

LE SPIRITISME.*

THIS, the latest French Book on Spiritualism, is written by a medical man who has, by a number of contributions to the principal French medical journals, given proof of his ability as a scientist.

His book may be shortly described as a plea for attention to spiritualism from the modern scientific investigator. He gives a sketch of the rise and development of modern spiritualism in America and Europe and shows by quoting experiences narrated by travellers in America among the American Indians, and in India, that similar phenomena have been observed in different parts of the world, among men of different races. The work contains a good summary of the experiments of Mr. Crookes and others, as well as a detailed account of the author's own experiences with Slade and other mediums, some of whom were private persons of the highest respectability.

Dr. Gibier does not put forward any definite theory of his own; his position is simply that here we have a mass of undeniable phenomena of an order previously unknown to modern science, and therefore that it is the duty of those who are the guides of the scientific thought of the day to examine into these phenomena as they do into those produced by heat, electricity, and the like. The writer hints that in his opinion it is quite possible that in investigations akin to those invited by modern spiritualism we may be able to find at least a closer solution than any yet offered to the problem "know thyself." We hope this book will be, as it deserves to be, extensively read. Without unnecessary digressions the author gives us a body of well-arranged facts and some of the conclusions already suggested by them to other observers. In a short compass he has succeeded in giving the average reader a clear idea of the rise, progress, and nature of modern spiritualism, and it now remains for others to follow out his recommendation and push forward investigations on their own account.

Dr. Gibier seems to desire the formation of a French society for psychical research, but somehow or other, ever since the celebrated enquiry into mesmerism by the French Academy, societies of this kind have not prospered. A good deal was expected of the English society; but there seems to be so much wrangling between them and the spiritualists, and so much bad feeling has been created by gratuitous assumptions on the part of those who are supposed to be, by hypothesis, absolutely impartial investigators, that it is to be feared the high hopes are doomed to disappointment; and so we think that if Dr. Gibier can succeed by his writings in awakening a few individuals here and there to the fact that there really are a few things outside the domain of modern science that require to be taken note of, he will have done good and achieved as great a measure of success as he could hope for.

* "Le Spiritisme (Fakirisme Occidental)," par le Dr. P. Gibier. Paris, 1887.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—We regret that for want of space we are unable to print the Correspondence in this issue. We hope to insert it in our next.—Ed.

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. VIII. No. 92.—MAY 1887.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

STUDIES IN BUDDHISM.

(Continued from page 390.)

A WRITER on Buddhistic Theosophy in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1885 condemns the system in unmeasured terms on the strength of statements concerning it which are altogether the reverse of the truth. He begins by saying that between the Northern and Southern types of Buddhism there is surprisingly little in common. That is not the opinion of cultivated Buddhists, but simply an erroneous view arising from the fact that English writers on Northern or Tibetan Buddhism have been greatly misled by accounts of that system given by Roman Catholic Missionaries, anxious to show, regardless of chronology, that Lamaism was derived from Christianity. It might as well be argued that Chaucer's Canterbury Tales are a plagiarism on Voltaire, but we need not go into that point at length. The Southern form of Buddhism is the simpler and more materialistic, in the sense that it does not attempt to grapple with some extremely recondite metaphysical subtleties dealt with even in the exoteric writings of the Northern school, but the two schools are the same in essentials, and are less divergent than the Protestant and Roman Churches as forms of Christianity. The tendency of this "quasi-religion" to heterogeneity, says the writer in the *Church Quarterly*, proceeding on the basis of his false assumption as if it were an absolute fact, is due to its fragmentary character. He thus explains a state of things which does not exist by an assertion which is not the fact: and then he develops the assertion: "The system does not itself possess—a *theology*. For Buddhism proper has no conception of the Divine, no consistent eschatology, no feeling for the world and for temporal things beyond an impatient loathing and repulsion. Its entire

energy is concentrated in the effort to undo and shake off all relations between the soul and its material environment. Success in this constitutes *Nirvana*, an ascent into the *Athman*—that is the unchangeable, the absolute, the *ens realissimum*,—or, strange to say, the everlasting Negative.”

Every clause of this sentence, every implication it makes, is erroneous, and most of them are diametrically so. The only one which has a superficial resemblance to the truth is the first—that Buddhism has no Theology. It may not have what the *Church Quarterly Review* would mean by a theology. But it has a profound science of divine things, and directly the writer before us drops his technical expressions and puts what he means in the abstract form—when he says that Buddhism has no conception of the divine—he makes a statement which, for earnest students of the higher Buddhism, could only be paralleled by saying of chemistry that it is a system which does not itself possess a microscope and has no conception of minuteness.

The strange contradictions of Buddhism, our author thinks, are due to its being a re-action—a product of “profound weariness of human life,” of a suicidal asceticism. Here the cart is very simply put before the horse, and the recognition of that will render intelligible not merely the mistakes of many Western writers concerning Buddhism, but the mistaken excesses of some among its own devotees, which fortify and lend some colour to these mistakes. The Buddhist ascetic of the higher kind, guided by Buddha’s injunctions to those who seek the monastic life, or by that un-written lore of Eastern philosophy which operates still more potently in the same direction,—foregoes the pleasures of physical existence *not* in loathings for them as such, but from a clear perception of the fact that, being transitory, they can give no enduring happiness, and because he realises that there is a higher spiritual life to be attained by physical self-denial. Because he does not advertise this in the *Times* and explain his motives beforehand to friends in England, the Western Orientalist calmly assumes that he is a crazy fool acting without any motives.

“Buddhism then,” says our reviewer, advancing still from one misconception to another, blindly unaware of the fact that all his premises have given way behind him, “has two aspects. In the first and more pleasing it is an ethical rule embodying certain of the truths of natural religion. In the second and later it is an indeterminate system of autological philosophy.”

“Indeterminate” only in the sense that its philosophy is held to be too intricate for the world at large, and has therefore been hitherto reserved for the study of the few who devote their lives to its comprehension. The ethical rules of popular Buddhism are designedly kept down to the simplest terms for the comprehension of the people at large. Doctrine in its higher details is reserved for the initiates.

But even in commenting on “this rule,” the writer before us mis-states its significance. “Indeed, the only *good* life, according to Buddhist standards, is the monastic.” He might have been guarded, one would have thought, from this particular misconception,—

which almost comically inverts the truth,—by remembering that the Buddhist system is so organised that the doctrinal instruction required for the ascetics who seek to hasten their spiritual growth, is kept back from the people at large, who are only supplied with as much ethical teaching as is required for men *content* to live a good life and float along on the normal stream of evolution. “Every good Buddhist,” we are *now* told, “*must* be a monk, and so only can Nirvana, *i. e.*, Salvation, be attained.” The reverse is really taught by Buddhist writings. The monk is he who endeavours to hasten the process by abnormal efforts. “Beyond this call to all alike to embrace the ascetic life”—which Buddhism does *not* make, but which the article before us has wrongly supposed that it makes,—“Buddhism has no gospel to proclaim to the world: and it is certain that a mere gospel of despair can have little or no element of real permanence in it;” and then follows a quotation from Dr. Oldenburg’s *Buddha*, describing how the Buddhist turns away with weariness from this life “which promises to the cheerful sturdiness of an industrious struggling people thousands of gifts and thousands of good things,” and this weariness is indicated as having written itself, “in indelible characters in the whole of the wonderful history of this unhappy people.”

