of *Jivas* are countless and their actions are likewise numberless. Having regard to their respective (mental) capacities which are necessarily (different), and having in view the (several degrees of their spiritual) maturity, the *Vedas* which are (our) shield⁵ will discourse the two *Pūrva-paksha*⁶ and *Siddhānta*⁷ in three sections (or *Khāndams*),⁸ just in the same way as (plants first) put forth flowers and then bear fruits.⁹

1. Or, will they speak with indecision?

2. *i. e.*, which of these two statements am I to consider correct? Or if the *Shastras* will not speak falsehood, then both the statements (which are apparently contradictory must be correct; in that case, how am I to reconcile them?

3. *i. e.*, The *Sanjita Karma*.

4. At one time the *Vedas* say that the *Sanjita Karma* must be experienced and exhausted—we can never, *i. e.*, under no circumstances, escape the results of our past actions; at another time the very same *Vedas* state that the results of our past doings will not affect us if we realize the self or in other words obtain *Gnānam*. Thus the two assertions contradict each other.

5. *i. e.*, which protect us by prescribing rules of conduct for us—by enumerating the active and passive virtues we must observe in order to be saved.

6. This word literally means 'the fore part.' A *Pūrva-paksha* assertion then is one that is made to an earlier stage. It can therefore be objected to and proved to be valueless at a later development.

7. Lit. established end. It is the true logical conclusion following on the reputation of the *Pūrva-paksha* or *prima facie* view of a question. What appears a *Siddhānta* proposition at one time will later become a *Pūrva-paksha* assertion. For the purpose of bringing round and reforming a person who wanders about unrestrained like a stray bull, the *Karma-Kādam* says that the observance of the rites and ceremonials mentioned in the *Purva Mimamsa* will certainly yield *Mukti*. This is *siddhānta* to such a person. The *Bhakti-kādam* says to the ritualist, or one who has come within the pale of *Karma-kādam*, that devotion to God, namely, performing the rites without referring them to himself and making them over to *Iswara*—will undoubtedly give him *Moksham*. This now becomes *siddhānta* and the former statement *Pūrva-paksha*. Next, to the devotee the *Gnāna-kādam* says, "you cannot obtain salvation either by rites or by mere devotion. You can only attain to a Devachanic state by these means which is not worth striving after. These cannot free you from the misery of conditioned existence. Know yourself; acquire real wisdom. Then only can you have heaven on earth. This alone is *Moksham* or Emancipation." This now becomes *siddhānta* and the statement of *Bhakti-kādam Purva-paksham*.

8. *viz.*, *Karma-kādam*, *Bhakti-kādam* and *Gnāna-kādam*.

9. The flowers of a tree allure men at a distance to the tree by their gaudy appearance and delicious fragrance, but do not themselves give them substantial benefit in the way of appeasing their hunger. So the *Purva-mimamsa* attracts men who wander about unrestrained by presenting to them the fascinations of *swerga* life or Devachanic existence, but does not afford them real *Mukti*. But the *Ettara-mimamsa* or *siddhānta* gives them real help like the fruits of the tree.

51. "What the most obdurate sinners must necessarily reach is the infernal regions. Nevertheless, is what (the Vedas) declare—namely, that they may be avoided by baths¹ (in sacred rivers), *Mantrams*,² *Vratams* and *Homas*³—untrue?⁴ However many the *Sanjita Karmas* (capable of yielding) many base births may be, the fire of true wisdom⁵ will burn them all out.⁶ If this statement of the occult science is to be relied upon, there will surely result *Mukti*."

52. "O you divine Master that ever graciously dwell in my heart as in a holy temple!⁷ The true wisdom that you (have taught and still continue) to teach will root out (the tree of) *Sanjita Karma* (that yields the fruit of) conditioned existence and will give (one) the form of one's real self.⁸ Vouchsafe to tell me the reason why the Devas and men, not understanding this greatness (of *Gnānam*), fall into the abyss of *Karma* (*i. e.*, rituals and ceremonies) and perish therein.

53. "O son! those that have always their vision introverted will reach the imperishable state of being the Self. If those, who walk on the road have their faces averted,⁹ they will, even though the eyes be wide open, surely fall into the pit (that is on the way). Similarly those, who, with their attention turned outward,¹⁰ have become possessed with a longing for sense-objects,¹¹ will whirl about in the reproachful¹² ocean of conditioned existence. They will never come up to the supreme state (of emancipation.)

54. "If thou dost say: 'O you divine master of ascetic life!¹⁴ Eminent good and (base) evil—are not these the doings caused to be done by *Iswara*? What can these (poor) *Jivas* do who have come into existence (because He has caused them to be born?)

1. The word in the text will also mean (visits to) holy shrines.
2. Words of adoration addressed to Deity.
3. Austerity, fasting, continence or any meritorious act of devotion is a *Vratam*.
4. Making oblations to the Devas or gods by casting clarified butter into the fire, accompanied with prayers and invocations. Called also *Yagnas*.
5. No. There is some truth in it.
6. Not the mere intellectual understanding of occult truths, but intuitive perception of the One Reality—the actual realization of the Self.
7. Vide stanza 96 of Part I. In Vallalar shastram we find this passage: "*Sanjita* will pass away by the holy gaze (of the master). *Prārabda* will depart with the gross body. The remaining *Agamya* will go off by the refulgent *Gnānam*. O son! if thou dost directly feel (*i. e.*, realize) that all that the (I) has done is the doing of *Siva*, the different classes of *Karma* will not come and meet thee."
8. *i. e.*, Considering or taking my heart as a holy temple for you to dwell in.
9. When such is the case, how is it that they perform rituals, &c., and perish?
10. *i. e.*, If they be careless or inattentive.
11. In the original the phrase is, 'with outward face.' Its opposite which has been rendered 'who have their vision introverted' is in the text 'who have the face within' or 'who have inner face.'
12. *i. e.*, Who have become possessed with *Kamam* or an inordinate longing for all objects generally.
13. Because it makes up material-children of the earth. The purport of the stanza is 'Those who internalize will become the *Jogīs* and those who externalize will become the *non-ego*.'
14. *i. e.*, Who have renounced all earthly desires.

How can (you) attribute the blame to them?¹—(I tell thee) this is the mad babbling that the fools, who² have lost sight of the true spirit of the meaning of Vedic works, prattle forth. Hear this, O my son!

55. "The creation of the self-effulgent *Iswara* and the creation of the *Jiva* are quite different from each other. The creations of *Iswara*, in the universe, are of a general character. They are all the moveable and immoveable things.³ But self-esteem, hate, love⁴—all these which are (the outcome of) egotism⁵ form the creations of the free-willed *Jiva* and not at all the doings of the Spotless One.

56. "The creations of the Lord (*Iswara*) existing as three (namely, Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra) will form the means of Emancipation to all *Jivas*; but the creations of *Jivas* are the plague that causes (the *Jivas*) themselves to be born (over and over again). If all objects beginning with immoveable things perish, (the liability to) births with regard to any *Jiva* will not come to an end.⁶ But if (passions, such as) anger, and so on die away, then the bondage (*Bandha*) called miserable births, will pass away.⁷

T. M. SUDRAM PILLAI, B. A.

1. Uniting the body and the soul together as well as separating them is the work of *Siva* and not that of *Jiva*. Hence whatever happens when the two have been joined together, cannot be the doing of *Jiva*. Moreover I have the authority of the Shastras which sanction this view, for they declare, "Not even a single atom can move without Him," "any thing whatever happens by the operations of *Siva*," and so on. It is therefore quite clear that *Siva* induces *Jivas* to good or evil. How can we reasonably therefore blame them? How can we hold them responsible for their actions, good or bad?

2. A person does not consent to be robbed by others of his property or to be ill-treated in any way, whereas he is ever ready to inflict pain on others or to appropriate their wealth, &c., to himself and excuses himself by saying that God has put such thoughts into his head and he cannot therefore help. But to be true to his principle, he must allow himself to be treated in the same way by others, seeing that they too are induced to do so by *Siva*. But he does not. Why? These are clearly therefore the actions of *Jivas*. We are not entitled to say, 'Everything happens by the operations of *Siva*,' so long as we possess *Jivatma*. In the 'Lamentations' of Musthan, the adept, we find this passage, "When, O Lord, is that time to come when I can say that all actions are of Thy doing?"

This shows that we are responsible for our actions till we realize the self or become *Siva*. Hence the master's reply.

3. These are the different bodies and all the crores of worlds. If the *Jiva* is also included in them, then there will be no necessity to distinguishing *Siva* creations and *Jiva*-creations.

4. The plural is used because there are many degrees and kinds of these.

5. Which are egotism itself.

The purport of this stanza is, "There are two kinds of creations, namely, *Siva*-creation and *Jiva*-creation. The former is all objects in the universe generally,—the latter is all passions and desires."

6. Though the whole phenomenal universe is destroyed, the *Jiva* does not attain to emancipation, if what has been generated by him does not come to an end. But even while all moveable and immoveable things remain, if the creations of the *Jiva* alone perish, then he obtains *Mukti*. Hence the two creations are quite different. *Iswara* is not therefore to blame.

7. Supply! "Even though moveable and immoveable things exist."

MAHARAJAH RANJIT SINGH'S SADHU.

THE whole medical world has read the narrative given in M'Gregor's "History of the Sikhs" and Osborne's "Camp and Court of Ranjit Singh," of the burial for six weeks of a Dekkani *Sadhu* who had thrown himself into the state of *samadhi*, and his subsequent disinterment and restoration to life and consciousness. The facts are so well authenticated by witnesses of perfect credibility, as to make the case one of great importance to the student of Oriental *Yoga*. On my first visit to Lahore I was fortunate enough to procure the personal testimony of a living witness—a Hindu gentleman who was clerk to the then British Resident at Lahore, Sir Andrew Wade, and an eye witness. His account substantiated the narratives of M'Gregor, Wade and Osborne, and was valuable on that account. During my latest visit to the capital of the Panjab, I met still another eye-witness, a venerable man now employed as Head Granthi, or teacher of the Sikh Scriptures, in the Government College, Lahore. His story runs as follows:—

"Declaration by Chandra Singh, (late Subadar Sherdal Regiment, No. 19)—Head Granthi, Oriental College, Lahore.

I know all the facts concerning the *Sadhu* who sat for *samadhi* for six months* under ground in the time of M. Ranjeet Singh, and am an eye witness. The account is as follows:—

First, in the village of Phalot, 6 kos from Jessota, Sirdar Sarup Singh and I were there, where I saw the *Sadhu* and introduced him to the Sirdar. On our asking the reason of his visit, he said he was going to take *samadhi* on the hills, and we asked him to do so there, and why to take the trouble of going there. It was the month of *Asuj*—*Sammatt* about 1890—I do not remember the exact year. His food was a little milk, rice and some *dāl*, the whole less than a *pas* ($\frac{1}{4}$ of a seer). To prepare himself for the *samadhi* he began to lessen his food. After all he took only some milk, and after some hours he got the milk out of his stomach and tested it on fire, and it was exactly the pure milk. This was a test to him that his internal organs were now all clear and pure.

After all this was done he got himself into a bag in posture. *Padmasana*, his *Chela*, sewed up the bag; the bag was put into a box which was locked up; the key was with me. The box was put into a room and the room was walled up. Only a small hole was kept in the wall for the purpose of burning *dhooop*, &c., and making *Asti* by the *Chela* and ourselves the town-people.

After six months when spring (*Chaitra Vaisakh*) came, *Urad*-*alta* and *Jaiphal*, *Lomag* and *Jawitri* and other warm substances, a bread like a cap was baked. The door was broken open. Key was taken from me and the box opened, and the bag too. The *Sadhu* was seen hard like wood, but no sign of death, the body was not withered nor worn out. His *Chela*—*Lachhman Das*—put his finger into his mouth caught the tongue which was turned over into the throat, kept the tongue for some time into his hand, and it got straight, and the prepared cap was put up on his head and fire was kept upon that. Great noise was kept by guns, rifles, musical instruments, &c., &c., clapping, songs. After some minutes the *Sadhu* opened his eyes like a child, slowly shutting them again, and so on. After some hours he gave motion to his hands, feet, &c., &c.

For two days he was weak, and on the third he appeared as well as before and began to take his ordinary food. When this *samadhi* was over there was a great fair, people from *Jassota*, *Narot*, *Kuthua*, *Pathankat*, &c., &c., gathered together and rejoiced on the occasion. There were good offerings and a good sum was collected, which was all distributed as charity.

His name was *Jamna Das*. He had *Ekmukhirudraksha* and *Narbadeshwar Mahader*.

* He probably means weeks.—H. S. O.

All the above is declared by me as an eye-witness to the whole affair, and now the after-accounts of the *Sadhu* I dictate as heard:—

After the fame of the *Sadhu* was spread far and wide, *Raja Suchet Singh*—officer of the army—invited him to *Ramnagar* (*Jammu*), and there also he sat for *samadhi* for six months. After this was over, *Maharajah Ranjeet Singh* invited him with great éclat with elephant procession, &c., &c., and got him put up at *Amritsar*—*Kanla Wali Dhâb*. There also he took *samadhi* for six months, *Maharajah* also living there from curiosity. After he came out successfully the *Maharajah* presented him many valuable presents.

Then *Raja Dhyan Singh* invited the *Sadhu* to *Lahore*, and he took *samadhi* in the garden of *Raja Dhyan Singh*, near *Badamiagh*, as usual for six months. *Raja Sahib* also gave him good presents, and the *Sadhu* returned to his native land, *Deccan*, with valuables of about two lacs as the people say."

(*Bhai Chanda Singh*, Chief Granthi, Oriental College, Lahore, A. D. 1887, date June 4th.)

To spare the reader the trouble of hunting up Dr. M'Gregor's book*—long out of print and scarce—I shall copy the following extracts:—

"A novel scene occurred at one of these garden houses in February 1837. A faveer who arrived at *Lahore* engaged to bury himself for any length of time, shut up in a box, without either food or drink! *Runjeet* disbelieved his assertions, and was determined to put them to proof; for this purpose the man was shut up in a wooden box, which was placed in a small apartment below the level of the ground,—there was a folding door to this box, which was secured by lock and key. Surrounding this apartment there was the garden house, the door of which was likewise locked; and outside of this a high wall, having the door built up with bricks and mud. Outside the whole there was placed a line of sentries, so that no one could approach the building. The strictest watch was kept for the space of forty days and forty nights: at the expiration of this period, the *Maharajah*, attended by his grandson and several of his *Sirdars*, as well as *General Ventum*, *Captain Wade*, and myself, proceeded to disinter the faveer.

The bricks and mud were quickly removed from the doorway of the outer wall, the door of the house was next unlocked, and lastly, that of the box containing the faveer; the latter was found covered with a white sheet, on removing which, the figure of the man presented itself in a sitting posture. His hands and arms were pressed to his sides, and the legs and thighs crossed. The first part of the operation of resuscitation consisted in pouring over his head a quantity of warm water; after this, a hot cake of *atta* was placed on the crown of this head; a plug was next removed from one of his nostrils; on this being done, the man breathed strongly through it. The mouth was now opened, and the tongue, which had been closely applied to the roof of his mouth, brought forward, and both it and the lip anointed with *ghee* or melted butter; during this part of the process, I could not feel the pulsation of the wrist, though the temperature of the body was much above the natural standard of health. The legs and arms being extended, and the eye-lids raised, the former were well rubbed, and a little *ghee* was applied to the latter. The eye-balls presented a dim, suffused appearance, like those of a corpse. The man now evinced signs of returning animation, the pulse was felt, while the unnatural temperature of the body quickly decreased. He made several ineffectual efforts to speak, and at length uttered a few words, but in a tone so low as to make them inaudible. By and bye his speech was re-established, and he recognised the bystanders, addressing himself to the *Maharajah*, who was seated opposite to him, watching all his movements. When the faveer was able to converse, the completion of the feat was announced by the discharge of guns, and other demonstrations of joy: while a rich chain of gold was placed round his neck by *Runjeet* himself, and ear-rings, bangles, shawls, &c., were presented to him.

However extraordinary this feat may appear to both Europeans and natives, it is impossible to explain it on physiological principles, and equally

* The History of the Sikhs. By W. L. M'Gregor, M. D., Surgeon 1st E. B. Fusiliers. London: 1846. Vol. i, p. 227.

difficult to account for the means which the man employed in his successful imposition; for he not only denied his having tasted food or drink, but even maintained his having stopped the functions of respiration during the period of forty days and forty nights, resembling in this respect the child before birth."

Then comes the author's attempt to explain away the astounding physiological phenomenon he had seen. Of course, he puts forward the theory of trickery—the favourite resource of European commentators upon Asiatic psycho-physiological wonders; but he gives no facts of a suspicious character to support his theory. He plainly tells us that the Maharajah disbelieved the Sadhu's ability to perform the feat, and took the precaution of surrounding the house with an armed guard night and day until the disinterment occurred. The "Lion of the Punjab" was not a man to be trifled with, least of all by his body-guard, and there is not one probability in a thousand that any confederates could have helped the Yogi to elude his vigilance. Moreover our present witness, Sirdar Chandra Singh, tells us of similar samadhis by the same ascetic at Phalot and Jammu, and M'Gregor mentions the rumour that there had been one by the same man at Jesselmere. The simple truth is that our modern physiologists must wait until they have mastered the science of *Yoga* before pretending to really know the mysteries of the constitution of man.

H. S. OLCOTT.

ESOTERIC STUDIES.