The *Church Quarterly* reviewer might have permitted his readers to perceive that he was not rightly interpreting this “weariness,” and this “mournful history” if he had gone on with the whole quotation. Dr. Oldenburg proceeds to point out that the character of Buddhist pessimism would be misunderstood if it were regarded as infused with “a feeling of melancholy which bewails an endless grief, the unreality of being.....The true Buddhist...feels compassion for those who are yet in the world...for himself he feels no sorrow... for he knows he is near his goal which stands awaiting him noble beyond all else.....He seeks Nirvana with the same joyous sense of victory in prospect with which the Christian looks forward to his goal.” The “gospel of despair” does not seem a phrase appropriately applied to the message on which he relies, and Dr. Oldenburg, from whom our critic clips a disjointed phrase which totally fails to convey the general drift of his argument, deals with the whole subject mainly to combat the idea that the creed of Buddhism is nihilistic. Far on in his book he writes: “Does this end of earthly existence imply at the same time the total cessation of being? Is it the nothing which receives the dying perfect one into its dominion? Step by step we have prepared the ground, so as now to be able to face this question,” and then with the natural prolixity of a German philosopher but in unmistakable language, he shows that no such gloomy teaching is really conveyed by the Buddhist writings which have been erroneously supposed to bear that significance. Dr. Oldenburg is far from having divined the real clue to the ambiguity of language in many of the Buddhist texts he so patiently weighs and analyses, but he is equally far—much further—from the upside down view of the subject which the *Church Quarterly* tries to make him support.

The four noble truths relating to the futility of physical life as a source of happiness, the desire of physical life as the cause by which souls are drawn back into incarnation, the neutralisation of this cause by the extinction of desire for physical life, and the possibility of extinguishing such desire only by a life of holiness, are interpreted by the writer before us as "resting" on the axiom that existence is in itself suffering," and therefore that the only remedy is to become as nearly as possible as though one were not living. Again the misunderstanding is ludicrous to the esoteric student of Buddhism and glaring to any one made acquainted with the spiritual science of the East on which the policy of the Buddhist monk in pursuing the ascetic life entirely depends. "A pessimism so thoroughgoing and deadly could hardly, it would seem, take a very general possession of any race in whom the vital forces were strong." By modern pessimists, I believe, the inner philosophy of Buddhism, on which the asceticism and reincarnations of its monks altogether rest, is condemned, not as being too pessimist, but as being incurably optimist,—pointing to a great preponderance of happiness in the long run as a consequence of existence,—reckoning physical, *plus spiritual* existence in one great account, but as usual the verdict of the *Church Quarterly* writer is wrong in that complicated manner which has to do as well with false inferences as with false bases. The sentence just quoted recast should stand:—a system of optimism so purely spiritual and so pitiless on the passions of the flesh, which are the weaknesses of the spirit, could hardly, it would seem, take a very general possession of any race in whom the vital forces were strong. And thus we arrive at a recognition side by side with our author of the fact that the intensely material generations of man steeped to the lips in our highly developed civilisation, are not in natural affinity with the Buddhist system of thought. That is quite true of our contemporary race as a whole, but it is true not because we are too spiritual for Buddhism, but because so far Buddhism has been too spiritual for us.

So ill does our reviewer understand the doctrine of metempsychosis "adopted by Gantama *sub silentio*," that he thinks it can hardly be said to blend well with the other features of his system. So far is it really from conflicting with these that it constitutes the keystone of the whole system without which it could not have been developed; from which all its doctrines of reincarnation spring, in reference to which all those reproaches are aimed at "existences," which the literal caricaturists of Buddhism pick up to support the monstrous theory that Buddha taught annihilation as a fact of nature, and as an object of desire. The correct appreciation of the true Buddhist doctrines of metempsychosis,—or rather of the evolution of man's soul through a long series of physical incarnations (not its descent into lower animal forms merely employed when mentioned at all in such a connexion to symbolise human passions,) will guard any one from the thousand misconceptions concerning the drift of Buddha's utterances as recorded by the exoteric writings in a somewhat enigmatical form. That doctrine is not peculiar to Buddhism. It runs through

all Indian philosophy, and is accepted as a practical fact of Nature by every spiritually educated Hindoo as well as by every Buddhist.

The ground on which the reviewer supposes the doctrine of rebirths to be inconsistent with (what he wrongly imagines to be) other features of the Buddhist system is worth a moment's attention. He says:—"for unquestionably the continued existence of an individual in one life after another implies the immortality of the soul, or principle of personality. Now Buddhism denies both the terms of this affirmation—the fact of immortality, and even the existence of the human soul." The looseness of language which thus uses the infinitely significant expression "immortality" as synonymous with survival after the death of the body is at the root of the mistake here. Buddhism does not deny—it affirms in a score of ways,—the survival of the human ego or soul through an enormous period of time—for millions of ages. But it recognises the law of progress and cyclic evolution as inherent in all natural processes, and therefore it perceives that the personality of any given man of one place in evolution must ultimately be destined to such transcendent elevation in the scale of Nature,—unless, indeed, at a very much later stage of that growth than any we need talk about for the present it should fail,—that, as I have already shown, it regards the term immortality as unscientific and inaccurate and therefore makes no use of it. Buddhism does not deny that which Western writers may generally intend to affirm when they employ the term "immortality"—it denies only the connotations of that term as severely thought out. In a frequently quoted passage which the reviewer once more brings forward to show that Buddha, as he thinks, denies the "permanence of the Ego" (meaning the survival), Ananda asks Buddha why he had given no answer to the wandering monk Vacchagotta who had asked him questions about the soul. Buddha explains in the replete and circuitous language of Oriental exposition that if he had said "the Ego is," the monk would have misunderstood him to mean that the soul remained for ever unchangeable, which would be contrary to the ultimate law of spiritual evolution. If he had said "the Ego is not," he would have been misunderstood to be affirming the doctrine of annihilation. Any one acquainted with the great subtlety and range of the esoteric doctrine will appreciate his reluctance to open up any of its intricacies in a conversation that could not afford an opportunity of developing them in detail. The *Church Quarterly* reviewer follows up the quotation of the Vacchagotta passage with a misleading quotation from Dr. Oldenburg's comment thereon. "Dr. Oldenburg," he says, "observes with perfect justice, 'if Buddha avoids the negation of the existence of the Ego, he does so in order not to shock a weak minded hearer.'" Dr. Oldenburg's real meaning is quite inadequately conveyed by this bald sentence, as will be appreciated by any one who will refer to page 266 of his book where he says:—"If any one describes Buddhism as a religion of annihilation and attempts to develop it therefrom as from its specific germ, he has in fact succeeded in wholly missing the main drift of Buddha and the ancient order of his disciples."

This is just what has been done by the writer in the *Church Quarterly Review*, and "missing the main drift" to begin with, he builds a quantity of irrelevant criticism concerning the collateral doctrines of Buddhism on his own wrong conclusions as to what the system affirms and denies. Thus he sets out to examine the theory of "Karma" by remarking "the system does not, as we have seen, acknowledge a soul or principle of individuality." He might as well set out to examine an astronomical speculation concerning the new star in Andromeda by saying, "the system, as we have seen, does not acknowledge the existence of matter outside the limits of Neptune's orbit." Just what an astronomical treatise beginning with that assumption might be expected to turn out—such is our reviewer's discourse on Karma. It is difficult to handle within a short compass, as it would be difficult to correct the outlines of a face looked at through a piece of corrugated glass. It is an altogether fantastic misunderstanding of the matter, in which even Dr. Rhys Davids' misunderstanding is taken as the starting point of a more aggravated perversion of the original doctrine.

That, in spite of being ghastly nonsense,—which indeed, it would be if it were what our reviewer represents it—Buddhism has been provoking a revival of sympathy of late years, is a fact which he then proceeds to consider, taking up as the "marked sign of the growth of this Neo-Buddhism.....the activity and rapid extension of what is known as the Theosophical Society." He quotes largely from, and in connexion with this branch of his subject exclusively discusses, the first of the books I have written bearing upon the Theosophical movement—"The Occult World." As the title of the far more important work "*Esoteric Buddhism*" stands amongst those which head the article, it is difficult to understand why he has ignored that, almost every page of which has some bearing on the interpretation of Buddhist doctrine, while the *Occult World* is a mere preliminary narrative of the very curious and interesting circumstances under which I was first drawn into the earnest study of Eastern esoteric philosophy. I have nothing to apologise for, nothing to retract in that original narrative, and I have never seen any criticism of the incidents recounted in that book which I could not have brushed away, and shown to be empty and valueless and illogical in open discussion with the authors thereof, but the book has scarcely anything to do with Buddhist Theosophy, and this fact may suffice to suggest how completely the writer in the *Church Quarterly* has failed to do justice to the modern current of thought he describes as the Neo-Buddhism of the Theosophical Society. The statements in *Esoteric Buddhism* concerning the view of nature taken by some thinkers in the East have been presented to the Western world on their own merits. Here I assert is a system of thought manifestly—as we who put it forward conceive,—coherent with the intention of a great many important Oriental writings, wonderfully consistent and harmonious in itself, constituting, in our opinion, the grammar of all theosophical thinking, woefully as this has sometimes gone astray.

We find that when, for the first time, this system is set forth in plain language, cultivated Brahmins, as well as Buddhists, say (*vide* correspondence in the *Theosophist*):—"Yes, that is our view of things; we have always been familiar with the leading ideas of that statement." The more we who have seriously taken up the study, apply our system as a key to the painful riddles of the earth, the more satisfactorily we find it to solve problems which seemed before to be hopeless. How irrelevant therefore at this time of day does it not seem for people who hear that there is such a movement of thought in the world to say "The man who has been instrumental in putting these thoughts afloat wrote a book some years ago about incidents which seem very trivial, compared with the destiny of the soul." *Per se* in their relation to occult physics, those incidents do not seem to me either trivial or unimportant, but they have no intellectual connexion whatever with the principles of "Buddhistic Theosophy." The writer in the *Church Quarterly* therefore does not seem to me entitled to congratulations on the judgment with which he has discussed them at great length, while evading all considerations of my other book entirely devoted to the subject he endeavours to treat, and replete with explanations which show the views he entertains to be erroneous.

Dr. Kellog's recent work,—"*The Light of Asia and the Light of the World*"—is an attack on Buddhism, especially designed to warn people from accepting the favorable view of that religion presented in Mr. Edwin Arnold's poem. The author, he himself says in the preface, "made up his mind long ago...that the gospel of Jesus Christ...is in a sole and exclusive sense the saving truth of God." His purpose therefore is to present what he conceives to be the tenets of Buddhism in a repulsive aspect and continually to call the reader's attention to the theory that such doctrines claim to be the Light of Asia. Unfortunately for the view he wishes to establish, the doctrines which he describes to be those of Buddhism are always at variance with and generally the exact reverse of what Buddhism really teaches. For example he says: "To sum up the case, so far is it from being true that the soul's immortality is a radical doctrine in Buddhism, and this doctrine one of its points of contact with Christianity, as has been asserted; even the existence of the soul is not admitted and the affirmation of its being is specially stigmatised as a heresy. There is nothing but 'name and form' that is all. No God! no revelation! no soul! and we are told that Buddhism is the Light of Asia!"

This passage is reproduced with an infinitude of variations throughout the book. The author makes a quotation from some Buddhist text: totally misapprehends it: infers from it that such and such a grotesque is a doctrine of Buddhism, and cries out what a shocking religion this is! And each misapprehension of this kind is in turn employed to fortify a denial that some other passage legitimately bears the spiritual meaning some other writers may have imputed to it. Thus Dr. Kellog tries to show that Nirvana merely means the attainment of a negative condition of existence in this life. "For according to Buddhist authorities, when a man

dies his body having perished, there remains no other part of him which can continue to exist. This is as true of the worldly as of the religious man." So all the passages in Buddhist writings which seem plainly to show that Nirvana is a state of existence enjoyed after death—a very glorious kind of spiritual existence,—are put aside as deprived of all significance by reason of—Dr. Kellog's primary blunder about the "heresy of individuality" and the denial by Buddhist authorities of immutability as a condition of the life after death. And building one misconception on another in a way which would be amusing for its absurdity if it were not annoying to have great ideas caricatured, he goes on to describe "what the Buddhists call by way of destruction *Parimbhāna*, the supreme Nirvana." This he understands to be the attainment of such an utterly negative existence that the man achieving such a state develops no karma to be the cause of another (!) man later on. "Nothing now remains in the man which could entail any moral necessity for the production at his death of a being who should reap the fruit of his karma. In other words, that particular continuous chain of personal existence in which I, for example, as now existing am a single link, is merely brought to an end."

The real doctrine of "*Parimbhāna*" as Dr. Kellog writes it, following the Pali spelling here, though he uses the Sanscrit spelling in the positive form of the word, can only be grasped after the true meaning of Nirvana is understood. All the spiritual beatitude which the human mind in its present (usual) state of development can think of—the most vivid consciousness, the most intense emotion,—the most over-whelming happiness—is attainable in the spiritual states (the devachanic states) intervening between the physical rebirths of the same entity. But in the course of an enormous futurity, the soul thus periodically bathed in a spiritual bliss which, though spiritual, has still some affinities with the higher emotions of earthly existence and individual consciousness, becomes ripe for a spiritual state which, in some way that we may talk about but which certainly few of us will realise, is enormously elevated above and superior on the cosmic scale to the devachanic state. This is the state of Nirvana and in a way which is wholly and entirely beyond the reach of a finite conception para-Nirvana is the superlative degree of Nirvana—a condition of existence so godlike, that speculation concerning it is hardly more practical for the Theosophist than for a student of science, speculation concerning the molecular physics of Sirius. However, though the primary meanings of Nirvana and para-Nirvana are as thus described, a secondary meaning attaches at all events to the word Nirvana. It is held by Buddhists that a psychological development is possible for some men even during physical life, which enables their inner consciousness to span the enormous gulfs which separate the normal man of the age from the normal man of a remote future. And by certain courses of very arduous training superimposed upon physical organisms born with appropriate attributes, it may happen that living men may not alone be enabled in trance to pass into the spiritual conditions of existence next adjacent to our own, but even in extraordinary cases taste or "attain" Nirvana—thus

anticipating the natural psychic evolution of eons. To no one with even the comprehension of the matter that the last few sentences may have suggested will the apparent contradictions to be discovered in the Buddhist writings on the subject of Nirvana present the smallest difficulty.