I.

Rise of the Lower Kingdoms.

THE attainment to the human state of what is below it can only refer essentially to the soul of things, the Fourth principle; whence it follows that the lower element of the human quaternary, the astral soul, was actual, in bygone cycles, as the highest principle of animal life, and—in times still more remote—of the two inferior kingdoms. The medium of advance is type or *Form*. Progress implies that the vehicle is a *new* form in respect of any given class of monadic essence. Therefore *progress* of the Monad concurs with *retrogression* of Form, otherwise, with decrease of the *vis formativa*; this must ultimately lead to the materialisation of astral substance, Form being thereafter reduced to a potential state. It is thus I understand the Law of Retardation.

As man never can be, so he never has been, manifested in a shape belonging to the animal kingdom in *esse*; *i. e.*, he never formed part of that kingdom. Derived, only derived, from the most finished class of the latter, a new human form must always have been *the* new type of the cycle. The human shape in one ring, as I imagine, becomes cast off clothes in the next; it is then appropriated by the highest order in the servant-kingdom below. We are now in the 25th Earth-ring of the Manwantara. May not man's type of the 24th Ring have been that of the Simiadæ in its variety? Might not the Monkey-kingdom of Ramayana fame rest on some far-off tradition relating to a period when that was

the common lot, or rather aspect, of man? Is Swift's fiction so preposterous—provided we withdraw the human figure from its network? Who knows what shape vehicled the Ego in remote rings? Man may have been a quadruped of some kind before he became a biped, and a crawling entity before that—and yet withal such would be the *Ego-kingdom*, the seventh; never less. The progress or advance of Form *is* in the latter.

The store-house of potential forms, from Ring to Ring, is of course the elemental-prototypes. Just as man, as I suppose, gives up his form to entities beneath him, when he develops a more perfected one; so likewise do the higher animals make over theirs to entities of a lower level; the lowest of these, to the highest order of plants, and the latter to the mineral powers—but with an ever-decreasing momentum. This is only a logical way of expressing the idea. The process, *applicable only to the astral period* of the ring, is in reality a process of *elimination*. The prototypes whose physical outcome may have been utilized by the higher orders of existence in the preceding ring, are now gradually eliminated through the inferior planes of astral existence, all such being ultimately (not in the same ring of course) involved in, and extinguished by, the Mineral-kingdom (physical), as will be suggested hereinafter. The retrogression of form, it is needless to observe, is in no way substantial; it constitutes the gradual ebbing of the *vis formativa* (3rd prin.) and a correlative increase of cohesive energy (1st prin.) by a variable withdrawal of the life-principle (2nd) from the former in behalf of the latter—hence consolidation of substance or the growth of "matter."

Leaving this part of the topic for a moment, let us see how it fares with the Monad (4th prin.).

The "seed" left with the seven Rishis, Manus, or otherwise Dhyana Chohan adepts, at the end of the Round, and also of every Ring, is, as I take it, the "Fire" (*i. e.*, Astral Light) of which there are seven "great descents" during the Manwantara, each producing seven secondary descents through the rings, and each of the latter as many sub-descents corresponding to the races. Discarding minutiae, I shall divide the "Fire" into four parts, symbolized by *a* (animal souls, *i. e.*, of the higher orders), *b* (animal monadic essence, *i. e.*, of the inferior orders), *c* (vegetable monadic essence), *d* (mineral and metallic monadic essence). These "remains" of the ex-Ring which "descends" at the expiration of a minor obscuration, manifest themselves by the aforementioned seven sub-descents. In each of these, as in Noah's ark, every order is fully represented (*a, b, c, & d*); but not one is like another, till finally the seventh sub-descent gives forth the last astral contribution. But before all this begins, the "Nature Spirits" must be woke up; for although we know not what they do, they surely have some very important share in the proceedings. We need take no further notice than of *one* sub-descent, and follow it in its course. When, by virtue of the first Life-impulse, the respective Elemental-kingdoms have revived, the first sub-descent commences, *d* heading the way as it were, (*d, c, b, a*, being, each in its turn, an exponent of "Fire").

The third *tanmatra's* supremacy is the immediate cause of descent. By alternations of supremacy among the *tanmatras* (the 5th being the rising power, the 1st the descending one, the others expressing intermediate values) there will be cycles describing both arcs, oftentimes and in different degrees, in which, as far as the 4th *tanmatra* is concerned, *a* and *d* concur with the extremes of rise and fall, *b* and *c* intermediately; until, under the sway of the 2nd *tanmatra*, *d* carries its charge over the boundary, so to say, of the second kingdom (aroused by the respective impulse), in which an analogous succession of cycles takes place, and so on through the third kingdom. As *a*, *b*, *c* and *d* all correspond to the *fourth tanmatra*, every turn of fortune which overtakes the monadic procession, represents some change in the equivalents of that *tanmatra* owing to the permutation which is constantly going on among the five combined subtle elements, whereby those equivalents are at one time equal to *a*, at another to *b*, etc. The result is an increasing involution of the monadic essence or fire-principle, the soul of things.

The vital "impulses" would seem to be nothing else but differentiations of the astral element made up of the five *tanmatras*, the impulse being tantamount to a certain fundamental change in their combinations. According to my conception the *critical* change (for change in itself is perpetual) answers to the moment when the *base*, which characterizes any given group of combinations, is altered. Now, as regards the planetary chain, the base of the primordial element must be the *fourth tanmatra*; hence it follows that the *first* life impulse is coincident with the passage of the basal power from the fourth to the *third tanmatra*. The subjoined table shows the sequence:

Descending arc.

First impulse	base,	3rd <i>tanmatra</i> .
Second "	"	2nd "
Third "	"	1st "

Ascending arc.

Fourth impulse	"	2nd "
Fifth "	"	3rd "
Sixth "	"	4th "
Seventh "	"	5th "

Needless to add that every change of base intimates a new modality of *life-potency* with regard to *type*, the *vehicle* (1st *tan.*) and the *Monad*.

Now, taking this in conjunction with what preceded, it will at once be seen that the *manifestation* of *d* coincides with the fourth impulse; and that *d*, being the *Monad*, the "impulse," here represents vital force expressing itself as *form* in its first mode, *i. e.*, the *mineral prototype* (force is *one*, its modalities *many*), and that the *rise* of the *Monad*, as well as of form and life, must commence from this plane, embracing numerous inner falls and ascents. Therefore, the manifestation of *c* coincides with the fifth impulse, and that of *b* with the sixth. Nor is there any difficulty in conceiving

that the monadic essence is (as I have seen stated, I forget where) *identical* in successive rounds; except, as I imagine, *d*, in its entirety, takes more than *one* round to reappear; nay part of it will require more than one *Manwantara*. As *a* is only a development of *b*, its manifestation belongs to one of the higher cycles of the same (6th) impulse. The *seventh* is beyond our present purpose, as pertaining to the human kingdom and connected with the union of the *etherial* and *material* factors. But the diagram herewith will convey a general idea of the scheme.*

Now (going back to the period prior to the "descent"), if *a* and *b* represent the soul-essence of the animal kingdom gradually freed by death during the former round or ring; and *c* corresponds to the astral residue of the vegetable kingdom, from whence proceeds *d*? From the earth itself by periodical desintegrations of its surface during the ascending arc. As I understand it, part of essence *d* goes no further than a certain depth below the surface, while another part does. The latter, starting from its own level of the fourth cosmic plane, proceeds through the under world (astral field of prototypes,) thence, as it were, on to the planet, dives into it, works its way down (cataclysms, etc.), remains buried in its bowels, probably for rounds upon rounds, then gradually rises after æons of incarceration as the rocks and metals of some round or other, and closes the tremendous circle of its migrations at the dissolution of those substances, by a return to the astral plane. The migratory circle of the other part of *d* is considerably lessened, and those of *c*, *b* and *a* are comparatively brief, as their heaviest point is never beyond the earth's surface. The return to the astral plane must ever be on some *lower* level than the starting-point, the monad combining some mode of the third principle.

The mineral *Monad* (taking a general view) thus immures itself at one time by virtue of the Law of Retardation, and at another regains its freedom by the Law of Dissolution (of matter), the former means *materialisation*, the latter *elimination of type* and liberation of the monad, which, of course, is never complete, as it depends on a vehicle (*a* mode of the form-principle) to escape dissolution.

Form begins with the universal, *in its astral stage*; forms utilized, which have done their work, higher up, are absorbed by the mineral *in its physical stage*, and finally annihilated by the same, after a *subsequent stage* (ethereal). The mineral (physical) far from being the initial kingdom from which sprout the others, as materialists will have it, is the annihilator, or rather concealer, of form, and, in the older sense, the Hades of Life. There is constant play between the principles composing the earth, a translation of force from one mode to another.

During the *Manwantara*, the direction, logically speaking, is from the centre toward the surface: the second, or life principle, withdraws (in a degree) from the *cohesive* mode, to energize the *formal* mode. At the approach of obscuration or *Pralaya*, translation is

* The diagram referred to being complicated and coloured, we regret that we are unable to reproduce it.—Ed.

reversed. When obscurity is at its highest all the planet's energies are concentrated as simple cohesion. This is *occultation* of vitality. As vital force recedes from the surface, matter there disintegrates: all mineral and metallic types manifested during the Ring are—after a period of “ethereal” manifestation, their ultimate degree of perfection (6th and 7th Race-cycles)—at last dissolved and the Monad set free.

If, as appears to be the lesson, our planet is mostly made up of a solid nucleus, covered by a plastic layer, the latter underlying the outer crust; then, it might be conjectured, that this surface crust is partly annihilated at every *ring*, and the whole of it by the end of the *round*, leaving nothing but the bare nucleus, from which, when revived, at the next round, a *part* of the new crust is upheaved, or otherwise produced therefrom, the equivalent of which is returned to the nucleus from the astral plane. The other part of the crust would be the result of sedimentary formations during the period. The nucleus recuperates its vitality by virtue of the evolution of water, which being under the auspices of the second *punchikrita* (with the intervention of the second kingdom) would probably coincide with the era of transition from the astral to the physical period. The process of absorption of mineral prototypes (alluded to above) would synchronize with a subsequent sub-era referable to the third kingdom's intervention. Such of these prototypes, or rather the substance containing their power, as might be taken into the nucleus, would only reappear in some far-distant round, or a future Manwantara, as the case might be, for there is a scale in everything. The new crust of every round (though differently made up, from above and from below) would represent *seven* orders of types, one order to be exhibited in each ring.* The underworld provides the earth, which now absorbs, now yields up; but its digestion is of prodigious length. From its soul comes its body, life and form.

Thus things proceed so long as *mater fecunda*, sleeping now and then to awaken with restored youth, waxes strong and flourishes without the cycles of her existence; but when the baneful curve of one of these coincides with that of the great Solar cycle, the waning period sets in; food and restoration come in slower and slower, whilst old age begins to tell apace. The decisive moment is when she receives the last morsel from her feeder, reluctantly tendered. Then, after her last delivery, follows the grand climacteric. Reduced in time to a formless crumbling mass, she assumes her freedom and wanders through space whilst the last sparks of vitality are dying out.

Long before this crisis (the end of the worlds, or solar Pralaya) the lower kingdoms have all “risen” or “passed through Man” who, as such, of course no longer exists. For, while *a* was continually, from round to round, developing into the lowest power of the

* As shown by spectral analysis, *iron* gives many lines, while some metals at a high temperature give none. Science has not yet explained this. Why may not *iron* manifest itself at one period with properties somewhat differing from those of another period, owing to subtle variations in its constitution through alterations in atomic weight, etc.? Why should not *iron*, as we know it, identify its *fourth* type of the present Round?

human soul; *b* had been ascending to *a*, *c* to *b*, and *d* to *c*. So that in due course the Monad, in all its grades, had achieved the *ne plus ultra* of its possibilities, *i. e.*, returned to the plane of its genesis, having been regularly *cast off* by the human soul in Kama Loka, where, after its Pisacha phase, it dissolved in the currents of its own element. Thus if form is eliminated by the mineral, the lower Monad is eliminated by man—the two poles of physical existence. It will be said, and rightly so, that *all* the monadic essence could not be manifested in man pending the solar Manwantara. The reply is that there must always be “remains” whatsoever cycle be contemplated; it is a necessity of *relative* infinitude, and of progress *in time*.

What about the *air* and *water* planes at dissolution? I did not follow up this off-shoot of the subject, as entailing too lengthy a digression; but I may here epitomize my inferences. The sixth and seventh Races mark the *physico-ethereal* period of evolution (man being then, according to present notions, *super-terrestrial*), and correspond with the two *physico-astral* races of the downward arc. Of the three planes (*terrestrial*, *liquid* and *atmospheric*), the first has been noticed, *viz.*, the gradually decomposing earth-crust manifests the two *new* sets of mineral and metallic types, the substrata or footing of “superterrestrial” man, but developing with never ceasing attenuation the most beautiful outlines, panoramas, etc.; for that kingdom has regained its plasmatic power. The *water*-plane, as it dissolves (which does not mean “evaporation,” but molecular resolution, a change of nature—water and air have their, no less than earth its, fathomless “depth in” a drop or atom)—yields the *new* flora (embracing two stages) of those races; and the *atmospheric* plane, the *new* fauna, under corresponding circumstances; for, part of *c* went to, or was reserved for, the *water*-plane, at its descent; and part of *b*, for the *air* plane.

The correlation between the second kingdom, vegetable-prototypes, and *water*-plane; and that of the first kingdom with animal-prototypes and the *air*-plane, before the evolution of six, will explain the basis on which the hypothesis rests. With *physico-ethereal* man there must be involution of sex. As *physico-astral* man depended on entities of the sub-human class (evolved from animal prototypes) for rebirth, so will *physico-ethereal* man find among the graceful, shapely orders issuing from the *air*-plane, one or more which will be developed for his successive embodiments when procreated forms are given up—a process which will only include all mankind very gradually. The Adamic and post-Adamic races were giants; their ethereal counterparts may possibly be liliputians—beauteous, luminous, diaphanous—but will assuredly be giants in mind.

VISCONDE DE FIGANIERE,

F. T. S.

SUGGESTION.*

A Narrative of Occult Science in the XVIIth Century.

I.

IT was during the winter of 1512. The army of Henry VIII of England was besieging the town of Ferouenne, and the French nation was terror-struck at sight of the power and resources of the English monarch.

In Paris itself the agitation was indescribable, the anger of the town and University had come to a climax, and King Louis XII hardly dared leave his palace or brave the fury of the mob. The King, the Queen and the Premier Georges d'Ambroise, Archbishop of Rouen, were holding counsel in the great hall of one of the towers of the ancient Louvre whose Gothic windows overlooked the Seine. The Queen, Anne de Bretagne, one of the most beautiful women that have ever graced the throne of France, was daughter of the last reigning Duke of Bretagne. Her first husband was Charles VIII of France, predecessor of Louis XII, who divorced his first wife, Jeanne de France, in order to marry her.

"Sire, we are lost," said the Archbishop after a long silence. Not only shall we lose Guienne, but the entire kingdom will be ruined also, for we can never stand against the powerful alliance that his Holiness Julian II has contracted with Spain, Germany, England and Venice.

"By St. Louis you speak the truth," said the King raising his arms and letting them fall again heavily on the table. "We are ruined, all the enemies of France prosper at the expense of our kingdom. Ferdinand of Aragon has become the most powerful prince of Europe owing to his marriage with Isabella of Castile and his conquest of Granada and the New World. The Emperor of Germany, traitor that he is, has broken his treaty and has joined forces with the Pope against us. On one side the Spaniards invade and trample down the country of our kingdom of Navarre, whilst on the other Henry of England makes war against our Fatherland without any provocation on our part, in the hope of usurping our own especial title of 'Most Christian King;' His Admiral Edward Howard infests our shores and has won the fatal battle of Brest, which we cannot but allow has been a total defeat for our navy. You are right, d'Ambroise; this time we are lost indeed! Never has France fallen so low, no, not even during the reign of Charles VII."

"Our fate would probably have been different if your Majesty had taken my advice, and if we had not attempted the conquest of Naples, and, by our imprudence, added this kingdom also to our immense possessions in Spain. But after all perhaps my sovereign has acted rightly in so doing."

"No. I was wrong d'Ambroise," sighed the unhappy King. "I ought never to have followed out the plan of my predecessor in

Italy. That campaign, although it gave the Duchy of Milan to France, was the beginning of all our misfortunes. And now the English march victoriously across France, and the proud Henry Tudor will enter Paris, never.....while there is life in me: I will fight him to the end."

"But what is the use of arms, Sire?" said the Queen, who had kept silent till that moment. "What can your troops do against the Sacred League formed by the Pope and the Emperor against your Majesty? Perhaps money and diplomacy might succeed better than fighting in such a crisis as this, for your army will not be of much use in a struggle with the whole of Europe, however brave your soldiers may be individually."

"Can my beautiful Anne still think that there is a chance of saving France?" cried King Louis, who had great faith in the talents of this remarkable woman twice wedded to the throne of St. Louis. "Can heaven send us a second Jeanne d'Arc, who will deliver the Fatherland as in the time of Charles VII?"

"Sire, my courage never fails me. Perhaps your Jeanne d'Arc is nearer you than you think."

"By St. Louis we will listen to your counsels," cried the King. "We will obey your Majesty in all her commands, for too well we know the intelligence and code of honour of the Queen of France to fear for an instant that she would ever endanger her royal kingdom."

"Quite the contrary, my Liege,—I will save it."