Dr. Kellog sets out by remarking in reference to the modern theory of evolution, that the general acceptance of the view may be partly responsible for having turned some people aside from Christianity. "As every one knows there are many who think that if once a theory of evolution be proved, then the hypothesis of a creator of the world is thereby shown to be a superfluity as if the discovery of the *method* of the formation of the universe, or of anything, relieved us from the necessity of supposing, an adequate sufficient cause". It is to be regretted that Dr. Kellog has merely made use of this profound remark to turn the flank of the scientific opponent set before his mind's eye for the moment, and has failed to see that it answers his own entirely erroneous assertion that in Buddhism there is no God. Since the Buddhist perceives quite plainly that the attributes of the God of the universe can only be considered with a prospect of comprehending them from the point of view of the consciousness of para-Nirvana, he does not perplex his lay congregations by endeavouring to interpret them in terms of earthly language and thought. But no misrepresentations of Buddhistic theosophy can be more grotesque,—no statement concerning it can convey to ordinary human minds an idea wider of the truth,—than that Buddhism is a religion of atheists who deny the existence of the Great First Cause, the supreme spiritual consciousness, the spirit which is the origin of all things, the fundamental reality of the cosmos. Dr. Kellog confidently assures his readers that the matter is not even in dispute with competent authorities.

"There is no God, is the central assumption of Buddhism. To this effect is the testimony of all the Buddhist books &c." To that effect *in the sense Dr. Kellog here intends*, he will not find one statement in any competent Buddhist authority. Wherever Buddha is represented as saying anything that modern readers construe as denying the existence of God, the significance of his language to all students of esoteric theosophy is unmistakeably different. The meaning is that nowhere in nature will be found a finite entity in the nature of a glorified man who is recognisable as the creator of the infinite cosmos. Buddha is merely concerned to break down the degrading conception of an anthropomorphic deity, and with that very simple clue to follow there is no passage in any Buddhist book about God which presents any embarrassment to the reader or lends colour for a moment to the extravagant statement concerning the "initial assumption" of Buddhism which Dr. Kellog ventures to put forward. Whenever an English version of some Oriental text may furnish a disjointed sentence here and there that seems to correspond with this conception, we may be perfectly sure that a mistranslation has in some way disfigured the original sense. The fact simply is that in contemplating the world Buddhism fixes its attention on the *method* of which Dr. Kellog speaks in the passage about evolution already quoted—and says little or

nothing about the cause behind that method which it conceives to be ineffable and indescribable. Other theological systems have skipped all reference to the method and have spoken only of the cause till their disciples, forgetting its remote grandeur, have invested it with the petty attributes of immediate vicinity. It is true as Dr. Kellog says that the recognition of the cause does not repudiate the method, but it is also true as he does *not* say, that the recognition of the method does not repudiate the cause.

A. P. SINNETT.

(To be continued.)

THE SIGNS OF THE TIME.

ONE has only to look about him with deliberate and passionless gaze, to discover that the days of Materialism are numbered; but it is not so with the forces of good and evil. These remain; Materialism and Spiritism ebb and flow, and the great mass of mankind are engulfed as with mighty waves. The popular idea of prosperity pertains to material things, and yet in this prosperity the masses seldom share. In the most prosperous countries known to modern times, even under democratic governments where the governing class and the wealthy owe their position to the suffrages or labour of the masses, these masses struggle with poverty and ignorance, only partially succeeding, at best, in beating back the devouring waves. When materialism declines, and when, as at the present time, a spiritual era begins, the condition is the same, though the terms of the equation often change sides, and the prospective enlightenment of a race ends in the liberation of a few, and the superstition of the many. If the rich and powerful are also superstitious, they look upon their own position as an evidence of the favour of heaven, and govern with a heavy hand. If intellectual enlightenment has removed superstition, the rulers become still more indifferent to the welfare of the masses, and are content with material dominion. It therefore transpires that in spiritual as in material prosperity only the few reap the fruits designed for all. The reason for this in either case is ignorance. Hardly one in a thousand of human beings in any community is more than half awake. The intoxication of wealth and the despair of poverty alike bewilder the soul of man.

The Bacchic frenzy of satisfied desire, equally with the unsatisfied craving, delude the real man; the one imagines that he possesses the source of happiness, the other that he lacks it. The rich man is sure to discover his mistake, and envy is likely to do for the poor what pride does for the rich.

The popular idea of a Christian's heaven only enables the rich and poor to change places, as Emerson has so well shown in one of his essays, for such is the logical sequence of rewards and punishments, based on belief and vicarious atonement. If the days of materialism are being numbered for the present generations of men, what under these conditions is to be the result? If belief in unseen powers and the immortality of the soul are to take the place of agnosticism and soulless materialism, what is to be the

result with the seething, sick, and struggling masses? What result to the wiser few? I answer superstition and fear for the many in the future as in the past: knowledge and enlightenment for the few. And why? I answer again, through *ignorance*.

When this time has arrived, prince and priest will rule by "divine right" as heretofore, and this patent of authority, when driven home to the last analysis, is nothing but the ignorant fear and superstition of the masses.

If all this be true, it gives a most profound significance to the present time; and this is history, and "history repeats itself." The philosophy of history has revealed the cycles of time.

This may be a doleful view, a discouraging outlook for humanity, but is it not nevertheless a true view? The signs of the present time reveal the dawn of a brighter day, but that day may again close in darkness. Creeds and superstition are crumbling to dust. The old shackles are being broken and the long imprisoned truth set free.

The Way, the Truth, and the Life are being declared, not to the rich, not to the wise, not to the powerful alone, but to every one who hath ears to hear. Not by favour of the gods, not by permission of kings, but because of the fulness of time, is the glorious sun of truth rising above the clouds of superstition and fear, and every one who wills may turn his eyes to the life-giving orb. The light that streams from the East for the healing of the nations shines once again for all. It is no respecter of persons. How many will look on it and be healed? Alas! not all who are groping in darkness desire the light. How many are joined to their idols! How many regard darkness as the natural condition and sole heritage of man! Who shall compel them to come in? A solution is offered of every question that has bewildered the mind and darkened the life of man; a way out of half our troubles, and all our perplexities, removing the sting of death, the sharpness of grief, and clothing even poverty itself in royal robes, such as kings might in vain envy. The cry has gone forth, Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the fountain and drink freely! How many have approached the fountain with questions, with timidity! The scientist has put a few drops under his microscope, the chemist reported his analysis, the physician declared the spring impossible, the bigot cried *poison*. Yet still it bubbles up in all its purity, sparkling with divine light and flooding the world for the healing of the nations. Few indeed have quaffed the pure waters. In every direction are springing up imitations. Some have poured a few drops of pure water into muddy wells, and are offering the compound at reduced rates as the genuine Elixir, with roads of easy ascent, so that the traveller may carry all his rubbish strapped to his back.