II.

The Queen rose and retired to her Oratory, which in those days took the place of the boudoir of our modern 'grandes dames;' then without hesitation she called one of her ladies in waiting and bade her send for Cornelius Agrippa.

This strange and extraordinary man had at this period made a great sensation all over Europe. Born of a noble family at Cologne in 1486, he taught philosophy and medicine for some years at Dôle in Franche-Comté. His lectures had been much in vogue and well attended, but after a time he gave up his classes, and for some years before the occurrence of the events narrated in this paper, he had consecrated his life to the study of Alchemy and the Occult Sciences. Louise de Savoie, Comtesse d'Angoulême, who was a dabbler in magic, a very fashionable amusement in those days, took the learned Professor under her protection and attached him to her service in the quality of physician.

When the grand Hierophant, for such was the proud title that he gave himself, was ushered into the Queen's presence, she greeted him in a familiar way, as one whom she was often accustomed to see; then, having motioned him to a seat near her own before the lofty Gothic fireplace, she immediately commenced the subject on which she wished to consult him.

Speaking rapidly and in a low voice she said; "You know the state of affairs and the dangers which surround France on all sides. I wish to know the future, can you help me?"

* Translated from *L'Aurore*—Theosophical Journal conducted by Lady Caithness, Duchess de Pomar, Honorary President of the Paris Theosophical Society.

Cornelius Agrippa did not answer for a short time and appeared lost in thought; when he roused himself he said,—“Yes, I can help your Majesty if she has faith in my power.”

The Queen replied: “I have no doubt whatever that you possess great Kabbalistic and magic powers, although, at the same time, I must confess that I cannot understand them. Some say that you are only a charlatan. I cannot tell, but at all events I wish to test your powers. I am superstitious perhaps.”

The Hierophant drew himself up haughtily at these words:—“Alchemy is no superstition, it is a science. The *Ars Magna* of the ancient races, is the most noble of all sciences, by it can one throw light into the most hidden depths of arcane synthesis and unlock the gates leading to the most carefully veiled mysteries.” Suddenly he took a large ball of rock crystal from under the folds of his long black velvet robe, and carefully rubbed it with a handkerchief; this operation ended, he drew a small phial from his pocket, poured a few drops of its colourless contents on the crystal ball, and then handed it across the table to the Queen. “If you deign to look in this ball madame, you will see the future. Behold!” Whilst the Queen was intently occupied in looking into the ball which she held in both hands in the red light of the wood fire, Agrippa approached, and standing close behind her made some mysterious passes above her head.

She trembled suddenly! “What do I see? Frances! Frances, the son of Louise de Savoie, your protectress, will be indeed the King of France after my husband?” “That can never be,” she added with a smile, “the king has children. However that was not what I wished to see, I do not care for the distant future, cannot you show me what will happen during the next few months?”

The magician made some more passes above Anne de Bretagne’s head. “Behold!” said he. The Queen again fixing her eyes intently on the crystal ball saw, or thought she saw, a lion caught and held in a trap of complicated cords which were knotted round him.

“Yes,” she exclaimed, “that is truly the situation of France, and this lion caught in a trap is very symbolical of our King; but who will deliver him,—who will be strong enough to free him from his bonds?”

“See!” replied the magician, and whilst he spoke the Queen saw a little mouse nibbling the cord that was holding the lion; then suddenly the cords appeared to relax, and the lion with a bound recovered his liberty.

“We know that a mouse can do many things that are impossible for stronger and larger animals,” said the Queen. “But who is the mouse that will deliver the lion of France?” As she spoke she suddenly recognised in the mouse before her the handsome features of the King of Scotland,—they were familiar to her, thanks to the many portraits that the vain young King had sent her during the past few months.

“The King of Scotland! Impossible! Yet, why not? Perhaps there is a lesson to be learnt in this fable of the mouse who is able to serve the king of beasts; but the question is how to gain influence

over the King of Scotland, what forces can I bring to bear on him? The brother-in-law of the King of England would surely never be so rash as to quarrel with such a powerful country simply for the sake of pleasing us! Alas! if it could only be done! If a Scotch army were to invade England in the north during the great crisis, Henry Tudor would be obliged to recall some of his troops from France, and then our Fatherland might be saved.”

Anne de Bretagne returned the crystal ball to the magician, and seemed for some instants to be lost in thought. She looked up suddenly and said, “Can you suggest any plan by means of which I can influence the King of Scotland?”

“Yes;” replied the grand Hierophant. “My study of occult science has taught me the art of influencing the minds of men, and has given me the power to guide their actions. By means of a strong effort of will I can project a fluid which acts on the astral currents, and thus make myself master of a man’s mind and suggest to him whatever ideas I wish.”

“Do you speak in earnest?”

“Yes. I can do this in the same manner as all those who know the secrets of nature and have studied occult science. It is no supernatural power. By the simple force of my will-power, guided by my Kabbalistic science, I can make any one, it matters not whom, see a person or an object that is not before their eyes. By creating a picture in the brain I bring into existence a hallucination of the sight, and I can then suggest actions which the person will be obliged to perform, even against his will and in defiance of his efforts to the contrary. These hallucinations and mental suggestions of acts to be performed can be inculcated a long time beforehand, for that which the psychic organs forget can be refound by the automatic action of the brain even a long time afterwards.”

“Do you wish to go to Scotland and work these miracles?” The grand Hierophant smiled.

“That would awaken the suspicions of the King; besides I cannot quit my protectrix the Comtesse d’Angoulême. However your Majesty can send another person to Scotland who can do the deed quite as successfully as myself.” “Who?”

“What would you say if it were one of your ladies in waiting?”

“One of my ladies! What do they know of your magic arts?”

“One of them has consecrated several years of her life to the study of occult science and to the grand mysteries of the magic of Hermes Trismegistus. She is far advanced and is sufficiently initiated in the art to be able to do all that is necessary at the Court of Edinborough, for she possesses the key of the hidden synthetic mysteries.”

“And who, may I ask, is this marvellous woman? One of my ladies in waiting did you say?”

“Yes. The Comtesse de la Tour.”

“Berthe! Berthe de la Tour-Marie! Never could I have believed such a thing,—she a magician, it is impossible!”

“Nevertheless she is one. She has been a pupil of the Abbé Tritheim, author of ‘*Steganographia*,’ and she has also studied with

me and my illustrious brother worker Paracelsus. I believe she is a descendant, on her mother's side, of the famous Nicolas Flamel, who was the most celebrated among the modern alchemists, and doubtless for this reason her spirit is attracted towards occult study."

As soon as Anne de Bretagne had asked a few more questions of Cornelius Agrippa, she sent one of her pages in search of the Comtesse de la Tour-Marie, a young widow, who was one of the most beautiful women at her Court. The Queen had a long consultation with the arch-sorcerer and his beautiful pupil, and when at last it was over and they had quitted the royal apartments, Anne de Bretagne cried with a sigh of satisfaction, "Yes, France will be saved—and by me!"

III.

James IV was one of the best kings that Scotland had ever had. He was much beloved by his people, and quite deserved his popularity. Owing to his marriage with Margaret, sister of Henry VIII, he had been enabled to make a lasting peace with England, and he could therefore give up all his time to looking after the interests of his kingdom, which the long and frequent wars of his predecessors had left in a deplorable state.

He had more power than any of the monarchs who reigned before him owing to the great care he took in fulfilling all his royal duties.

His Court was one of the gayest and most brilliant of its time, and he used in the most generous and royal manner the large personal fortune that had been left him by his father. Added to this, he was a gallant cavalier, a great lover of fêtes of arms and very proud of the victories he won at the tournament. He often issued proclamations through all Scotland, inviting all those lords and cavaliers, who desired to win fame and honours, to come to his Court and take part in tilting with the lance, combats with the axe or two-handed sword,—in fact, in contests of strength of every sort in which he himself excelled.

The fame of his victories had spread even beyond the seas, and he flattered himself that he had won the respect and admiration of all the other monarchs of Europe.

When the French Ambassador arrived with his suite in Scotland, the King, who at the time was residing at the Royal Castle in Edinburgh, received him with all the ceremony and honours that were due to the illustrious King that he represented. On the termination of the official presentation, a messenger came to inform the King that the niece of the Ambassador had a mission to confide to him which was of the greatest importance. The gallant prince made an immediate reply, and hastened in person to a private apartment where the French lady awaited him. On entering the room he stopped suddenly, so greatly was he struck by the beauty and grace of the woman who stood before him. Anne de Bretagne had known well how to choose her messenger, Berthe de la Tour-Marie was undeniably one of the most lovely members of that Court of France, so celebrated at all times for the

beauty, the grace and the charm of its women. She was tall and a blonde, and her natural charms were heightened, if such a thing could be possible, by the exquisite taste of her costume. The gracefulness of her manner was such as could only be attained by the height of Parisian culture. Therefore there was nothing astonishing in the fact that the young King should be struck dumb with admiration at the first sight of this young widow who was as beautiful as she was attractive.

"Sire, my mistress, Queen Anne de Bretagne, has given me a message for your Majesty," she murmured.

"So the echo of my victories has come even to the ears of the most beautiful princess of all Christian countries?" replied the King, whose vanity was greatly flattered.

"Yes, Sire, and she has listened with the greatest interest to the recital of the courage, gallantry, rare qualities, and personal charm of your Majesty, and to this end has she sent me to your Court, that I may judge of everything for her, in order that she may know through me what to think of the gallant knight who so much occupies her thoughts."

"In truth," cried the King, "she does me more honour than I merit. But, I pray you, sweet lady, do not keep me in suspense, but tell me what answer you will give the Queen? You have seen and doubtless judged me already. Tell me frankly your opinion of me."

"I hardly dare answer you, Sire, lest you should think that my words are prompted by flattery or ambition," answered the cunning diplomat, secretly amused at the King's vanity; she added, "I have seen you, Sire, and I have only the one answer to give my mistress."

"What is that?"

"It is, that all the flattering reports that circulate in Paris concerning the King of Scotland are very much beneath the truth."

"By St. Andrew, you flatter me," replied the King, who was more pleased than he cared to show; "to win the favour of Anne de Bretagne is more than I deserve, for I do not consider any man brave enough to be worthy of her. Is it true that the Queen is so wonderfully beautiful? You know her well, and therefore you can tell me more about her than my ambassadors, who are not always the best judges of feminine charms."

"I have brought a portrait that the Queen herself gave me..... telling me at the same time that I was only to give it to your Majesty, if I found that the report we had heard was really true. I hardly like to offer it to you, Sire, it does so little justice to the Queen! It would not be possible for a painter to give any idea of her beauty."

Whilst saying this she put a miniature into his hands. It was a pleasing and rather flattering picture of Anne de Bretagne, and it is hardly necessary to state that the King was enchanted with it.

"She ought to be very lovely," cried he, "Oh! if I could only see her in reality!"

"You can, Sire, if you desire it," replied Agrippa's pupil with a mysterious smile.

"I can see her? What do you mean? Certainly by going to Paris I could do so; but that, alas! is quite out of the question. I must not leave my kingdom!"

"It is not at all necessary to leave Scotland in order to see my lovely Queen. If you will give me the guidance of your thoughts and fix all your attention on me for a few minutes without any fear of my intentions towards you, I can, by the aid of a secret power that I possess, transport you in the spirit to Paris, and allow you to contemplate the beautiful Anne de Bretagne."

"In a dream that will be forgotten as soon as I wake!"

"No, you will remember every thing, if you desire it; but have you no doubts? Are you ready to put yourself under my control for a few minutes?"

"I fear nothing, beautiful enchantress," replied the King of Scotland. "Give me a vision of the Queen of France, and you will make me the happiest of mortals. How could I mistrust any magic you might use to attain such a result?"

The pupil of Agrippa and Paracelsus begged the King to seat himself in a large armchair, and when she had arranged a velvet cushion under his head, she placed herself on a low seat in front of him and began some mysterious passes with her hands. After a while she took his hands in hers and gazed into his eyes with much intensity.

"Do you sleep?" she asked in quite a different tone of voice to the one she had hitherto used.

"No," murmured the King, but his eyes closed in spite of his efforts to keep them open, and very soon he fell into a state of trance, which the doctors of the present day have named suggestive catalepsy.

With a commanding voice she said, "Go to Paris. Enter the Louvre."

"I am there."

"Behold the Queen of France."

The King uttered a cry and opened his eyes wide as if he was in an ecstasy. To his great astonishment he saw, or thought he saw, which, after all, comes to the same thing, the beautiful Anne de Bretagne, the lady of his thoughts.

However strange this at first sight may appear, and however much the superstitious minds of the 16th century may have attributed it to the agency of the devil and sorcery, the conscientious student of hypnotism and magnetism will have no difficulty in understanding the reality of this phenomenon, for thanks to the discoveries of modern science and to the results of experiments by Braid, Charcot, Bernheim and Ochorowicz, we know now that "hypnotism affects the brain to such an extent that an idea suggested to that brain will act with overpowering force, and will, by means of the automatic cerebral action, produce a corresponding motion; and therefore the whole organism of a person subjected to such an experiment will become a mere machine that can be entirely directed by the will of the operator."

In this state all illusions, all hallucinations become realities, and all acts are performed as ordered. The subject on awaking does

not remember what has happened, but the ideas that were suggested to him during the 'trance,' remain engraved in his memory with all the appearance of reality; he forgets their origin, but believes in their spontaneity, and he will perform all the acts that have been suggested to him without quite knowing why he does so.

The King of Scotland remained in this state for some time under the influence of the powerful magnetism of the clever Parisian, who was enabled by the help of her secret science to suggest to his mind all she desired. It was not a cataleptic sleep, but rather a peculiar psychic state mentioned by Dr. Bernheim in his work entitled "De la Suggestion." Such a state lessens the strength of the cerebral resistance and renders the brain amenable to suggestions,—a phenomenon which was attributed to the powers of darkness in the 16th century. Van Helmont writes in his "Opera Omnia," p. 731:—

"I deferred till now the unveiling of a great mystery. It is the fact that man has an inner force, by means of which, and when aided by his power of will and imagination, he can act on a substance that is foreign to or apart from his own body, and he can also obtain a lasting influence over some other person who may even be at a great distance from him. This mystery alone throws a great deal of light on several facts that were difficult to understand, especially on those relating to the magnetic power of all substances, to the will power of man, and to all that has been written and said concerning magic and its domination of the Universe."

This truth, stated as we see, even as far back as the 17th century, is included in the scientific formula of Dr. Ochorowicz in his remarkable work on "Mental Suggestion," page 527. He says:—

"It is enough to suppose that the electric currents of the atmosphere modified by a psycho-physical transmission, as the ray of light in the photophone is modified by a word, transmit this modification to the electric currents of the brain, which, under these conditions, are liable to be influenced by the slightest pressure."

It is possible, as Dr. Ochorowicz himself points out, that such occurrences may not take place, but that they do sometimes happen, nobody at the present time can doubt, and up to the present speculative science has given us no further explanation of the subject. To return to our story:—

When the beautiful adept thought that her experiment had lasted long enough, she made some magnetic passes before the eyes of her patient, and then, rising from the seat on which she had been sitting all the time, she said, "It is enough for today. Rouse yourself, Sir."

After this first attempt, Madame de la Tour often threw the King into a magnetic sleep, almost always at his own wish, and little by little she gained great power over him. Naturally during these hypnotic trances she had no difficulty in suggesting to him the idea of making war on England in the interest of his lady-love, the Queen of France. As soon as she saw that this idea had taken

firm root in his brain and was constantly occupying his thoughts, she gave him a second portrait of Anne de Bretagne in a golden frame, on which the following words were written in precious stones; the original medallion is preserved in the Royal Treasury at Edinborough:

"He who loves me must prove his love. I adjure my favourite knight to march three leagues on English territory for love of me."

"By St. Andrew I will do it!" swore the King, when he read these words. "I understand the meaning of my beautiful princess! Henry Tudor insults her, and her lands are trampled on by English feet, all the crowned heads of Europe are leagued against her, whilst I, her adorer, her chosen knight, I stay at home without stirring hand or foot to save her!"

Madame de la Tour was delighted to see that her mission was so successful. "Sire!" she cried, "you are truly a brave and noble knight, and you well deserve the love that my mistress has for you. But have you no fear of the consequences? Think of the powerful armies of Spain and Germany. Think of your wife, the Queen, who is Henry's sister. What will the world say, what will your people think, if you put an end to your alliance with England?"

"The world can say what it chooses. I am the favourite knight of Anne de Bretagne, and I will not allow fear to have any influence over me. No earthly power shall prevent me from meriting the love that the most beautiful Princess of Europe has deigned to bestow on me. Could I possibly refuse the only request she has ever made me? No, the honour of James Stuart binds him to listen to her prayer."

"The chivalrous King kissed the beautiful Parisian's hand. And what can I do for you, fair lady? How can I ever thank you for the delightful hours you have given me by bringing within my sight the object of my true love?"

"I only did that which the desire of serving my mistress dictated to me, Sire," replied Madame de la Tour with an enigmatical smile.

"I will take care of your future. We cannot permit such a charming lady to leave our country. You are a widow. I will marry you to one of the nobles of my Court, and you shall be the faithful messenger between me and your royal mistress. You shall be first among Scottish ladies, for are you not the friend of *Anne de Bretagne*?"

IV

At this time grand fêtes and tournaments were given at Edinborough and Sterling in special honour of the Comtesse de la Tour-Marie. The King in person entered the Lists with the young and gallant Earl of Caithness, one of the gentlemen of his Court.

They charged each other at full gallop, and when they met in the middle of the arena, the "King's lance" struck his opponent such a violent blow on the chest that the Earl fell heavily to the ground,

happily without being dangerously hurt. The King wished to go on with the contest, but Madame de la Tour threw her handkerchief into the arena as a sign that the combat should cease. When James IV rode up to the balcony where the lovely French woman in company with the other ladies of the Court was presiding over the tournament, she said to him:

"My Liege, I have often heard of your bravery and courage, but I could never believe that so much strength could be united to so much grace."

The King was so enchanted with the compliment that he offered her the hand of his vanquished adversary, the Earl of Caithness, which she accepted.

The marriage ceremony took place in the Royal Chapel of the Palace of Holyrood in presence of the King and Queen.

History, that relates the fact, forgets to tell us if the young Earl was enamoured of the beautiful Parisian, but doubtless he was very proud to carry off such a grand prize of beauty and intelligence in the face of so many other noble and rich rivals.

During this time the King had not been idle. As soon as he had concluded a secret alliance with Louis XII, he sent an envoy to the camp of Henry King of England, before Terouenne, summoning him in haughty terms to abstain in future from all aggressions against his ally the King of France, and reproaching him at the same time for having kept back the legacy that Henry VII had left to his daughter, the Queen of Scotland. The proud Henry VIII considered with justice this letter to be a declaration of war, and replied to it in his haughtiest manner, declaring, moreover, that the King of Scotland was a perjurer, since he wished to break the treaty with his brother's kingdom, a treaty that he had solemnly sworn to observe at the time of his marriage.

He deridingly disdained the order to evacuate France, saying that the King of Scotland was a sovereign of too little importance to be able to decide in a quarrel between England and France.

The behaviour of James IV at this time has been a difficult problem for historians, and they have been obliged to attribute it to a sort of passing madness. There was no possible reason why the King of Scotland should declare war against his brother-in-law, who had always shown him great kindness, and with whom he had always been on the best of terms up to that time. Therefore we are driven to seek the reason in the mysterious influence that the beautiful French woman exercised over his impressionable mind, and to the hallucinations that she succeeded in producing in his imagination by means of her secret science.

For the King really believed himself beloved by the Queen of France whom he had never seen, and he was convinced that she had ordered him to march against England in order to prove his love for her. The writers of the 16th century who were not free from the superstitions of the time, attributed this strange obsession to spells and charms, and considered the mysterious woman to be a magician. But it is probable that her pretended occult science, like that of her illustrious master Cornelius Agrippa, of Paracelsus, of Nostradamus and of the famous Ruggieri who afterwards acquired

such a great influence over Catherine de Médicis, was simply the very natural power that she probably possessed in a great degree of producing the phenomena to which modern science has given the names of Hypnotism and Suggestion. And doubtless we shall discover with time that there was in reality a scientific basis to all these soi-disant miracles and supernatural phenomena worked by the necromancers and occultists of the Middle Ages and by the magicians and alchemists of the 16th century; and perhaps our scientists will soon be able to give a natural and plausible explanation of the strange phenomena produced in their times by the adepts and Indian Fakirs, and by the spiritualistic mediums.

Madame de la Tour-Marie had hypnotised James IV several times, and whilst he was under her influence had suggested to him the idea of declaring war against England. She acted blindly, for very probably she did not even know the true nature of her power, but contented herself by fulfilling the orders of her master Cornelius Agrippa. Nevertheless the idea that she had endeavoured to suggest to the King had taken root in his brain, and had gradually supplanted every thing else without his being even aware of the fact.

Yet James IV had no hysterical nature: he was an intelligent man and had very good health.

Dr. Charcot, however, proves that it is not alone the diseased and nervopathic temperaments that are susceptible to the power of suggestion.

Dr. Bernheim of the College of Surgeons at Nancy writes in his work entitled "De la Suggestion et de ses Applications à la Therapeutique."

"When a subject has often been hypnotised, especially by the same person, that person acquires such an influence over him that he will perform the most eccentric, serious or even dangerous actions without the least apparent attempt at resistance."

And we read in another part of his book:

"A peculiar aptitude for transforming into action the idea that has been impressed upon the brain exists amongst hypnotised subjects. In the normal state each idea is formulated and discussed by the brain which only accepts it if it is to the advantage of the inventor; the impression is elaborated, controlled and analysed by a complex cerebral action, which ends in its being either accepted or neutralised; with a hypnotised subject on the contrary the transition from the idea to the action is so quickly made that the intellect has no time to obtain any control, nor can it even produce a negative effect when the actions suggested are not to be performed for a long period of time."

Doubtless it is to a suggestion of this kind that we must attribute the strange conduct of the unfortunate King of Scotland, who, contrary to the advice of all his counsellors, decided to invade England without any apparent reason, except the desire, which he proudly owned, of pleasing the Queen of France whom he had never seen. The Scottish Parliament declined for some time to vote as the King desired, but he was so popular that at last he obtained its consent to this fatal and unjust war. In consequence

of this decision many of the nobles revolted, and amongst them curious to say, William Sinclair, Earl of Caithness, the husband of *Berthe de la Tour*.

V.

Scandal mongers are always busy in an idle Court, and plenty of people insinuated that *Berthe de la Tour* was the King's mistress, and that the secret of her great influence over him was nothing more or less than sensual love.

But there was nothing in their mutual relations that warranted such an opinion, in fact quite the contrary, for when James was in a normal condition he did not appear to take more than ordinary notice of the clever Parisian who had no influence over him except during his magic sleep. When he was not in this state he did not seek her society, although he always treated her with great affability and kindness, for he was the most gallant and accomplished of knights. It is possible that in reality he rather feared her secret power over him. Lord Caithness had first married the daughter of Keith of Ackergill. He was a very accomplished and handsome man, a few years younger than his second wife who was passionately attached to him. This strange and mysterious creature, in spite of all her occult science, was before all things a woman, and the great love that she felt for her husband induced her to confide to him the secret of her mission to the Court of Scotland and the charms she had employed to make it successful. The noble Earl at once understood the whole matter and also the object of the Queen of France, who, by feigning a passion for James, wished to force him to declare war against England, so that he might distract the attention of the latter country from France. His fury was great, he poured imprecations on his wife's head, refused to live any longer with her, and told the whole plot to the Earl of Angus, the head of the powerful clan of Douglas. Lord Angus publicly accused the French Ambassador, but neither he nor Lord Caithness dared reveal to the King the treacherous policy of his beautiful Anne de Bretagne. After a short time Lord Caithness reconciled himself with his wife whom he loved tenderly, but on condition that she should confess all to the King, and thus try to repair the harm she had done in the innocence of her heart. *Berthe*, who then for the first time understood the terrible gravity of the plot in which she had been used as an instrument, was horror-struck, for she had a noble heart, and could not bear the idea that she had taken part in the ruin of such a chivalrous King, who had received her with so much kindness in a country which was now her own. She told all to the King, notwithstanding her dislike to confess that she had used charms and spells; but, alas! his impressionable spirit had been affected to such an extent that even this complete avowal of the truth did not convince him, and *Berthe*, being ignorant of the true nature of the science she had employed, did not attempt to supplant the former by a new suggestion, which would be the plan of a modern hypnotiser in such a case.

James IV knew that he had been basely mystified, but he did not realize the extent of the plot. All his anger fell to the share

of Berthe and her innocent husband. He exiled Lord and Lady Caithness from his Court, confiscated their lands and titles, and only spared the life of the Countess on the consideration that she had formerly been the friend of Anne de Bretagne.

VI.

However, neither the confession of Berthe, the advice of his Parliament, nor the entreaties of his wife, Margaret of England, had any power to prevent the ardent romantic and generous King from embarking on this ill-fated expedition. He was so strongly bent on following up the idea suggested to him, that he assembled in all haste 50,000 men, and on the 22nd August 1513 he crossed the frontier and invaded England.

Lady Caithness, who had followed her husband in his exile to their country at the extreme north of Scotland, seeing that there was no way of turning the King from his foolish design, persuaded the Earl to assemble the whole of his clan and march with them into England, so that they might rescue the King from the dangerous position in which he had put himself.

"Only one thing remains to be done," she said, "we must win the campaign, and save both France and Scotland."

The young Earl consented, owing to his love for his wife, although he feared the case was a hopeless one. He rallied his clan round his standard, and the troop started from the Castle of Barrogill, in the county of Caithness, where his wife promised to remain till his return.

The separation was heart-rending, for each felt that they might never meet again, and the story of these sad adieux has often since been sung in poems and ballads. During this time the Earl of Surrey at the head of the English army had advanced as far as Wooler, so that the opposing armies were only four or five miles apart. The single and disastrous battle of this fatal campaign was fought on the 9th of September.

The Scotch army was encamped on a hill called Flodden, which rises in such a manner as to shut in the wide plain of Millfield.

Before commencing the battle, the Scotch set fire to their tents and all their camp baggage, so that it should not fall into the hands of the enemy. At the same moment and to their great surprise they saw a troop of soldiers in green uniform advancing towards them through the smoke which covered the hill. At the first moment they thought it was a detachment of English hidden in the clouds of smoke, but before long they could clearly distinguish the green tartan of the Sinclairs and the Caithness banner with its crowing cock or Chanticleer and the well-known motto: "Commit thy work to God." The King was so rejoiced at this unexpected reinforcement which he owed to the loyalty of the young Earl, that he immediately signed on a drum parchment, since nothing better could be found, a full pardon for Lord and Lady Caithness, and a restoration of all their lands and titles. A courier was also immediately dispatched with a like document to Lady Caithness at her Castle of Barrogill, so that her position

should rest assured in case her noble husband should meet with a disaster. This messenger was the only man of the whole troop who ever returned to his country. The document is still to be found in the archives of the family at Barrogill Castle. The Scotch were entirely annihilated at this fatal battle of Flodden, and James IV himself was killed during the fight; he is said to have uttered the name of Anne de Bretagne with his dying breath. The unfortunate Earl of Caithness was one of the first to fall, and poor Berthe paid dearly for her imprudent conduct. She lived in solitude for the rest of her days. The Earl when going south had crossed the frontier of Scotland on a Monday, and since that time an instinctive superstition has prevented his descendants from ever crossing the boundary on that day of the week; the green tartan of the Sinclairs has also been changed to blood-red.

The battle of Flodden field is the greatest disaster that has ever afflicted Scotland. The English lost 5,000 men, the Scotch at least twice as many, nearly all of whom were personages of high rank. They left on the field of battle their King, two Bishops, two mitred Abbots, twelve Earls, thirteen Lords and five Barons. There was hardly a family throughout Scotland that did not go into mourning after this terrible battle.

Such were the consequences of this insane love! Scotland lost its liberty for ever, but France was saved!

DUC DE POMAR.

MAGNETIZERS AND THE MAGNETIZED.

THE priest is the magnetizer and the congregation the magnetized. Magnetic relation is nominally established by kissing the hand or touching the thumb of the priest, and somewhat better by the priest charging the head and face of the layman with his gaze and his hand and his breath. Magnetizers should be physically healthy, morally great, and spiritually devout. Although the priest or magnetizer may receive pay or fees, he should not be moved by this motive, but by the desire of doing good. Obligated to renounce ordinary means of subsistence as distracting his attention and impairing his power, it is necessary that he and his family should have the means of sustaining life. Hence the gift of a few annas to the Brahmans on all important occasions bearing on the health of the Hindus. The giver receives the magnetic influence of all to whom he thus pays respect. "To bless" means to direct the magnetic influence, "to pray" means to seek or to collect it, and there can be neither effective blessing nor effective prayer in ordinary temples and churches, where the air is saturated with impurities of matter, sound and thought, nor in crowds indulging in all sorts of worldly desires and glitter. The public places serve only for public teaching. And I would deprecate houses springing up close to sacred places.

Simple diet, cleanly dress, and unstinting good-will are essential for blessing and prayer. The best hours are before 6 A. M. and after 6 P. M., for then the contamination of the bustling and vain

world is least felt. Flowers and incense are used for disinfecting the air, and idols or pictures are useful to fix the gaze. Magnetism cures diseases and forms moral character. Magnetic somnambulism sets free the interior sense, and ecstasy or exalted somnambulism reveals mysteries of God's government. No one unfit to enter the ecstatic state is worth respecting as a bishop or acharya, no one unfit for somnambulism as a priest or vathya, and no one who cannot magnetize is worth consecrating or ordaining. The Brahmans have been spoiled by luxurious diet, etc., and the Hindus at large, finding the Brahman power to be but nominal, are tempted to ignore and defy it. But the magnetic aura is latent in every man, and "Brahma-tejas" is only a form of the same depending upon the Brahman's hereditary vegetable diet and religious habits and culture. It is never too late to develop what is latent by prayer and blessing, and all the armies and police in the world will not avail against the lightning of heaven invoked by prayer and blessing. I know better than most Roman Catholics that the Roman Catholic Church has best preserved the principles and developed the power of magnetism. And it is the Roman Catholic form of Christianity alone that can coalesce with the Hindu church. All other missions are merely retarding the progress of Christianity in India.

The magnetic aura or tejas, is the vital fluid sustaining all life, whether plant, animal or human. It is in each individual as the oil is in the seed or the smell in the flower. The weakness, absence, or adulteration of the fluid is the cause of all disorders and pains. The word *influence* means the flowing of the 'aura' into another Life and its aura are three-fold, namely, physical, moral and spiritual; and a person accordingly exercises a corresponding influence upon another. One man's aura may receive as well as repel another's aura; hence friendships and antipathies. The loving and self-sacrificing develops, receive, and impart healthy magnetism and repel the unhealthy, and the selfish misanthrope *vice versa*. Character and conduct bring inevitably their own reward and punishment, however much one may strut and flatter and deceive himself and the world. The true Christian or the true Hindu sees the cause and effect within himself, and the false outside himself.

The unhappy rogue finds no peace in solitude, but is always busy with gossips and tell-tales. You can distinguish a good man from a bad one by the company he keeps. The good man loves retirement and meditation, and feels ill at ease amidst the luxuries and ostentations of earthly life.

Communication of aura is effected by manipulations of the head by the breath and by the gaze, and it is these processes which the novice is taught in the rites and ceremonies of external worship. But the saint or retired magnetizer can operate from a distance and by force of "the word" and "the thought."

The saints who have given up their physical bodies are all the more powerful in *thought*. Mary, Peter and Paul are vastly more powerful in heaven than they were while living on this earth, and so are Rama, Krishna and Ganesa. Protestants do not know what they are condemning as idolatry and apotheosis. Whether the

worshipper and the image are in real "communication" with the saint in any particular case is another question. Communication with the living is called magnetism—with the dead "invocation." Husband and wife, father and son, Guru and Sishya are, or ought to be, the best illustration of communication in the three-fold nature or life. Hence the Catholic and the Hindu Church recognise no divorce, the latter no widow-marriage. "Those whom God (through magnetism and invocation) has joined together, let no man or law put asunder."

The Vedas and Sastras and Puranas are the teachings of persons in a state of high somnambulism and self-mesmerisation. As only Brahmans of mental strength and moral worth can rightly and efficiently use them, the Vedas are declared to be above the Sudras, and in the case of persons unauthorised reading or misusing them, the Vedas are said to be stolen and the practitioners are called Asuras and Rakshasas.

A. SANKARIAH, F. T. S.,

President, Hindu Sabha.

SACRIFICE.

A Dialogue.

MUNDANUS.—How is it, Oh Mystic, that slaughtering animals, or, if you prefer it, destroying their *upadhis*, is fraught with such direful consequences, unless indeed it be done for the furtherance of Nature's work in evolution, and yet Rishis and other holy men in times long past, which are generally supposed to have been more spiritual than this materialistic Yuga, sacrificed animals in the performance of their religious rites?

Mystic.—Manu says: "Sacrifice is for the existence of all; therefore slaughter in sacrifice is no slaughter."

Mundanus.—Manu gave laws in the infancy of the world to a simple people who did not ask the why and the wherefore. But we live in the so-called Age of Reason. So, may I ask, can you defend this dictum of Manu from the standpoint you took on the general question of "Killing."

Mystic.—Certainly I can. But the subject is closely connected with mysteries that are not embraced by your philosophy, so my explanation must necessarily be incomplete in some of the details. Know then that by sacrifice the world was created: by sacrifice man was created: by sacrifice the world and all it contains are preserved; and by sacrifice man attains immortality. Evolution may thus be said to be wholly dependent on sacrifice. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*—out of nothing comes nothing—is a proposition which nobody denies now-a-days. The rider may be added, *To gain something, something must be sacrificed*. The truth of this you will see presently. The first and greatest sacrifice of all was that of Purusha who sacrificed parts of himself to form the great elements. This, the Macrocosmic Sacrifice, was the leading idea of the ancient Brahmanical faith, and was celebrated by the great Kshatrya princes in the horse sacrifice,

by the Brahmans in that of the goat. In these sacrifices certain parts of the animals were offered with mantrams to the great Devatas that rule over fire, water, and the other elements, and are the agents of the Deity for the elaboration of his Kosmic work.

Mundanus.—I do not see the principle which justifies the slaughter, and I am sure the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals would fail to see it. I might as well say, that because my grandfather gave me a carved silver hound when I was a little boy, I ought to celebrate the gift from time to time by killing one of my canine pets. It seems to me that a good sermon, or the recital of a stirring epic, would have called to the minds of the people the gift of Purusha quite as effectively without bloodshed.