These are a few of the signs of the times. "He who drinks of the water that I shall give him shall thirst no more; there shall spring up in him a well of living water." In every human soul lies hidden the fountain of Youth; this fountain is clogged by pride, lust, greed, envy and all uncharitableness, the springs of knowledge and immortality clear it out and let its waters flow for the good of our fellow man. Do we fear that it shall run dry?

Know ye not that it takes its rise in the delectable mountains, and that the more it flows the more it receives; the more it withholds, the less it has, till the fires of self burn out the last drop, and the soul is seared as with devouring flame.

This is not a new religion, but the sentinels of the ages who have so long guarded the sacred stream give it out afresh. The old channels long ago ran dry, and the cry of humanity as with one voice has reached the loving watchers, like the wail of a sick child in the night borne to the mother's heart, and there has come the ready response, *Here am I*. Their motto is, truth and nothing but the truth, and truth against the world. Have they honoured the rich? Have they despised the poor? Have they sought dominion? Have they claimed authority? Where are the signs of evil? Servants of truth, they are the Masters of time. Obeying the law they are no longer bound but free. Wouldst thou approach their sacred abode? Lo! they have made plain the way, and promised an escort when by earnest zeal a certain station is past.

Is it too much trouble? Then blame only thyself for thy future woe. Dost think thou canst climb up some other way? Discover some easier road, then ask thou the right to try; and when involved in thine own conceit, and lost in the labyrinth, thou shalt curse thy folly, and bewail thy fate. May all good angels pity thy folly, only *thou* hast thy fate in thine own hands. The very gods cannot save thee against thy will. Seek then instruction of thine own soul. Listen to the voice of thy higher self, and when the ear of thy soul becomes quick to catch its loudest cry, perhaps thou mayest discern a still small voice bidding thee to come up higher.

HARIJ.

MIND AND BODY.

(Continued from page 427.)

MATERIALISM, as a theory, possesses no small attractiveness for the superficial thinker. The assertions of its leading advocates are as uncompromising and dogmatic as could be wished. Moreover it has, at first sight, a seemingly invincible array of evidence in its favour—to one who does not look below the surface. The phenomena of mental evolution in its ascending arc throughout Nature, the obvious dependence of the mind on the brain in life as shown in its phases of growth, maturity, decline or disease, the unvarying physical processes which attend thought, etc., all these and similar facts induce him to exceed the licence permitted by the law of concomitant variations, and to assert either that thought is nervous motion or that nervous motion produces thought. He leaps to this conclusion on the testimony of his senses, expresses sensation in terms of matter and resolves mental activities into problems of physics. A closer introspection, however, reveals the following flaws in the argument for Materialism.

(a) It is apparent that the recognition of consciousness as a mere "bye-product" (Tyndall), a mere symbol of certain physical processes—a sort of will-o'-the-wisp flickering over the cerebral

mechanism—involves as a corollary the doctrine of human automatism. If consciousness is a mere phantom generated amid the whizzing of the machinery of the brain without ability to interfere in the nervous processes, man is wholly the creation of his heredity and environment. Praise and blame are not logically justifiable, and the Criminal Code is a barbarous enactment, except in so far as the terrorism inspired by the law may be conceived to mould the heredity of future generations. But it is a fact of human experience resting on the widest induction possible, that an individual *does* possess liberty of action within constitutional limits. He can no more act without a motive than breathe without lungs; but the unmistakable deliverances of consciousness—the only reality we can *absolutely* postulate, all other "realities" being inferences of more or less probability only—assure him that, given the choice between two motives, he can be master of himself if he chooses.* Every disciple who has, as his first task, to reform the whole previous tendencies of his ideas and break up by sheer force of will the vicious sequence of certain trains of imaginative thought, will corroborate this statement.† The assertion of the Materialist as to his personal inability to do so, is of purely subjective value, and in no way binding on anyone but himself. But Materialists occasionally fall into an inconsistency by ignoring their own doctrines. Thus we find Dr. Lewins, the founder of the "Hylo-Idealistic" philosophy—a sort of hybrid between Materialism and Idealism—speaking of men who "were the slaves, not the rulers of their ideas." Now on the basic principles of his own philosophy no man *can* by any possibility be the "Ruler" of his ideas,—the "physical processes in the brain [of which consciousness is only a "bye-product"] being complete in themselves."‡

Experimental proof of the reality of this liberty of action is within the reach of every sceptic—and moreover is invariably assumed

* Professor Ferrier rightly speaks of the modern man depicted by science as:—"the representation of an automaton that is what it cannot help being; a phantom dreaming what it cannot but dream; an engine performing what it must perform; an incarnate reverie; a weathercock shifting helplessly in the winds of sensibility; a wretched association-machine, through which ideas pass linked together by laws over which the machine has no control."—"Lectures and Philosophical Remains," Vol. II, p. 19.

† He can do this either (1) by combating the tendency directly or (2) by forcing an idea, whenever it presents itself, below the field of consciousness. This possibility completely upsets the dogma of the "Associationalist Psychology," that there is no "Self," and that consequently states of consciousness follow one another on purely predicable lines.

‡ It is interesting to note the way in which secularists habitually fail to realise their own principles. If we are all automata, the violent declamations frequently heard against certain institutions become absurd travesties of reason. But, of course, since different brains must "cerebrate out" different thoughts and emotions—like so many millstones grinding out flour—the whole process of human controversy and speculation is shown to be a Comedy of Automata.

For other instances of this inconsistency—necessary indeed—see Fiske's "Cosmic Phil." Vol. II, p. 433. The writer is a Spencian Monist, but invariably in practice assumes liberty. Also Büchner "Force and Matter" (Eng. Transl. 1864) p. 146, where, the author, a Materialist, speaks of the will which "like the player requires practice" to play on the brain. Was ever such inconsistency seen? He has yielded the whole point.

by him—in the conduct of his daily life. At the same time it is open to question whether a considerable portion of mankind are not practical automata, obeying their original impulses without the interference of will. It may be, too, that the "How?" of liberty may not be amenable to expression in terms of empirical thought. Experience, however, establishes its reality, and we are consequently in view of this consideration alone compelled to reject materialism. The same contention also holds good against the basic assertions of monistic negation. (See further on).

(b). Not to dwell upon the fact that the subordination of consciousness to expression in materialistic formulæ and symbols, really involves the rejection of objectivity *in toto*, inasmuch as the physiological facts adduced by the Materialist are only cognizable by and through the same dethroned consciousness, it remains to add that, if we are automata, and the physical processes are complete in themselves, no satisfactory reason according to the theory of natural selection can be given for the evolution of consciousness at all.* The physical equipment of the organism resembling a well adjusted piece of clock-work, the advent of consciousness could be of no conceivable utility to it in its adaptation to environment. As the facts stand, "irritability" and awakening sensation supervene comparatively early in the evolutionary life-chain. This argument is of course only applicable to that form of development known as the Darwinian Theory—now however accepted by Freethinkers generally—but it is fatal to any psychological speculation (on materialistic lines), which has nailed its colours to the mast of natural selection.