Mysticus.—That is just what I should have expected you to think. For here the question crosses over into the realm of occult dynamics. The horse sacrifice was a magical ceremony of a high order, celebrated for the purpose of invoking the gods to send down a spiritual influx upon mankind.

Mundanus.—Is it then a ready-money transaction with God—you give him a horse and he gives you a spiritual influx? I should not think he would be particularly well pleased with the bargain. For the horse is his before you give it to him, and in its slaughter the evolution of one of his creatures is interfered with.

Mysticus.—It is said in the Vishnu Purana: "Nourished by sacrifices the gods nourish mankind by sending down rain"—a symbol of the influx I spoke of.

Mundanus.—Do you mean that the gods make an Homeric feast and devour any part of the horse—body, soul, or spirit, if it has one?

Mysticus.—No. The nourishment comes from the soul of man, the *Karana Sarira*, which belongs to the same plane of matter as these gods.

Mundanus.—Then God is dependent upon man's support?

Mysticus.—God—the *Logos*—is not; but the great Powers which he has established for the carrying out of his work are. They are stimulated and nourished by the incense which arises from men's souls. Just as an Evil Power, a Black Angel, may be developed and strengthened by constant communion with the men who work for evil on the spiritual plane, the Brothers of the Shadow as they have been expressively termed, so also is the converse true—that the Powers of Good obtain nourishment and strength from the sacrifices of holy men. In the Bhagavad Gita we read: "With sacrifice having created mankind long ago, Prajapati said: 'By this is increase caused: let it be your Cow of Plenty to supply your needs. Nourish the gods by this, that the gods may nourish you. Thus nourishing each other, ye shall obtain the highest good. For the gods, nourished by sacrifice, shall give you the needful sustenance (*gnanam* and the like). He who eats the things given by them without offering to them in return, that man is even a thief.'"

Mundanus.—It appears then, that if we would receive spiritual knowledge and strength without sacrificing our honesty, we must

slay our horses and give them to the gods. If you defend this practice, allowing, as I believe you do that animals have souls, why not carry the matter to its logical conclusion and advocate human sacrifices? For man is said to be the noblest work of God, so he should be the fittest offering.

Mysticus.—Ah! My friend, the customs of those ancient days, so oft derided now, were more reasonable than you seem to think; but then a totally different association of ideas occupied men's minds; hence the difficulty of explanation. The Haya Greeva, or Horse-necked form of Maha Vishnu was the first *Logos* that was manifested at the beginning of the Kosmic Manwantara. The story is told in the Moksha Parva of the Mahabharata, and is shortly as follows:—The waters of the Great Deep—Mulaprakriti—were over all. On the surface lay Parampurusha. All Atma was in him. Darkness was around—the darkness that precedes the dawn. Unconscious of surroundings, like one in dream 'twixt sleep and waking, he thought the Kosmos. Ahankaram—"I am I"—began. Then in the thousand-petalled Lotus growing from the navel of the recumbent God appeared the four-faced Brahma—the Universal mind—shining like the Sun. The Great One created the four Vedas—the knowledge of nature's powers and nature's law—and placed them in the side of the four-faced deity, who forthwith was filled with pride. Narayana—Maha Vishnu—to destroy his pride caused two drops of water to become two Asuras, Madhu of the Tamo-guna—which signifies the qualities of darkness, materialism and slowness—and Kaitapha of the Rajo-guna—the quality of passional activity. Both had demon forms and were armed with the mace. They saw Brahma, all glorious, sitting in the Lotus, and in his side the shining Vedas. These they stole, and carried in hot haste to the nether Pole, where is Patala Loka. On discovering the theft, Brahma grieved and worshipped the Parampurusha. Then the Great One, hearing his prayer, assumed a form with the head and neck of a milk-white steed—his form in manifestation—, and, invisible to the Rakshasas, went in mighty noise to where the Vedas were concealed, took them, and gave them back to Brahma. Hence he is called Haya Greeva. There is a connection between this Haya Greeva form of the first *Logos* and the offering of the horse in the *Asva* sacrifice.

Mundanus.—It is a beautiful story, and though I cannot understand its full significance, I perceive that there may be a reason beyond my comprehension for the offering of the horse. I suppose the theft of the Vedas shows how even the Universal mind cannot prevent its knowledge from being perverted to base uses. But yet another doubt arises in my mind in connection with sacrifice. If it is good, how is it that such god-sent teachers as Buddha and Christ were so deeply incensed against the practice and condemned it so vehemently?

Mysticus.—That, my friend, is easy to account for. As there were sacrifices offered up by holy men according to the Vedic ritual as a kind of sacrament with the *Logos*, for the purpose of stimulating the great Powers of Good to react for the benefit of mankind; so

also there were the sacrifices of vile men, who shed the blood of animals with black Tantric rites, in order to obtain for themselves power and objects of desire from lower gods connected for the most part with the astral plane. Ages rolled on, and Brahmanism was no longer the pure Wisdom-Religion of earlier days. The sacrifices consequently lost their pristine purity and became coloured with the above mentioned Tantricism. Such being the case, the chosen agents of the divine *Logos* who subsequently appeared on earth, Krishna, Buddha, Sankaracharya and Christ, perceiving that the sacrifice of animals no longer served the purpose for which it was originally instituted, but that it was on the contrary a source of evil to the world, condemned the ordinance and preached its abolition. Krishna ordered his disciples to set aside some food when they sat down to their meals, and to devote it to the gods, which practice is still observed by Brahmans. He also instituted the sacrifice of flowers, fruits, and special herbs. "When any one," he said to Arjuna, speaking as the *Logos*, "sacrifices by devotion to me a leaf, a flower, fruit, or water, I consume this devotion-offering of an earnest soul. Whatever thou doest, whatever thou eatest, whatever thou offerest in sacrifice, whatever thou givest, whatever thou meditatest upon, O son of Kunti, that do as an offering to me. Thus shalt thou be free from the bond of *Karma*, which gives good and evil fruit."

Buddha and Sankaracharya preached the doctrine of *Ahimsa* or *Jivahimsa* which we discussed the other day. In order to reconcile the discrepancy between this doctrine of not taking life and the Vedic ordinance of animal sacrifice, some of their followers took to sacrificing a goat made of flour with the full Vedic ritual.

Christ instituted the Eucharist, or "Lord's Supper" of bread and wine, which elements symbolise the mystery of the *Christos* and the Holy Spirit, the Philosopher's stone (which the builders rejected) and the Elixir of Life. Bread and wine have always symbolised these Principles or Powers: you will remember they were used in the rites of Ceres and Bacchus, which were taught to those initiated into the mysteries at Eleusis and other such centres.

Mundanus.—I see that there is much more in sacrifice than I thought, and I should be glad if you could make the rationale of it more clear to my understanding.

Mysticus.—Perhaps an illustration may help you. Consider the Kosmos as a high compound entity,—the great *Devatas* the internal nerve ganglia which regulate the circulation, the souls of men, the cells, which together form the parts of the body, and are connected with the internal nerve centres by nerves which transmit nerve currents of an electrical character to and from those centres. When the cells are thrown into a state of activity, chemical action occurs, heat is generated and nerve currents passing to the ganglia stimulate them. The ganglia on receiving the stimulus become active in their turn: some physiological change takes place in the substance of which they are formed, the result of which is known as reflex action, that is to say, an efferent current is discharged by them to the part whence the afferent current came, and it has the effect of increasing the calibre of the blood vessels of that part so

that more of the life-giving fluid is supplied in answer to the demand. The blood, renewed by its passage through the organs, supplies nourishment to the nerve centres which govern those organs and the extremities, so that they are mutually dependent on each other for their nourishment. This illustration is of course imperfect. It is not intended to be taken quite literally, but merely to suggest the idea of the mutual relation of the *Devatas* and men.

Mundanus.—In the body every action affects the centres and produces reflex action. So I suppose every action of the soul reacts upon the *Devatas*. May I then infer from what has been already said that *Karma* and sacrifice are synonymous terms?

Mysticus.—The analogy holds good so far, and if a part of the body is diseased, the morbid growth flourishes at the expence of the rest of the body. Special minor nerve centres are developed in the part, and it uses up far more than its share of blood, so that the rest of the body is starved for want of its due supply of nutriment. So also in the world, when religion is degraded and spiritual powers are perverted to unhallowed uses, the souls of men pine for want of their due allowance of spiritual nutriment, and a great reformer has to be sent to act the part of the surgeon. *Karma* and *Yagna* (sacrifice) have been considered as identical by a certain school of Eastern philosophers, and much has been written on the subject. But it is not worth while for us to go into a long and unproductive controversy on the subject. *Karma* and *Yagna* are the same up to a certain point, but *Yagna* is more limited in its scope than *Karma*. Krishna uses the term *Yagna* in a very broad sense. In his doctrine the expenditure of energy in the pursuit of knowledge is a sacrifice: he considers it a much higher kind of sacrifice than any ritualistic practice, so you may consider your friends Huxley, Tyndall, Clerk Maxwell and Co., to be sacrificers of no mean order. The great renunciation of all desires, attachments and affections, is the great sacrifice which a man must make before he can attain immortality, and for which he should even now prepare. The fire of knowledge must be kindled, for it is the sacrificial fire which burns up the desires and emotions of the heart. Wherever a man is, whatever he does, if he does it unselfishly from a sense of duty, in that he believes it to be his appointed task to carry on the work of the world in that particular way, that man is engaged in sacrifice. It is not the work that should be abandoned by a disciple, but only the egotistical desire that benefit should accrue to him. Sri Krishna says: "The man who is contented with his own work (*swakarma*) gives honour to the Procreator of beings by whom this world was spread. That man attains perfection. Better one's own duty though of low degree than an exalted work well done."

Mundanus.—Old George Herbert says something not unlike it in sentiment:—"Who sweeps a room as in His sight, makes that and the action fine." A right good philosophy it is to live by and to die by. The simple peasant can understand it quite as well as the brilliant scholar, sometimes better. By the way you were

speaking about Christ. What have you got to say about his death upon the cross as a sacrifice to God for the salvation of mankind?

Mysticus.—The meaning of the sacrifice of Christ is clear to any one who has delved deep enough into mysticism; but as to the facts of the death of Jesus of Nazareth I can only surmise. Know then that the crucifixion of the Christ represents the great drama which was played in the garden of Eden, the cradle of humanity, when the great spirit of this planet sacrificed himself for the world, giving his own life that man and beast should live. The sacrifice consisted in taking upon himself a human incarnation, not in giving it up. You can form no conception of the magnitude of that sacrifice, the mighty effort, the awful agony of the God who subjected himself to the restricted limits of corporeal existence upon this globe and gave from his own store the life that is in every man and beast, bird and reptile, fish and insect. He sacrificed himself to create humanity, as Purusha did to create the Kosmos. This is the Microcosmic Sacrifice. It is the key-note of the faith of the Christian mystic, as the other is of that of his elder brother the Brahman. I have already spoken to you concerning the sacrifice of the planetary spirit when he incarnates upon earth. I may now add that he makes a second sacrifice for the preservation and fulfilment of his work, when at the expiration of his term of office he leaves his mantle to his successor. Apostolic Succession, or *Guruparampara*, as it is termed in the sacred books of the East, is a doctrine which has been cruelly misunderstood by churchmen for many centuries. The truth is that the Dhyana Chohan, whilst performing his task upon earth, has the gift of the supreme light and energy of the *Logos*, the Holy Ghost of the Christian, the Schechina of the Jewish Rabbi, the *Daiviprakriti* of the Brahman. Sacrificing himself, that the world may not be a loser through his departure to his Father, he transfers this precious inheritance to his Apostolic successor, and with it the accumulated knowledge and experience by him acquired (they are spoken of in Kabbalistic treatises as his *garments*). This wealth of experience and knowledge becomes grafted on to and blended with the consciousness of the newly appointed agent of the *Logos* upon earth, when he receives the gift of the Holy Spirit, which henceforth he will give out to the world according to its need. The holder of this office is the Maha Chohan, the great Initiator and the head upon earth of all the Brotherhoods of adepts. When at length a successor is ready to take his place, he in his turn transfers his holy trust with the further knowledge and experience superadded during his incumbency. Thus the world is never the loser; for each inheritor of the sacred office starts with all the power and wisdom which his predecessor had attained to at the time of quitting it. The sacrifice of the life-blood of a physical man to save mankind would be a small matter, not worthy of so exalted a being. For what good man would not willingly suffer a painful death and sacrifice his incarnation, that all his fellowmen might gain immortality? Thousands have given up their lives for much smaller objects. The sacrifice of a Son of God is perforce a much greater thing.

Mundanus.—Has the cross any special significance, or would any other mode of death have been equally symbolical of the Microcosmic Sacrifice?

Mysticus.—The cross has a very special meaning. It is one of the most mystic symbols on earth and veils one of the deepest mysteries known to the Initiate. I can only tell you that it represents a particular Tetragram, or *Logos*, in a special aspect. May you some day know its full significance, for you will then be more than man. The cross has always been used as a symbol in initiations. Indeed the crucifixion may be considered as symbolical of final initiation as well as of the Microcosmic Sacrifice. The trial in the garden, the darkness, the crown of thorns, the visit to the realm of the Shades, the rending of the veil of the temple—the veil of Isis that hides the face of God, that man may not be burnt up by the awful glory of that countenance,—the death of the person who has lived the life of the world and the birth of the immortal in the life of the *Logos*, the Son of the Father, as the Kabbalists call the full Initiate who has attained the mystic union, all these things symbolise the mysteries of the great initiation. The mistake, which many Christians of the present age fall into, is that they attach too much importance to the letter of the Bible and do not search for the mysticism which lies concealed under the words. In all religions there has ever been the written law and the oral tradition, which supplies the key to its interpretation—the *Lex Scripta* and the *Lex Oralis*, as the Kabbalists call them. Judging from the account written in the Gospels I certainly think it very questionable whether Jesus of Nazareth physically died upon a wooden cross.

Mundanus.—What! Do you mean to say that you believe the whole thing to have been a gigantic hoax perpetrated by the Evangelists who wrote the Gospels?

Mysticus.—It might be that Initiates wrote the accounts solely for the purpose of inculcating a great lesson: that just as Jesus is related to have spoken on many occasions in parable, so they wrote as it were in parable without any foundation of fact. However I do not think this likely, for such teachers generally avail themselves of history and use it as a vehicle for their esoteric teaching.

Mundanus.—I must confess I fail to reconcile the two conflicting statements, that Jesus of Nazareth did not die upon the cross, and that his death was an historical event.

Mysticus.—I will endeavour to explain the paradox. To begin with, let us take for granted that a man called Jesus of Nazareth lived, that he was an adept, and that a *Logos* used him for the purpose of initiating a great religious reform. It is most unlikely that an adept would allow himself to be put to death by the people. If the crucifixion were necessary to teach exoterically the great lesson of self-sacrifice, which has been of such good service in the world, it was quite possible for him by means of adept powers to cause the appearance of the crucifixion to take place before the people subjectively to their consciousness, just as on a small scale Professor Charcot can make some of his subjects, even whilst wide awake, see whatever he wishes them to see; and on a rather larger scale an Indian fakir can make a whole company see a boy cut to

pieces when he cuts up a pumpkin. Let us take this supposition and work it out. Jesus would make his preparations in the garden after throwing his disciples into a mesmeric trance. It is said in one of the Gospels that an angel was with him : that might be the astral form of a Chohan, or Mahatma, who had come to help him ; for an illusion on such a scale requires a large expenditure of energy, and adepts sometimes unite their forces to carry out a big occult undertaking. After having set up the *Maya*, or illusion, he would quietly walk away and work it from a distance. Or it might be that he would leave in his place a faithful elemental, who would take his form and go through the ordeal. There is very little difference between the two processes. I am tolerably certain, however, that Jesus did not die then. The Bible contains strong evidence—to a mystic—that he was alive after that event. When the *Maya* was removed three days after the crucifixion, the tomb was found to contain only the grave clothes, which of course were real. No one who knows anything about such things would believe that the physical body was revived, pushed away the stone and walked off. It is related in the Gospel of St. Luke, that when the women came to the sepulchre and found it open, they saw two men in shining apparel, one of whom said, "Why seek ye the living among the dead." As to the appearances to the disciples, they would perfectly accord with astral visits by a living adept who had left his body entranced in some safe place. Such an one does not hang about after death without a physical body : he would have no source whence to draw the requisite power. The theory that the disciples were visited by the materialised spook of the Jesus they loved, is utterly untenable in the case of such an holy man. You will remember that before he was taken by the soldiers in the garden Jesus told his disciples to go into Galilee, where they should meet him ; and at the end of the Gospel of St. Matthew it is said, that the disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain, where Jesus had appointed them. They met him there and worshipped him ; and he gave them instructions about preaching his doctrine. There is every probability that Jesus took up his abode for the time being in that mountain and was seen there by the disciples in his physical body. It is the general practice of adepts to reside on mountain heights, where the conditions are better suited to their peculiar constitutions than those of lower altitudes. But you look as if you had had enough for today, so it is no use my going any further into the question. Remember I do not profess to know anything about Jesus of Nazareth. I have merely thrown out a hint or two as to the manner in which I should interpret the gospel narrative on the general principles of mysticism, which hold good in every recognised religious system.

Mundanus.—Well, I will go home and read the Bible. Good day.

HENRY MERVYN, F. T. S.

ROSICRUCIAN LETTERS.

(Continued from page 607.)

III.

Truth absolute and relative.

ALL worldly science is based upon the supposition that things actually are what they appear to be, and yet but little reflection is required to understand that this supposition is erroneous ; for the appearance of things does not depend merely on what they actually are, but also on the conditions of our own organization and the constitution of our perceptive faculties. The greatest impediment in the way of progress for the student of occult science is that he has grown up in the erroneous belief that things are what they appear to him to be, and unless he can rise above this superstition and consider things—not from the mere relative standpoint of this limited self, but from that of the Infinite and Absolute, he will not be able to know absolute truth. Before we therefore proceed farther with our practical instructions for approaching the Light, it will be necessary to impress once more strongly upon your mind the illusive character of all external phenomena.

All that sensual man knows about the external world he has learned to know by means of the impressions which come to his consciousness through the avenues of the senses. By repeatedly or continually receiving such impressions, comparing them with each other and taking that which he believes he knows as a basis for speculation about things which he does not know, he may form certain opinions in regard to things which transcend his power of sensuous perception ; but whether his opinions in regard to external or internal things are true or false, they can be true only relatively to him ; and relatively to other beings who are constituted like him ; in regard to all other beings whose organizations are entirely different from his own, his arguments and logical speculations find no application, and there may be untold millions of beings in the universe, of an organization superior or inferior to his own, but entirely different from it, to which the world and everything in it appears in an entirely different aspect, and who see all things in an entirely different light. Such beings, although living in the same world in which we live, may know nothing whatever of that world which is the only conceivable one for us ; and we may intellectually know nothing about their world, although the latter is one and identical with the one in which we live. To obtain a look into their world, we must have strength enough to tear ourselves away from inherited and acquired prejudice and misconception, to rise for the time being from the stand-point of self, which is attached to the sensual world by a thousand chains, and to occupy mentally the stand-point from which we can survey the world in a superior aspect ; we must, so to say, die—that means become unconscious of our own existence as individual human beings—before we can become conscious of the higher life and look at the world from the stand-point of a god.

All our modern science is therefore merely relative science, that is to say, our scientific systems teach the relations which changeable and external things bear to that transient and illusive thing which we call a human being; but which in reality is nothing but an external apparition caused by some internal activity, of which external science knows nothing. All this much vaunted and praised knowledge is therefore merely superficial knowledge, relating to only one of the perhaps infinite number of aspects in which God may become manifest.

Learned ignorance believes its own special mode of regarding the world of phenomena as the only true one, it clings to these illusions, which it believes to be the only realities, and calls those, who recognize their illusive character, dreamers; but as long as it clings to these illusions it will not rise above them; it will remain an illusive science; it will not be able to realize the true character of nature, and in vain will such a science ask that God should be demonstrated to her, while she shuts her eyes to exclude the eternal light.

It is however by no means our intention to ask that modern science should attempt to put herself upon the stand-point of the Absolute, for in that case she would cease to be relative to external things and become useless in regard to them. It is admitted that colours are not self-existent realities, but that they are merely caused by certain numbers of undulations of light; but this fact is no impediment to the manufacture of colours and their useful employment. Similar arguments may be made in regard to all other external sciences, and the above statements are not intended to discourage external scientific pursuits, but to instruct those to whom a merely superficial and external knowledge is not sufficient, and also to moderate, if possible, the self-conceit of those who believe that they know all things, and who, chained to their illusions, lose sight of the Eternal and Real, and even go so far in their presumption and blind prejudice, as to deny its existence.

It will be admitted, that it is not the external body, which sees, hears, smells, reasons and thinks; but the inner and to us invisible man, who performs these functions through the instrumentality of the physical organs. There is no reason why we should believe that this inner man ceases to exist when the external body dies, for on the contrary, as will be shown further on, such a supposition is contrary to reason. But, if this inner man loses through the death of the physical organism the power to receive sensual impressions from the outer world; if he by the loss of his brain loses the power to think, the relations in which he stood to the world will be entirely changed, and the conditions in which he exists will be entirely different from ours. His world will not be our world, although in the absolute sense both worlds will be one. Thus there will be a million of different worlds within this one world, provided there are a million of beings, whose constitutions differ from each other; in other words, there is only one Nature, but it may appear under a perhaps infinite number of aspects. With each change in our organization the old world appears to us under a new aspect; by

each death we enter into a new world, although it is not necessarily the world which changes, but only the relations which we bear to it that are changed by such an event.

What does the world know about absolute truth? For all that we really know, there may be no sun, no moon, no earth; there may be neither fire, nor water, nor air; all these things exist relatively to us only as long as we are in a certain state of consciousness, during which we *believe* that they exist; there is no absolute truth in the realm of phenomena; there is not even any absolute truth in mathematics, for all mathematical rules are relative and based upon certain suppositions in regard to magnitude and extension, which are in themselves merely of a phenomenal character. Change the fundamental conceptions upon which our mathematics are based, and the whole system will require to be changed. The same may be said in regard to our conceptions of matter, motion and space. These words are merely expressions to indicate certain conceptions which we have formed of inconceivable things, in other words, they indicate certain states of our consciousness.

If we look at a tree, a certain image is formed in our mind; that is to say, we enter into a certain state of consciousness, which brings us into relation with some external phenomenon, of whose real nature we know nothing, but which we call a tree. To an entirely differently organized being a tree may not be what we call a tree, but something entirely different, perhaps having no material solidity, being transparent; in fact to a thousand beings, whose constitutions differ from each other, it will appear in a thousand different variations. Thus we behold in the sun merely a fiery globe, but a being of a superior receptivity may see in that which we call "the Sun" something which we cannot describe; because having no faculty to perceive it, we cannot conceive it.

External man stands in a certain relation to the external world, and can as such know nothing of the world but this external relation. Some people may therefore argue that he should content himself with that knowledge and not attempt to seek deeper. To do so would at once cut him off from all further progress and condemn him to remain in error and ignorance; for a knowledge which is entirely dependent on external illusions is necessarily a merely illusive knowledge. Moreover the external appearance of things is the outcome of an interior activity, and unless the true character of that interior activity is known, the true character of the external phenomena will not be properly understood. Moreover the real and inner man, who inhabits the external form stands in certain relations to the inner activity of the cosmos, which are not less strict and defined than the relations existing between external man and external nature, and unless man knows the relations which he bears to that power, in other words to *God*, he will never understand his own divine nature; he will obtain no knowledge of self. To teach the true relation which man bears to the infinite All, and to elevate him to the exalted stand-point which he ought to occupy in nature, is and can be the only true object of true religion and science. The fact of a man being born in a certain house or town

is not indicative that he should remain there all his life; the fact of a man being in a low physical, intellectual or moral condition does not force upon him the necessity of always remaining in such a state and to make no effort to rise higher.

The highest knowledge which can possibly exist is the one which has the highest object of knowledge; but there can be no higher object for knowledge than the universal cause of all good. God is therefore the highest object of human knowledge, and we can know nothing of God except its mode of activity within our own selves. To obtain a knowledge of self, means to obtain a knowledge of the action of the divine principle within our own selves, in other words, a knowledge of our own self after that self has once become divine and awakened to a consciousness of its divinity. Then will the divine inner self—so to say—recognize the relations which exist between it and the divine principle in the universe, if we can speak of *relations* existing between two things, which are not two, but which are one and identical. To express it therefore more correctly, we may say: Spiritual Self-knowledge takes place, when God recognizes his own divinity in man.

All power, whether it belongs to the body, the soul, or to the intelligent principle in man, originates from the centre—the spirit. It is due to spiritual activity that man is able to see, to feel, to hear and perceive with his external senses. In the majority of men this internal spiritual activity has only called the intellectual power and the external senses into activity. But there are exceptional people, in whom this spiritual activity has reached a higher state, and in which higher or interior faculties of perception have been developed. Such persons may then perceive things, which are imperceptible to others, and exercise powers which other people do not possess. If such a case is occasionally met with, it is regarded by the would-be-wise as having been caused by some diseased state of the body, and then they call it the outcome of a “pathological condition;” for it is a fact based upon our daily experience, that external and superficial science, knowing nothing whatever of the fundamental laws of nature, continually mistakes effects for causes and causes for effects. With the same show of logic might a crowd of horses, if one of them had obtained human speech, call their colleague diseased and talk about his “pathological” condition. Thus wisdom appears insanity to the insane, light as darkness to the blind, virtue as vice to the vicious, truth as falsehood to the false, and everywhere we perceive that man does not see things as they are, but such as he imagines them to be.

Thus we see, that all that men usually call good or evil, true or false, real or illusive, useful or useless, etc. etc., is at best only relatively so. It may be so relatively to one, and be entirely the contrary to another, who has other views, objects or aspirations. It is also a necessary consequence of this state of things, that wherever language commences, confusion begins; because each man's constitution being somewhat different from that of others, each one forms conceptions of things different from the conception of others. This is true in regard to ordinary affairs, but it is

still more evident in regard to matters connected with occult things, of which most men have only erroneous conceptions, and it is doubtful whether a single sentence can be uttered, which cannot give rise to misunderstandings and to disputes. The only truths which are beyond disputes are absolute truths, and they need not be uttered at all, because they are self-evident; to express them in language is to express only what everybody already knows, and which no one disputes; to say, for instance, that God is the cause of all good, is to say merely that we symbolize the unknown cause of all good by the expression “God.”

All relative truth refers only to men's individual and changeable selves, and no one can know Truth in the Absolute, except he who rises above the sphere of self and phenomena to the never-changing and eternal *Real*. To do so, is to die in a certain sense of this word; that is to give up entirely the conception of self, which is merely an illusion, and to become for the time being one with the Universal, wherein no sense of separateness exists. If you are thus ready to die, you may enter the door of the sanctuary of occult knowledge; but if the illusions of the external worlds, and above all the illusion of your own personal existence attracts you, you will in vain seek for the knowledge of that which is self-existent and independent of all relations to things; the one eternal centre from which all things come and to which all things must return; the fiery centre—the *Father*—to whom no one can approach except through the *Son*, the *Light*, the *Life* and the supreme *Truth*.

F. H.

(To be continued.)

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE MICROCOSM.

(Continued from page 511).

I SHALL now proceed with the continuation of my article on the Constitution of the Microcosm. Madame H. P. Blavatsky has sent a reply to the previous portion of my article for publication in this issue, and to avoid the necessity of writing another article on the subject, I find it necessary to take this reply also into consideration in this very article.

The real question at issue between us is after all a very simple one; but it has been obscured and unnecessarily complicated by the line of argument which Madame H. P. Blavatsky has chosen to adopt. I have nowhere denied the importance of number seven in the processes of natural evolution or the interpretation of cosmic phenomena. On the other hand it will be clearly seen from my first lecture that I fully admitted its importance while rejecting the seven-fold classification hitherto adopted as unsound and unscientific. I have not even denied the possibility of a seven-fold classification in the case of the microcosmic principles, or the existence of a seven-fold classification recognized by the ancient occult science. My remarks and criticism were strictly confined to the particular classification which has hitherto been explained

and commented upon in Theosophical publications. It must further be noted in this connection that my criticism did not proceed from the necessity of maintaining any orthodox Brahminical dogma. I found it necessary to condemn this classification on account of its own inherent defects, and not because it emanated from a trans-Himalayan source. I found fault, not with Madame H. P. Blavatsky, or her use of Sanskrit terms, or her exposition of Brahminical philosophy, but with the incorrect and misleading classification which has introduced so many contradictions and so much confusion into Theosophical writings. If these few facts are borne in mind, it will be found that a considerable portion of Madame H. P. Blavatsky's argument is altogether irrelevant to the real question at issue. The whole argument, from the commencement of page 452 to the end of the second paragraph on page 455, can only establish the fact that the number seven is of great importance in nature and the arrangements of occult symbology. Even if this fact is admitted, it does not necessarily follow that in every case we are bound to adopt a seven-fold classification. The only inference that can fairly be drawn from it is, that in all probability there are seven principles which enter into the composition of a human being. But this inference can by no means establish the correctness of the particular classification under consideration. Otherwise, the truth of any seven-fold classification we may choose to adopt can be equally proved by this process of reasoning. Any person can name any seven principles in the complex structure of man and claim the sanction of nature for his classification, as is now done by my critic.

It is pointed out in the reply that the seven-fold classification is essential for "practical demonstration in Occultism," and that the four-fold classification, though "metaphysically" and "theoretically" sound, is incapable of any practical application to "the phenomena of daily and especially of *post-mortem* life." The same argument is repeated in various forms throughout the reply. This is one of those vague general arguments which seem to mean a good deal, and which take easy possession of the minds of people who are not generally in the habit of scrutinizing or analyzing their own ideas. I fail to understand what kind of practical demonstration it is which necessitates the adoption of this classification. My critic is silent on the point. I know for certain that this seven-fold classification will be an obstacle in the way in a considerable number of occult process which an initiate has to pass through in seeking that final union with the Logos, which is to be the ultimate result of his labours. This inconvenience results from the fact that the mystic constitution of the Logos itself, as represented by the sacred Tetragram, has not a septenary basis. If the assertion, however, does not mean anything more than that the septenary classification is required for explaining the so-called spiritualistic phenomena, I am fully prepared to account for every one of these phenomena from the stand-point of the classification I have adopted. I have in fact dealt with the general aspects of spiritualism in my lectures from this very stand-point. The very fact that this four-fold classification was found sufficient for all

practical purposes by occultists who investigated these phenomena for thousands of years and examined the workings of nature on all its planes of activity, will be an unanswerable reply to this argument. I am quite certain that Pisachas and Bhoots will never succeed in disproving my classification. I think that this defect is the result of a serious misapprehension in my critic's mind regarding the nature of this four-fold classification. At the end of page 450, Madame H. P. Blavatsky points out that the three *Upadhis* of the Rajayoga classification are Jagrata, Swapna and Sushupti, and continues as follows:—"But then, in transcendental states of samadhi, the body with its *linga sarira*, the vehicle of the life principle, is entirely left out of consideration; the three states of consciousness are made to refer only to the three (with Atma the fourth) principles which remain after death. And here lies the real key to the septenary division of man, the three principles coming in as an addition only during his life." This real key unfortunately breaks in our hands the moment we begin to apply it. The whole mistake has arisen from confounding *Upadhi* with the state of Pragna associated with it. *Upadhi* is the physical organism. The first *Upadhi* is the physical body itself, and not merely Jagrata Avastha. And again how is Jagrath to be identified with the fourth principle? If, as my critic says, the three states of consciousness—Jagrath, Swapna and Sushupti—are made to refer only to the three principles which remain after death in addition to Atma, Jagrath must necessarily be identified with the fourth principle. But sure enough the fourth principle is not the physical body. The four principles of my classification can by no means be superadded to the first three principles of the seven-fold classification, seeing that the physical body is the first principle of the four-fold classification. Even if *Upadhi* is mistaken for a state of consciousness, the seven-fold classification cannot be deduced from the Raj-yog classification. Jagrath Avastha is not the condition of Pragna associated with the fourth principle. The whole argument thus ends in nothing; and yet on the basis of this argument Madame H. P. Blavatsky has thought it proper, in the fourth argument of her present reply, to pronounce an opinion to the effect that the Vedantins have denied the objective reality and the importance of the physical body, and overlooked its existence in their classification, which has thereby been rendered unfit for practical purposes. My critic would have done better if she had paused to ascertain the real meaning of *Upadhi* and of Jagrath before using such a worthless argument in defence of her own classification and giving expression to such an erroneous view regarding the Vedantic theory.

The whole argument about the comparative merits of the two classifications rests on a series of misconceptions, or arbitrary assumptions. The first *Upadhi* is identified with Jagrathavasta, and then it is assumed that the latter is the same as the 4th principle of the septenary classification. I must here call the reader's attention to another curious mistake in the reply. It is stated in the second para. on page 450 that the four-fold classification is "the Bhagavat Gita classification," "but not that of the

Vedanta." This statement is apparently made for the purpose of somehow or other discrediting the four-fold classification. It has, however, no real foundation in fact, and is altogether misleading. Madame H. P. Blavatsky has probably ventured to make this assertion on account of the headings given to the five-fold and the four-fold classifications in my note on the "Septenary Division in different Indian Systems." I called the five-fold classification the Vedantic classification, and the four-fold classification the Raja Yoga classification, merely for convenience of reference and not because the two classifications refer to two different systems of philosophy. Though both the classifications are used in Vedantic philosophy, the four-fold classification is the one frequently referred to. Tharaka Raja Yoga is, as it were, the centre and the heart of Vedantic philosophy, as it is decidedly, in its higher aspects, the most important portion of the ancient wisdom religion. Very little of it is known at present in India. What is generally seen of it in the books ordinarily read, gives but a very inadequate idea of its scope or importance. In truth, however, it is one of the seven main branches into which the whole of the occult science is divided, and is derived according to all accounts from the "children of the fire-mist" of the mysterious land of Shamballah.

It is necessary to state further in this connection that the four-fold classification I have used is not the only classification to be found in this magnificent system of philosophy. It has also a seven-fold classification, which will hereafter be noticed.

Attention has been called to some of my former articles in the *Theosophist*, and it is argued that I have already admitted the truth and the correctness of the classification which I am now criticizing, and that I am now estopped from denying the same. This kind of argument is altogether out of place in the present case. The only article in which I had seriously considered the question, is the one referred to as the article on "Brahminism on the Seven-fold principles in Man." I must explain the circumstances under which this so-called article was written. While yet an utter stranger to me, Madame H. P. Blavatsky, after seeing my article on the Zodiac, asked me certain questions by letter about the classification of the various powers and forces recognised by occultism, and further, calling my attention to the "Fragments of Occult Truth," enquired of me whether *as regards spiritualistic phenomena* my views harmonized with those put forward in the said article.