(c). The capital argument against the philosophy of Materialism is undoubtedly the inconceivability of the causal connection it sets up between neuroses and psychoses. Some advocates of this system even go so far as to say that thought is nervous motion,—not merely the *resultant* of the latter. Dr. Robert Lewins gravely assures us that "psychosis is diagnosed by medico-psychological symptomatology as vesiculo-neurosis in activity"†—a phalanx of *sesquipedalia verba* which yield on interpretation the result that nervous motion is consciousness.

"Thought," says Büchner, after Moleschott, "is a movement of matter." The "grotesque Frenchman"‡ similarly identifies mind with nerve and brain, and consigns psychology to the dust-bin of speculation.

Dr. Friedrich Strauss in his "Confession" says: "It is certainly not very long ago since the law of the Persistence of Force has been discovered.....the time cannot be very far distant when

* We believe with Schelling that the whole evolutionary course of Nature exhibits "one varied play,.....one aim, one impulse towards a higher life." According to the Pantheists of Germany, the Universe is an *eternal becoming*—an objectification of spirit (the absolute consciousness) in Nature, the realization of itself by spirit in man (the "contemplation by spirit of itself as a concrete reality is *self* consciousness" writes Hegel), and the re-ascent of spirit (God) once again out of nature—an eternal cyclic process.

† Appendix No. II. "What is Religion?" by C. N.

‡ Comte; Huxley's criticisms of this philosopher in his "Physical Basis of Life" are admirable.

the law will be applied to the phenomena of thought and sensation. If under certain conditions motion is transformed into heat, why may it not under other conditions be transformed into sensation?" It is open to question whether Schopenhauer is not amenable to inclusion in the same category. "The intellect," he writes, "is physical, not metaphysical, that is, it has sprung from the WILL to whose objectivation it belongs, so is only there to do it service." Schopenhauer claimed to be a follower of Kant, but in reality he is in almost every one of his conclusions directly opposed to that great thinker. Kant's distinctive feature is that he was the first to insist on, as the central point of philosophy, the relativity of all our knowledge—as only of the phenomenal.* The senses 'perceive' phenomena, not noumena. The world, as interpreted in our consciousness, is an illusion; what it is as a *thing-in-itself* existing independently of a perceiving mind, it is folly even to conjecture. The *thing-in-itself* to Schopenhauer was WILL ever rushing into life, the last phase of which is individual consciousness. The personal God of Kant and the Supreme Spirit of Hegel are dethroned in favour of a blind unconscious WILL, which has produced a universe where misery is pontiff-regnant. Why individual consciousness should be the last phase of will we are not informed. The universe assumed to be a folly, the philosophy of it must necessarily, it would seem, follow suit. But in fact Schopenhauer's WILL—in which he includes all energies, physical, mechanical, organic, etc.,—is simply the FORCE of the 'advanced' materialistic school. The conception of WILL as a self-existent entity† is utterly unpsychological. Will is not an ultimate, but is resolvable into three components,—motive, desire, exertion of power (neither of which by itself is will); it is a synthetic term for a certain process, *pre-supposing* states of consciousness. Schopenhauer's philosophy has been truly called the "Metaphysics of Materialism."

But it is only on a close inspection that the hollowness of the materialistic philosophy stands revealed. It resembles some ivy-clad castle, whose imposing grandeur daunts the distant traveller, but which discloses its crumbling ruins and tottering turrets as he approaches. The extreme speculations of the German scientists are in reality based on a relatively unimposing foundation of fact.

* Esoterically considered it is in a sense true that matter is evolved from mind and mind from matter!—an apparent paradox. It is really not so, inasmuch as while the matter of our present perceptions is the creation of mind, yet the objective reality underlying phenomena (the sensible universe) is evolved primarily out of its substance the *upadhi*, through which Parabrahm wells up as consciousness and creates the world of appearances. The noumenal kosmos has evolved the ego, which perceives not its author, but the illusory phenomena conjured up by its own subjectivity. It cannot perceive *things in themselves*, but only as given in its consciousness (sense-objects, which thus equals states of consciousness). The real object is not perceived, but co-operates with the subject to create the phenomenon. When the co-operation ceases, the phenomenon ceases. Hence it is true that "when mind perishes, the world perishes." The latter would also result if the transcendental object was annihilated. The subject would then receive no impressions.

† This, of course, is a purely psychological statement, relating only to the *subjective process* denominated will. It has no reference to physical facts in Nature, such as nerve-audic emanations, etc.

Their dogmatic denial of a soul is an assumption in no way confirmed by scientific data, and untenable in the light of the phenomena of our individual subjective consciousness.* Physiology, for instance, can never, owing to the very nature of things, yield any support to materialism. It can only show—what, however, is still undecided, though very probable—that all mental facts are accompanied by certain cerebral processes. And, as these self-same processes only exist by and through a perceiving mind, it is highly unphilosophical to subordinate mental facts to their physical accompaniments—the creators to the created. Assertions like those of Dr. Lewins and Moleschott, can scarcely be characterized as less than nonsense. The conception of the nerve-vibrations in the brain-matter meditating on their own eschatology† is comical. It is the utter abstraction these writers make of our subjective consciousness, which raises the good-natured amusement of the impartial psychologist. When Vogt tells us that the phenomena of mind stand on the same level as those of glandular secretion ‡ etc., it is difficult to know whether this distinguished anatomist is joking or has turned “psycho-maniac.” If certain mystics have run wild, the instances of hasty generalization at the other extreme are none the less numerous.

The gulf between the physics of the brain and the phenomena of thought cannot be spanned. Dr. Buchner in his celebrated work “Force and Matter” admits the connection between mental and physical changes to be inexplicable. Materialism—the creed that the neuroses are or cause the psychoses—is at least untenable. As Professor Tyndall put it in his “Belfast Address:” § “Given the nature of a disturbance in water or ether or air, and from the physical properties of the medium we can infer how its particles will be affected. The mind runs along the line of thought which connects the phenomena, and from beginning to end finds no break in the chain. But when we endeavour to pass by a similar process from the physics of the brain to the phenomena of consciousness, we meet a problem which transcends any conceivable

* The elder Darwin defines an *idea* as:—

“a contraction, a motion, or configuration of the fibres which constitute the immediate organ of sense.....[an] animal motion of the organs of sense.” This, I think, puts even Dr. Lewins’ psychology in the shade. But is not the materialistic absurdity of regarding the pride of intellect, the imaginative faculty, the “flash” of genius as merely symbols of automatic physical processes in the brain sufficient to subvert the whole philosophy?

† The fact being—one, however, which an Idealist of any grade ought to grasp—that the “objective brain-processes” are just as subjective as all other sensuous phenomena. And yet we find Dr. Lewins, who professes Hylo-Idealism (a form of objective Idealism), terming *thoughts* “brain-processes.”