I sent her a letter in reply, not having the slightest notion at the time of writing the same that it would ever be published as an article for the information of the public. This fact was acknowledged by the editor in her preface to the said article, when it was originally published in the columns of the *Theosophist*, and it was the editor who selected the title. It will be clearly seen that the article is divided into two parts. The first part is confined to the questions put regarding the classification of the "powers of nature," while the second part deals with the spiritualistic phenomena. Madame H. P. Blavatsky has, however, thought it proper to quote a passage from the first part, which has nothing to do with the classification of the microcosmic principles, or the spiritualistic

phenomena, for the purpose of drawing an unwarranted inference in support of her contention, and for the purpose of making a disagreeable insinuation against the ancient occult science of India.

The passage in question is as follows:

"However that may be, the knowledge of *the occult powers of nature* (the italics are in the original, see p. 155, "Five Years of Theosophy") possessed by the inhabitants of the lost Atlantis was learnt by the ancient adepts of India, and was appended by them to the esoteric doctrine taught by the residents of the sacred island. The Tibetan adepts, however, have not accepted this addition to their esoteric doctrine; and it is in this respect that one should expect to find a difference between the two doctrines."

There is nothing ambiguous in this passage. It clearly refers to the Tantras and Agamas which were originally cultivated and developed by the Atlanteans. In course of time their doctrines and ritual gradually crept into the Brahminical doctrine, as the Dugpa doctrines crept into Tibetan Buddhism before the time of Song-ka-pa. And just as the last named adept undertook to weed out these doctrines from the Tibetan religion, Sankara Charya attempted to purify the Brahminical faith. The assertion made in the article does not in the least justify the assumption that the ancient Brahminical occult science was derived from the Atlantean. Tantras and Agamas have little or nothing to do with the classification of the microcosmic principles; and the statement quoted has not the remotest reference to the seven-fold or the four-fold classification. My critic was more or less of the same opinion when she wrote her first article on the "Classification of Principles," published in the April issue of this Journal. After quoting the above-mentioned paragraph from my article, she makes the following observation on p. 449:—"But this difference between the two doctrines does not include the septenary division..." But this opinion seems to have changed subsequently. For, in the present article, after citing the same passage, she makes the following remark: "Thus, the readers of the *Theosophist* were told from the first (in 1882) that they 'should expect to find a difference between the two doctrines.' One of the said 'differences' is found in the *Exoteric Exposition* or form of presentation of the seven-fold principle in man." As might naturally be expected, this statement is a little obscure. This "Exoteric Exposition" cannot possibly refer to the seven-fold classification, because in her opinion this classification "was always esoteric" (p. 448). It must therefore refer to the four-fold classification which is looked upon as the exoteric form of the esoteric seven-fold classification. The statement now made amounts to this then. The seven-fold classification was esoteric and was derived by the Tibetan adepts from Shamballah; the four-fold classification was exoteric and was derived by the ancient adepts of India from the Atlanteans. This difference was noticed and admitted by the article on "Brahminism and the Seven-fold principles in Man."

This is the gist of the present argument. This argument is sufficiently refuted by what she herself wrote in the April article. She then thought that my statement did not refer to the

classifications, and alleged that both the parties derived the seven-fold classification from the Atlanteans (see page 449). It will be a mere waste of time to dissect this argument any further. I can only regret that my critic should stoop to such arguments and insinuations for the purpose of defending her position.

The second part of my article deals with the seven-fold classification only *incidentally*. It was not necessary to discuss the merits of the seven-fold classification of the "Fragments" in that article. And I did not think it proper to go out of my way and criticize the said classification. It would have been foolish on my part to have done so when my correspondent was a stranger to me, and when I was assured that in her opinion it was a correct classification. I therefore followed the classification of the "Fragments" as far as it was convenient, introducing such changes into it as were absolutely necessary. The following passage at the commencement of the second part of my article will show what I undertook to establish in the said article, and why I adopted the seven-fold classification:—"I have carefully examined it (The Fragments) and find that the results arrived at do not differ much from the conclusions of our Aryan philosophy, though our mode of stating the arguments may differ in form. I shall now discuss the question from my own stand-point, *though following, for facility of comparison and convenience of discussion*, the sequence of classification of the seven-fold entities, or principles constituting man, which is adopted in the "Fragments." The questions raised for discussion are—(1) whether the disembodied spirits of human beings appear in the seance rooms and elsewhere, and (2) whether the manifestations taking place are produced wholly or partly through their agency." The conclusions referred to herein do not refer to the classification adopted, but to the views expressed on the questions raised. The reason given for following the seven-fold classification is clearly stated and cannot possibly mislead anybody. The so-called mathematical demonstration of the evolution of seven entities from three can only establish if correct the probability of a seven-fold classification, but is utterly insufficient to establish the truth of the seven-fold classification therein adopted. It will be further seen that the seven-fold classification I adopted in that article is different in many important respects, viz., the position of Prana and the nature and importance of the 5th and the 6th principles, from the classification of the "Fragments," in which the so-called "original teachings" was embodied. Curiously enough my alterations were quietly accepted in subsequent expositions in spite of the "original teachings," to which so much importance is now attached. I was not then pretending, and I have never pretended subsequently, that I was teaching occult wisdom to the members of the Theosophical Society. Under such circumstances it is altogether unreasonable to lay so much stress on the importance of my article in discussing the important question now formally raised for final decision. It is quite true that I refrained from pointing out fully the defects and the unsoundness of the seven-fold classification in my note on the various classifications while I was the acting editor of the *Theosophist*, though I stated that, in some res-

pects, it would be more convenient to follow the four-fold classification. I did not then think it proper in the interests of theosophical investigation to raise an important issue about the correctness of the seven-fold classification, as I thought it would be premature to do so. The seven-fold classification, though incorrect, was a step in advance. It did serve some purpose in its own way towards the investigation of the ancient systems of occult psychology. And I did not think it prudent to disturb it when matters were hardly ripe for taking another step in the right direction. My article on the "Personal and Impersonal God" does not, in fact, touch the question at issue. It does speak no doubt of seven states of matter, of seven principles in man, and seven aspects of Pragna. But the article does not adopt the seven-fold classification under consideration. It is based on Mandukya-panishad which enumerates seven phases of consciousness, while it accepts the four-fold classification. These articles therefore do not settle the point in dispute, and there cannot be a better proof of the weakness of my critic's position, than the fact that, instead of attempting to justify the seven-fold classification on its merits, she is trying to find a support for it in the articles above alluded to.

Madame H. P. Blavatsky says that she is certain that the classification in dispute is the real esoteric seven-fold classification. I am very sorry she is so positive in her statements. In my humble opinion it is not the real esoteric classification. There is but one source from which all the various writers on occult science have derived their classifications. It is one of the oldest directions of the ancient Wisdom-religion that the macrocosm should be interpreted according to the plan revealed by *Malchuth*, and that *Shechinah* should be accepted as a guide to the interpretation of the constitution of the microcosm. I use the Kabbalistic names, though not precisely in the Kabbalistic sense, as I am not at liberty to use the Sanskrit equivalents. This *Shechinah* is an androgyne power, and is the *Thureeya Chaitanyam* of the cosmos. Its male form is the figure of man seen on the mysterious throne in the vision of Ezekiel. Its mystic constitution gives us, as it were, the equation to the microcosm. It is the eternal model of the perfected microcosm. The universal life copies this model in its work of evolutionary construction. This equation can be interpreted in nine ways, and it has been so interpreted by the ancient teachers. There are nine stand-points from which the microcosm can be looked at, and in nine ways has the constitution of the microcosm been explained. The real esoteric seven-fold classification is one of the most important, if not the most important classification, which has received its arrangement from the mysterious constitution of this eternal type. I may also mention in this connection that the four-fold classification claims the same origin. The light of life, as it were, seems to be refracted by the treble-faced prism of *Prakriti*, having the three *Gunams* for its three faces, and divided into seven rays, which develop in course of time the seven principles of this classification. The progress of development presents some points of similarity to the gradual development of the rays of the spectrum. While the four-fold classification is amply sufficient for all practi-

cal purposes, this real seven-fold classification is of great theoretical and scientific importance. It will be necessary to adopt it to explain certain classes of phenomena noticed by occultists; and it is perhaps better fitted to be the basis of a perfect system of psychology. It is not the peculiar property of "the trans-Himalayan esoteric doctrine." In fact it has a closer connection with the Brahminical Logos than with the Buddhist Logos. In order to make my meaning clear I may point out here that the Logos has seven forms. In other words there are seven kinds of Logoi in the cosmos. Each of these has become the central figure of one of the seven main branches of the ancient Wisdom-religion. This classification is not the seven-fold classification we have adopted. I make this assertion without the slightest fear of contradiction. The real classification has all the requisites of a scientific classification. It has seven distinct principles, which correspond with seven distinct states of Pragna or consciousness. It bridges the gulf between the objective and subjective, and indicates the mysterious circuit through which ideation passes. The seven principles are allied to seven states of matter, and to seven forms of force. These principles are harmoniously arranged between two poles, which define the limits of human consciousness. It is abundantly clear from all that has been said in this controversy, that the classification we have adopted does not possess these requisites. It is admitted by Madame H. P. Blavatsky, that in her classification there are not seven distinct seats of consciousness (see p. 451). The arrangement of the principles also is not regular. The life principle, for instance, which is alleged to have for its vehicle the *linga sarira*, is made to precede the latter instead of following it. Such defects show that the classification we have hitherto used is not quite sound and scientific. It was to pave the way for the adoption of the real classification that I ventured to criticize the old classification, and I hardly expected that my remarks would give rise to such a controversy. It will be a mere waste of time at present to explain the real seven-fold classification. There is not the slightest chance of my being heard. Time will show whether I was justified in my criticism or not. Personally I am not in the least interested whether the members of the Theosophical Society adhere to or reject the seven-fold classification. I have no desire of having a following of my own in the Society, or starting a separate branch for enforcing my own views on the matter. There is but one statement more in the reply to which it is necessary for me to advert. I have not held Madame H. P. Blavatsky responsible for the mistakes of "Man" and "Esoteric Buddhism," as she and some of her friends seem to think. I merely grouped together all the various inconsistent statements found in prominent theosophical publications about the classification under enquiry, and in giving my quotations I referred to the various books and articles by name. I nowhere alleged or insinuated that Madame H. P. Blavatsky should be held responsible for the blunders committed by others. The scope of my argument will be clear if my article is carefully perused. But before the heat of advocacy subsides there is no chance of preventing people for raising unnecessary side issues for the purpose of

quarrelling. I am extremely sorry that I have entered into this unpleasant controversy. I hope Madame H. P. Blavatsky will kindly excuse me if I have in any way wounded her feelings by my remarks or criticism.

T. SUBBA ROW.

Reviews.

THE RIG VEDA.

It is only within recent times that any of the Vedic texts have been available in printed form, and since their publication a whole literature on the subject has sprung up in Europe. But such editions of the Vedas as have hitherto appeared are, if not imperfect like that of the Royal Asiatic Society, of which only one volume has appeared, too costly to allow of their circulation in this country. Mr. Tookaram Tatya in bringing out a cheap edition of the Rig Veda Sanhita has laid all Sanskrit students throughout India under a deep debt of gratitude. The whole of the Sanhita may be now purchased for four and a half rupees—about one-fourth the price of any other complete edition. When we consider that the sacred book is now within the reach of every student, to so many of whom it was, for all practical purposes, a sealed book, we are almost tempted to look upon this publication as marking a new epoch in the present revival of Sanskrit. All those Branches of the Theosophical Society which boast of a library will of course provide themselves with copies, but we would specially urge upon all our readers that they should make this publication known among their friends and acquaintances, as there are, to our knowledge, a large number of persons who would be only too glad to possess a copy did they know how and where it could be obtained so cheaply. We may add that the printing is admirably executed in large, clear, Devanagari type.

It is not for us here to dilate on the value of the Vedas. They are prized even by those who see in them no more than the untutored utterances of a simple people, while to the initiate who understands the hidden plan on which they are composed, they reveal the powers and laws of the forces of nature and the springs of evolutionary development.

Mr. Tookaram Tatya informs us that the "Theosophical Publication Fund" has now started two new branches, the one to undertake the publication of Sanskrit books (the publication of the work under notice being the first of these), and the other to issue, in monthly parts, reprints of the old Marathi works on philosophy and religion. Of the latter Marathi translations of the "Yoga Vashistha" of the Sadhu Ekhnathswami, and the "Amritasambhava" by the Sadhu Dyaneshwar, have been commenced.

It is intended to print the Rig Veda Sanhita Bhashya by Sayanacharya in eight parts, and after this other Vedic works will be published.

We also hear that a new edition of Wilkins' translation of the Bhagavad Gita, with the slokas in Sanskrit, is in preparation, as also are a "Guide to Theosophy" and the Sankhyakarika, with Gondapada's commentaries in Sanskrit.

Correspondence.

THE RELIGION OF CHRIST AND MODERN "CHRISTIANITY."

THERE are two important documents which illustrate so well the difference between the doctrines of the Christian religion and the way in which these doctrines are carried out by the professed followers of Christ, that it seems worth while to reproduce them in the *Theosophist* for the benefit of those readers who find it difficult to free their minds from the ingrafted superstition that the Christian clergy are the true representatives of the religion of Christ, and who consider all that is said against clerical arrogance and assumption as an attack against the spirit of Christianity. There is also another class of readers, "freethinkers," upon whom the mere mention of such terms as "Christ," "God," etc., has the same effect as the shaking of a red cloth before the eyes of an infuriated bull. They too labour under a misconception of terms, and cannot see that the living Christ, the Light of the *Logos*, is not identical with the "Christ" whose vice-regents and representatives Christian clergymen imagine themselves to be.

The living spirit of Christ, whose voice is still heard by all who are able to hear it, whether they have been "baptized" or not, teaches that men should love each other and even their enemies; that they should forgive those who injure them and do good to those by whom they have been offended. The following is a translation of the malediction which the viceroy of Christ upon this earth, the "meek, mild and gentle old man," Pope Pius IX, during the time of his "blissful pontificate" sent out against the King of Italy, Victor Emanuel, because the latter had carried out certain political measures, which interfered to a certain extent, with the financial interests of the Catholic Church. The curse is as follows:

"In the power of the Omnipotent God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, in the power of the laws of the holy Church, in the power of the Immaculate Virgin, the mother and nurse of our Saviour, in the power of the Angels, Arch-angels, Thrones, Dominions, Cherubims and Seraphims, of all holy Patriarchs and Prophets, of all Apostles, Evangelists, holy Martyrs and Witnesses, of the holy Virgins and all Saints and all which have been elected by God; We—hereby excommunicate and expel him from the Church and separate him (the king) from the threshold of the holy Church of Almighty God; that he may be tortured with eternal pain and suffering with Dathan and Abiram, and with all those who speak to God: Avaunt we desire none of thy ways! And as the fire is extinguished with water; likewise shall his light be for ever extinguished."

"May the Father who created mankind curse him! May the Son who suffered for us all curse him. May the Holy Ghost who was given to us in baptism curse him! May the holy cross upon which Christ rose in triumph over his enemies curse him. May the holy and eternal virgin Maria, the mother of God, curse him! May the holy Michael, the advocate of holy souls, curse him. May all the angels, arch-angels, principalities, powers and all the celestial armies curse him. May the holy St. John, the precursor, and John the Baptist, Saint Peter, Paul and Andrew and all the other apostles of Christ curse him. May the other disciples and the four evangelists, who by their doctrines converted the whole world, may the admirable society of martyrs and witnesses who, in consequence of their holy works have become our advocates before God, curse him."

"May the choir of the holy virgins who, in honour of Christ, have treated with contempt the things of this world, damn him; may all the saints, who ever since the beginning of the world have been the favourites of God, damn him; may the heaven and the earth, and everything holy contained therein, damn him."

"May he be damned wherever he is, at home or upon the field, upon the street or upon a path, in a forest, in the water, or within a church. Let him be damned in life and in death, while eating or drinking, fasting or suffering thirst, dozing or sleeping, waking and walking, standing or sitting, resting or working, and even when he goes to—bleed himself."

"He shall be cursed in all the internal and external powers of his body. He shall be cursed in his hairs and in his brain, upon the crown of his head and in his temples, upon his forehead and in his ears; in his eyebrows and cheeks, in his jaws and nostrils, in his front and back teeth; in his lips and œsophagus, in his shoulders and joints, in his arms, hands and fingers."

"He shall be damned in his mouth, his breast, his heart and in all the intestines of his body. He shall be damned in his veins and groins, his knees, legs, feet and toes. He shall be cursed in all the joints and sinews of his members. There shall be nothing healthy about him from the top of his head down to the soles of his feet."

"May the Son of the living God with all His glorious majesty curse him; may the heavens with all the powers moving therein rise against him, curse him and damn him! Amen. Yes! Amen!"

These were the words spoken by the venerable Pope and written down in the official document of the Church. That this solemnly and publicly denounced curse had no visible effect upon the poor King, seems to be sufficient proof that the Catholic Church has lost that spiritual power which is said to have been given to her; or, perhaps, that she never possessed that power at all. Her efforts to inflict evil being impotent, it cannot reasonably be supposed that she possesses any spiritual power for good, or is able to impart the "Holy Ghost" (which she does not possess) upon any one; it is far more reasonable to believe that she does not monopolize the Holy Ghost, that her blessings are as worthless as her curses are without power, and that her claims to superiority and sanctity, not being sustained by facts, are merely illusions and idle pretensions. But if this is true, then we see the most powerful Church of the world based upon a gigantic fraud: we see governments, kings and courts of justice in league with those who defraud the public, and the lover of humanity being horrified at the stupendous amount of ignorance existing in the civilized world, will involuntarily exclaim: "How long, Oh Lord! how long will it be until reason begins to dawn upon the world?"

But if a ray of reason actually falls among the ranks of the benighted followers of the Babylonian Beast, let us see how they treat it. If the money bags of the Church are in danger, the cry arises that the religion of Christ is in danger, as if money and Christ were identical. If the absurd and blasphemous pretensions of priestcraft are shown to be what they are, then the truth is denied, and he who dares to express the truth is denounced as a traitor and a child of the Devil. This fact is well illustrated in the second document, being a copy of the speech made by the Roman Catholic Bishop Strossmeyer at the Council of Bishops and Cardinals in the Vatican in Rome, at the time when the "infallibility of the Pope" was made into a dogma and publicly proclaimed. We give it in an abbreviated form. Bishop Strossmeyer said:

"Reverend Fathers and Brothers!—Not without trembling, but free and tranquil in my conscience, I rise to speak in this solemn assembly. I have listened attentively to the speeches which have been made in this room, and I have earnestly desired that a ray of light from above may illuminate my mind and enable me to vote in this holy œcumenical assembly according to the dictates of reason and justice. Penetrated with the knowledge of my responsibility, I have seriously studied the writings of the Old and New Testaments, and enquired whether the holy Pope who presides at this Council is really the successor of St. Peter, the vice-regent of Jesus Christ, and the infallible teacher of the Church? I have studied these documents and I have found nothing which would justify such claims. I have not even found a Pope, being a successor of Peter or a representative of Christ, mentioned in the history of the ancient church.

"You, Monsignore Manning (the English bishop) will say that I am blaspheming, and you Mr. Pie, will accuse me of being insane; but you are both wrong. I have read the whole of the New Testament, and here I lift my hand to this great Crucifix, and I declare before God, that I have not found a trace of Papacy as it exists at present. Reverend brothers, do not refuse me your attention. Do not by groans and interruptions justify the sayings of those who, like Father Hyacinthe, assert that this Council is not free; but that we had been ordered beforehand how to vote. I thank His Excellency the Bishop Dupauloup for the sign of agreement which he gives by moving his head, and I continue. I cannot find a single verse in the Bible, which would go to show that Jesus Christ gave to Saint Peter any power over the Apostles, his co-labourers. Reason tells us, that if Christ would have wanted to make Peter his successor and to appoint him as the head of the Apostolic Collegium, he would have said so."

(The Bishop now proves with strong arguments that Christ appointed no such successor, and that the Popes could not be the vice-regents of Christ. His speech is frequently interrupted by such cries as, "Be still, you heretic! You lie! It is not true! Let him leave the pulpit! Close up his mouth! etc." Still the valiant Bishop goes on to show that Peter never has been a bishop of Rome and that the tradition of his having been at Rome, is merely a fable.)

"I am ready to be silent"—he continues—"but is it not better that we should prove things before we decide about them? We are here in the presence of a dictator, who is superior to us all, and before whose decision even Pius IX must bow his head. This dictator is history. History is not like a piece of clay which can be moulded at pleasure. Here I hear a voice saying, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." (Math. i. 6). By this "Rock" you understand the apostle Peter; and if this interpretation were correct, there would be an end to our dispute. But our forefathers were of a different opinion, and they knew certainly something about this matter. Saint Cyril says: "I believe that this "rock" refers to the firm power of Faith." Saint Hilarius says: "This rock is the blessed rock of Faith, and upon this Faith has the Church been built." Saint Hieronymus says: "The Church has been built upon the rock of Faith, and after this rock the Apostle Peter received his name." Saints Chrysostomus, Ambrosius, Augustinus teach the same doctrine. "The Church of Christ is built upon the faith in the living Christ and upon nothing else." (Calls and interruptions. Stop you impudent Protestant).

"I am not a Protestant, I merely quote history. If I have asserted anything which history shows to be false, prove it to me to be so, and

I will revoke what I said: but have patience and you will see that I have not said all I might say, and which history shows to be true, and I am therefore forced to continue, even if death upon a stake were waiting for me, upon St. Peter's place."

"Mons. Dupauloup very properly said that if we declare Pius IX to be infallible, we must logically maintain the infallibility of all the previous Popes; but history shows that they were by no means infallible, as the following facts will show: Pope Victor (192) first approved of Montanism and afterwards condemned it. Marcellinus (296—303) offered incense to the heathen goddess Vesta. Gregor I (578-590) calls every one *Antichrist* who accepts the title of universal bishop; but Boniface III (607—608) caused the parricidal emperor Phocas, to convey this title upon him. Pascal II (1088-1099) and Eugenius III (1145—1153) sanctioned duelling, but Julius II. (1509) and Pius IV (1560) prohibited it. Hadrian II (867-872) declared civil marriages to be valid, Pius VII (1800-1823) condemned them. Sextus V (1585-1590) published an edition of the Bible and recommended its reading; Pius VII condemned and prohibited it. But I would never come to an end, if I were to attempt to expose all the contradictions of the Popes and their doctrines. If you declare the infallibility of the present Pope you must either prove (what is impossible) that the Popes never have contradicted each other, or you must say that the Pope began to become infallible only in 1870. Perhaps the people may pass silently and carelessly by such theological questions, which they cannot comprehend and whose importance they do not see; but although they may care nothing about principles, they will not be blind to facts. What shall we answer to the protestants, if they recall the histories of the Roman Bishops from the time of Lucas down to Pius IX?" (call: "Stop! It is enough.")

"Pope Vigilius (538) bought the Papacy of Belisar, the Viceroy of the Emperor Justinian. It is however true that he broke his promise and never paid what he had promised to pay. Pope Eugenius III (1145) imitated Vigilius. You all know the history of Formosus: Stephan XI caused the corpse clad in the Papal apparel to be exhumed, the fingers which were used to bless to be cut off and the body to be thrown into the river. He himself was soon afterwards imprisoned by the people, poisoned and choked to death. Romanus, the successor of Stephan, and afterwards John X, restituted the honourable memory of Formosus, whom Stephan had officially declared to have been a perjurer and a bastard. These are facts, which we would like to ignore, but of which it is at present our duty to speak. The celebrated Cardinal Barosius speaking of the Papal Court of these days, says: "The Roman Church was like a powerful prostitute ruling at Rome. The highest positions and honours in the Catholic Church could be bought for money or be obtained by favour." Tenebrado, a historian (901), says: "This is an unfortunate age, because for nearly 150 years the Popes have departed from virtue and have acted more like renegades than as apostles." Speaking of John XI, the natural son of Pope Seraius and the woman Marozia, he says: "The holy (Roman) Church has been fearfully degraded by this monster." John XII (956) having been elected Pope at the age of 19 years through the influence of prostitutes, was no better than his predecessors. I will say nothing of Alexander VI, father and lover of Lucretia, nor of John XXII (1316) who denied the immortality of the human soul. At those times the Papal chair was occupied sometimes by two and even three claimants. Which one of those was the true (infallible) Pope?"

"If you declare the present Pope to be infallible, you must also declare that all the Popes who existed before him were infallible. Can

you do this and assert that stingy, incestuous, murderous and sacrilegious Popes have been the true vice-gerents of Christ? To do so were to commit treason upon Christ, to throw dirt in his face." (Calls: "Down from the pulpit! Quick, Stop the mouth of the heretic!")

"Reverend brothers! You are making much noise, but would it not be better to weigh my words upon the scales of justice? You may announce the infallibility of the Pope! but history will protest eternally against your decision." (Cries: "Down with the traitor! Put him out, the Protestant, the Calvinist, the traducer of the Church!")

"Your cries Monsignori does not frighten me. My words may be hot, but my head is cool. I belong neither to Luther nor to Calvin, neither to Paulus nor to Apollo, but to Christ." (Renewed cries: "Anathema! Anathema! The renegade!" etc.)

"Anathema! Monsignori, Anathema! you know very well that you do not protest against me but against the Apostles. If they were to come to you now, would they say anything different from what I have said to you. Would you dare to tell them: We prefer the doctrines of our Popes to yours? Alas! If the ruler of all desires to punish the Church, he need not call upon the soldiers of Garibaldi, to drive us away from the eternal city; it will be sufficient for him to permit you to make a god out of Pius IX, as you have made a goddess out of the holy Virgin."

The finishing words of this speech were spoken among a great noise and uproar made by the assembled Bishops and Cardinals. Many rose and left the room with signs of disapprobation; but many Italians, Americans and Germans, also a few French and Englishmen surrounded the valiant speaker and congratulated him, who, if he had lived two hundred years before, would certainly have had to pay for his audacity by being burned alive upon a stake. The effect which this speech had upon Pius IX and his followers was merely nil: they treated it with contempt.

Seventeen years have now passed away since the absurdity of Papal infallibility was publicly proclaimed, and millions of people give their silent consent by still adhering to the Church of Rome, while the number of the so-called "Old Catholics" who refuse to believe in Papal infallibility is growing less every day; because they have neither the money nor the prestige which is at the command of the Church of Rome. The power of the Roman Catholic Church still grows in spite of all the blunders performed by its leaders. This fact is very suggestive. It seems that the "Age of Reason" has not yet begun to dawn; or is it perhaps an indication that the mass of the people crave after some external form of worship and care nothing about the principles upon which such a worship is based?

H.

THEOSOPHICAL THEORIES OF THE MICROCOSM.

THE greatest schisms often come about through the supporters of one cause disputing over mere terminology. Mr. Subba Row, in his able addresses on Bagavad Gita, condemned "the sevenfold classification" which has come to be very largely accepted among Theosophists all over the world, and declared, that as that particular classification seemed to him unscientific and misleading, he preferred to adopt another. This brought out a reply which was published in *The Path*, and one which H. P. Blavatsky wrote for the *Theosophist*. As editor of the first named magazine I saw no occasion to enter into any part of the small contest,

although at the time the first reply was not really on its face an argument newly propounded for the theory, but rather one pointing out possible inconsistencies in Mr. Subba Row's position. In the May *Theosophist* Mr. Subba Row goes at more length into the matter, and it seems that if his two articles are taken together a way out of the difficulty may be found.

As his articles appeal to my eyes and mind, the real difficulty seems to be, not with *any* and *all sevenfold* classifications, but with the *particular sevenfold classification* found in *Esoteric Buddhism* and other theosophical works. He has in many places given in his adherence to the number *seven* as a perfect number, but that does not necessarily bind him to the sevenfold division of *Esoteric Buddhism*. And although I have been an adherent of the Theosophical Society longer than our brother Subba Row, as well as an admirer and supporter of H. P. Blavatsky for many years and am still, yet I cannot adopt the manner in which the terms in the equation of man have been allotted by the author of *Esoteric Buddhism*. I have all along thought that that allotment was more or less tentative, but still have always believed that man—taken as a whole—could be called a sevenfold composition. While the changes of position given to the various "principles" have been going on, I have preferred to stick to the threefold division of *Body, Soul* and *Spirit*, leaving it open to me to say whether or not I would adopt a fourth—that is, the whole three together.

On page 506, May *Theosophist*, I find Mr. Subba Row saying:—"I am yet to be convinced that the sevenfold classification we have adopted was the *real sevenfold classification of this ancient school of occultism*." (The italics are mine.) From this we must conclude that he believes the ancient school did have a sevenfold classification, but that ours is not the same. In this—if it be his position—I agree with him. But we should never quarrel over mere words or numbers. If one should say "I believe in duality, and not in the septenary," he would be right so long as he admits that one of two making up the duad was not perfectly known to him in all its parts; for in the duality could be found every one of the seven or the nine, or the twenty-five principles into which some other philosopher chose to divide the human subject. So for the present, I say I believe in the *ternary* division, that being one more easily comprehended by the minds of this Kali-Yuga.

This brings us to the question:—"Is it possible for the mind of this Yuga or perhaps of this part of it—to thoroughly comprehend a psychological enumeration which includes seven numbers?" We can grasp seven easily enough in lower things, such as mathematics, the days of the week, and so on, but I doubt if the undeveloped man can, with his unregenerated mind, grasp *seven* when applied to the unknown quantities of the higher nature. The more especially is this difficult when one considers the poverty of the English language in psychological things.

It is a language that has come up out of piracy, brigandage and war. Very true that it has taken over words from almost all languages, but for what purposes? To suit the uses of nations bound on the path of self aggrandisement, of mere money getting, of individualism. How could European minds understand the statement that there may be an astral body and an astral shape also, each distinct from the other, when they have always known that *body* is a thing due to accretions from beef and beer? And if one were to tell them that upon approaching the hall of Brahman a point is reached where the flavour of Brahman is perceived, while at another point the glory of Brahman becomes apparent, they

would understand the flavour as something due to seasoning or sauce, and the glory to be a mere effulgence or wide extended fame. But it was necessary to direct their minds to the fact that there is more of man than mere body, and therefore such books as *Esoteric Buddhism*, *Zanoni* and others came before them. And in Mr. Sinnett's book some division had to be adopted that Western minds could grasp until they were able to go higher. But for my part I have never understood that his book was gospel truth. The great basis of our Society would be undermined by any such doctrine, just as much as his own progress would be retarded did he fancy that the views expressed by him were his own invention. In his work he has been careful to show that his teachers hold that a comprehension of numbers is coincident with a development of certain inner senses or principles in man; and as he says that our "fifth principle" is only in germ, it must follow under the law of correspondences,—that it is impossible for the present man to grasp an equation, relating to these higher states, which includes more than five terms. The result then is that when we deal with these matters we will have to use the unknown quantity x , and leave every one who deals intellectually with the problem to his own manner of placing the different terms. Those who investigate the subject, however, by means of the inner guide, will discover upon attempting to convey their experiences to their intellect-using fellows, that it is not possible to put their hearers into complete possession of the information gained in that way. But even if both of these classes in the West are left to their own devices, many decades will pass away, and many false as well as ridiculous systems will arise, grow up and disappear, before the whole truth will be known. But if that object of our Society which calls for a demonstration of the value of the ancient Aryan philosophy and psychology is sedulously pursued, we may hope for an earlier dawn of a better day. Who then are to be foremost in this? Our brothers who now possess Hindu bodies! They are within reach of the material, they are now in bodies that have grown on Indian soil, they are charged with a debt to the great sages of the past. Let them faithfully translate those books into English, explaining the terms as nearly as possible in every case, and not go on with mere transliterations of words that do not exist for the West. Thus the power and energy of the West will be wedded to the metaphysics and spiritual inheritance of the East, while both will be saved from a greater darkness. If this is not done, the day will come when the Hindu of to-day will find that he has failed to help his Western brothers who were in reality once themselves Hindus. Mr. Subba Row can very easily—owing to his mastery of English—enlighten us all by giving us better translations, or if his time will not allow that, by inducing many Brahmans in India by whom he is held in high esteem, to act upon suggestion of his in that direction.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

ॐ

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. VIII. No. 96.—SEPTEMBER 1887.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

BUDDHISM IN JAPAN.

THE sources of information in English about Buddhism in Japan are very scanty. Almost the only details available have to be gleaned from Mr. Bunyiu Nanjio's little book entitled "A Short History of the Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects," an abridged translation from Japanese MSS., and it is upon this authority that the present writer relies for his information, and as the book is published in Tokyo, Japan, many of our readers may not be able to come across it.

The first introduction of Buddhism into China took place in 67 A. D. when two Indian priests, Kasyapa Matanga and Chiku Horan, arrived at the Chinese capital bearing with them an image of the Lord Buddha and some sacred books. In later times some fourteen sects were developed, now included in the two great divisions of the Blue-robe sect and the Yellow-robe sect, the latter including Lamaism.

Not until nearly five hundred years after China, in 552 A. D., did Japan become acquainted with the doctrine of Buddha. In that year the King of Kudara, one of the three divisions of Corea, presented the Japanese Emperor with an image of Buddha and some sacred books. The teachers of the Japanese were priests from Corea and China and some of the Japanese also went to China to study the doctrine.

Of the twelve principal sects of Japanese Buddhists, the first is called the Ku-Sha-Shū or Abhidharma-Kosa-Sastra sect, taking its name from the principal book of the school. This book was composed in India by Vasubandhu, who lived about nine centuries after Buddha. This sastra was translated into Chinese first in 563 A. D., and secondly in 654 A. D. In 658 A. D. two Japanese priests went to China and returned, bringing with them the translation.

You are free:



to **Share** — to copy, distribute and transmit the work



to **Remix** — to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:



Attribution — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).



Noncommercial — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.



Share Alike — If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under the same or similar license to this one.

With the understanding that:

Waiver — Any of the above conditions can be **waived** if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Public Domain — Where the work or any of its elements is in the **public domain** under applicable law, that status is in no way affected by the license.

Other Rights — In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:

- Your fair dealing or **fair use** rights, or other applicable copyright exceptions and limitations;
- The author's **moral** rights;
- Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is used, such as **publicity** or privacy rights.

Notice — For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work. The best way to do this is with a link to this web page.