‡ In the course of a recent controversy on the bearings of Hylo-Idealism on the doctrine of a soul (*National Reformer*, January 23, 1887), Dr. Lewins again surpasses himself by declaring that “cerebration and chylification are generically alike.”

§ Professor Tyndall—though often apparently inclining to materialistic views—has wisely committed himself to an agnostic attitude on the question. Do the phenomena of thought cause molecular readjustments or *vice versa*? This is at least better than Huxley who assures us (*Physical Basis of Life*, Fortnightly Review, 1869) that “thought is the expression of molecular change in that matter of life, which is the source of our other vital phenomena.” Hence it follows that Huxley’s own brain-tremors “cerebrated out” his Essay. But how did mere nervous vibrations assume such variations as to work out the problem of their own eschatology?

expansion of the powers we now possess. We may think over the subject again and again—it eludes all mental presentation.” Not less categorical are Clifford, Lewes, Bain and other eminent writers.* Let us however cite two representatives of the purely Agnostic School. Du Bois Raymond tells us:—

“What could be more interesting [if it were possible of course] than to direct our intellectual vision inwards and see the cerebral mechanism in motion corresponding with an operation of arithmetic, as we can watch that of a calculating machine; or to perceive what rhythmical movements of the atoms of carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, etc., correspond with the pleasure we experience from musical harmony; what eddying currents of the same atoms attend the acme of delight, and what molecular tempests accompany the frightful agony which results from irritation of the trigeminal nerve.....as regards mental phenomena themselves, it is easy to see, that after having acquired an ‘astronomical knowledge’ of the brain, they would remain just as incomprehensible as they are now.....The most intimate knowledge of the above to which we can aspire would only leave to us matter in motion; but no arrangement and no motion of material particles can form a bridge to carry us into the domain of intelligence. Motion can produce nothing but motion.....These phenomena [mental] remain outside of the physical laws and causality, and that is sufficient to render them incomprehensible.”†

And Professor John Fiske remarks:—“Push our researches in biology as far as we may, the most we can ever ascertain is that certain nerve-changes succeed certain nerve-changes or external stimuli in a certain definite order. But all this can render no account of the simplest phenomenon of consciousness.”‡ (“Cosmic Phil.” Vol. II, p. 80-1).

So much then for the rude dogmatism of sensuous materialism. Its pretensions are nugatory; its boasted ‘scientific’ basis worthless except in the eyes of those who make an entire abstraction of the phenomena of consciousness. But sensuous materialism constitutes only one aspect of the annihilationist argument. A deadlier and far more plausible foe to the spiritual intuitions of the philosopher is the creed of modern Agnostics—MONISM. But before touching on this question we will propound a curious corollary that flows from the logic of Materialism.

It will have been noted that our self-consciousness is left unexplained by this system of physiological psychology. But suppose the individuality of a new-born child to consist of the harmony of the molecule whose groupings constitute its brain, and a curious paradox

* See also Mill, “System of Logic,” Popular Edition, p. 515—6.

† According to materialistic “logic” our thoughts are determined for us by their physical creators—brain-processes. Contrast this absurd dogma with the spontaneity of thought—our power of controlling our ideas, etc.,—and observe the utter collapse of this shallow philosophy.

‡ Huxley himself fully admits that consciousness *per se* is an inexplicable fact “what consciousness is we know not; and how it is that anything so remarkable as a state of consciousness comes about as the result of irritating nervous tissue, is just as unaccountable as any other ultimate fact of nature.”—“Lessons on Physiology,” p. 188.

presents itself. Materialism involves immortality! Ages hence in the abysmal depth of the future those molecules will, according to the law of chances, once again re-assemble—it may be after millions of millions of nebulae have condensed, and returned to their diffused states—but re-assemble they ultimately *must* in an organism identical with the former. The “I am I” will therefore be eternal, as the awful lapses between the re-union of the molecules will be but as periods of dreamless sleep to the dis-integrated organism. But the conception that self-consciousness is equivalent to an arrangement of molecules is in honest truth beneath the contempt of the philosophic mind.

II. MONISM on the other hand denies the existence of any causal relation between mental and physical phenomena. States of consciousness cannot produce molecular changes, nor molecular changes states of consciousness. The two sets of phenomena run an independent parallel course, walled off entirely from mutual interaction. Though apparently distinct, they are aspects only of the same phenomenon which has two sides—the objective (brain-change) and the subjective (mental states). “The mind,” says Dr. Bain,* “is a double-faced unity.”

According to the late Prof. W. K. Clifford it is:—“A stream of feelings which run parallel to, and simultaneous with a certain part of the action of the body.....the two things are on two utterly different platforms—the physical facts go along by themselves and the mental facts go along by themselves. There is a parallelism between them, but there is no interference the one with the other.”

This theory has assumed various forms. The only one of any importance will now be discussed. Herbert Spencer’s “Substance of Mind” was the forerunner of the celebrated hypothesis of Professor W. K. Clifford. Briefly stated it runs as follows:—There exists a universally-diffused “mind-stuff” which is manufactured into mind, sensation, or mere “irritability,” according to the relative development of the organic brain, or its substitute in the nervous mechanism of the lower life-forms. Every molecule has a piece of “mind-stuff,” and on the aggregation of molecules into a highly organized state, consciousness supervenes. Self, however, in the sense of an entity, is a fiction, and the individual is resolved into a mere congeries of mental states. With the disintegration of the physical basis of mind, mind itself vanishes, and the brain-matter passes through a series of chemical combinations dispersing the “mind-stuff” in every direction on the breaking up of the continuity of its component molecules. The unity of the organism is thus the unity of the individual, and a black nothingness is the final lot of the vast aggregate of conscious beings on this and other planets. Monism is thus, though a plausible enough hypothesis, in one aspect—that of its theory of the parallelism of mental and physical facts—little more than a re-statement in a modern garb of the Leibnitzian “pre-established

* “Mind and Body,” p. 196.

† See Vol. II, “Lectures and Essays.” Edited by Leslie Stephen and Frederick Pollock.

harmonies.” I believe it, however, to contain a germ of truth and to embody an aspect—though a *physical* one—of esoteric doctrine. But before proceeding to discuss the spiritualistic hypothesis, it may not be out of place to glance at a few facts presented to our consideration by the advocates of the foregoing system.

In the first place the anti-automaton argument holds as good against Monistic as against Materialist negation. This is a most important point. In the second place the contradictions of its sustainers are innumerable: *i. e.*, Spencer while denying the existence of an ego apart from its mental states, is forced to use language implying the reverse all through his psychological researches (see ensuing remarks). Clifford betrays great confusion of thought in telling us in one place that “the *thing-in-itself* (noumenon) is mind-stuff;” and in another that “every molecule has a piece of mind-stuff;” mind, according to him, being the result of the aggregation of molecules of matter, owing to the fusion of the innumerable pieces of “mind-stuff” linked with them. He thus makes the molecule of matter also noumenal (absolute objectivity). Clifford himself admits that it is difficult to conceive of matter being conscious, but what else is his “mind-stuff”—which can exist in piece and is subject to the “counterparts of physical laws”—but matter? He therefore contradicts his own theory. The same writer speaks of conscience, right, wrong, self-control, etc., and in another breath assures us that man is a “conscious automaton,”* and that “the physical processes are complete in themselves,” assertions which reduce human existence to a complex of whizzing machines without aim or object. Does not Huxley too tell us that consciousness is merely a ‘symbol’ of the physical processes going on in the brain; elsewhere admitting that our “volitions count for much”—a gross and palpable self-contradiction. Instances like these—and they can be multiplied at will—show that that impartial critic Buckle, in the opening chapters of his “*History of Civilisation*” was not wrong in referring to the barrenness and incompetency of Western metaphysical research. And even where it has soared into the empyrean of truth, we can usually detect—as in the case of Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann—the source from which the inspiration was drawn. And that source—is it not the hoary archaic systems formulated by Indian philosophers? We Europeans are far too slow in acknowledging the debt, but its amount is not diminished by that fact.

III. The two great obstacles Spiritualism—in the scientific sense—has hitherto been unable to surmount, are (a) How can an

* This contradiction pervades almost every treatise of the Negative School of Ethics, etc. All assume that we can modify our disposition; all theoretically deny the power, when brought face to face with the question of liberty itself. Grosser contradictions occasionally crop up. When, for instance, Buchner compares the will to a *player on the brain*, and Fiske in a careless moment speaks of “the motions of a corpuscle of nerve-substance, when thrown out of equilibrium by an act of thinking.” Is thought then the power which *causes* molecular change in the brain? Both these statements involve that inference—hence the idea of a soul. Such instances are more flagrantly incompatible with Monism and Materialism than even Clifford’s argument that we (*automata*) are responsible for posterity’s welfare, and for our confirmed tendencies of thought. What, when the physical processes do it all for us!

immaterial mind produce molecular re-adjustments in the substance of the brain? (b) If we recognise an "immortal Ego" in Man, how can we reconcile our belief with the evidences of mental evolution in the animal world from the simplest organisms upward? In the first place what is Mind? Is it the highest grade of subjectivity in the Universe? The answer must be in the negative. Mind is merely a *mediate phase of the subjectivity of the ONE LIFE*.^{*} It is the manifestation through a material—though to us supersensuous—*Upadhi* (5th principle) of the Absolute consciousness)† (=Unconsciousness) in that relatively low grade, which we must term the Mind-consciousness.

The manifestations of the Absolute consciousness vary according to the relative differentiations of the *upadhi*. Thus through the more finely differentiated essence, which composes *Buddhi* or the 6th principle‡—still a material vehicle—the absolute spirit wells up in that exalted phase of subjectivity which Schelling suspected to exist and designated "intellectual intuition." And concurrently with the superior nature of the principle, the personal shades off into the impersonal—the sense of separateness fading away proportionately to the progress of the adept. An instance of the more veiled manifestation of the absolute consciousness is that of the *Life-Principle* which equals a super-sensuous state of matter through which the *ONE LIFE* manifests in a phase of *unconscious purposeness*. Thus the Life-principle animates and pushes forward all organic life, as the (sub-conscious) vehicle of the infinite consciousness—which transcends human conception. But—to return to our subject—if the 5th principle or Mind [vehicle through which absolute spirit manifests as mind-consciousness] is material, how was it primarily built up? That is the problem we have undertaken to attempt a solution of in this paper.

The Human Mind being resolvable into states of consciousness—though with the permanent continuity of a unifying self running through them—and dependent for its action on sensations produced by external stimuli—is, as we have said, incomparably beneath the *Buddhi* or spiritual consciousness.

Mind manifests its action by the tardy process of classification and discrimination between various states of feeling. Its vehicle (5th principle) is constituted of matter existing in a state

* That is to say of the "Universal Mind" (Cosmic Ideation, the Manwantaric aspect of Parabrahm—the other is Cosmic Substance) focussed in the fabric of the MANAS. The grade of the *Upadhi* determines the grade of individual subjectivity; i. e., the degree of intensity, with which Cosmic Ideation is able to manifest.

† See note below. Also the admirable remarks of Mr. T. Subba Row. "Personal and Impersonal God," (*Theosophist*, March 1883) "the objective universe itself is, so far as we are concerned, the result of our states of consciousness.....Cosmic Ideation is the real source of the states of consciousness in every individual. Cosmic ideation exists everywhere; but when placed under restrictions by a material *upadhi* it results as the consciousness of the individual inhering in such *upadhi*." (The italics are my own)

‡ To quote the words of a MASTER it is made of the "essence of what you would call Matter.....in its 6th or 7th condition or state, the animating *atman* being part of the *ONE LIFE* or PARABRAHM." Parabrahm—the ultimate source of every manifestation of consciousness—is itself ABSTRACT CONSCIOUSNESS—ABSOLUTE UNCONSCIOUSNESS. We say "ultimate," because Cosmic Ideation or SPIRIT is but an aspect of the *ONE REALITY*—its Manwantaric projection so to speak.

supersensuous to the uninitiated—a phase of 5th state matter. As observed by an acute thinker "the recognition of finer forms of matter than can affect our physical sensibility must carry within it the possibility of their organic constitution, and this possibility may be raised to the rank of a necessary hypothesis by the more profound psychology for which somnambulism seems to offer a foundation."^{*}

The "mind-stuff" of Clifford—gravely distorted as has been the hypothesis in his hands—is this phase of 5th state matter [Cosmic Principles corresponding with each other invariably], of which the material fabric of the *manas* is composed.† Call it mind-matter and the matter of our present plane (that exciting our objective consciousness)—1st state or physical matter. The postulate is that of a universally-diffused mind-matter, a molecule of which is linked with every molecule of physical-matter; the aggregation of physical-matter molecules into the brain of some organic form carries with it a corresponding aggregation of mind-matter molecules. In the case of the lowest animals a temporary soul is thus formed. The psychoses would bear the same relation to the neuroses as in the case of the highest forms‡. In that of man—where Tyndall makes the important admission about the two processes that "observation proves them to interact"—perception and sensation being the result (unconsciousness) of the motion set up in the organised mind-matter (*Manas*), by a neural tremor; thought produces the physical processes in the brain by the motions in the *Manas*—which is always changing its molecules—setting up the physical-matter motions.§ However, before proceeding further, it will be necessary to say a few words on the evolution of the "Ego." The lower animals we certainly cannot credit with an "immortal principle." They are merely the stepping-stones of Nature toward the true evolution to follow. It is different when we reach the higher, such as anthropoids, etc. According to the teachings of a Master:—

"Each atom or molecule of ordinary scientific hypotheses is not a particle of something, animated by a psychic something, destined to blossom as a man after eons. But it is a concrete manifestation of the universal Energy which itself has not yet become individualized: a sequential manifestation of the one Universal *Manas*. The ocean does not divide into its potential and constituent drops until the sweep of the life-impulse reaches the evolutionary stage of

* C. C. Massey. Preface to Von Hartmann's "Spiritism."

† Clifford's grand error lay in making "mind-stuff" *conscious*, whereas it is only a state of matter, the vehicle of a certain grade of consciousness. We must not confound the latter with "the atomic aggregation, which is only the vehicle and the substance through which thrill the lower and higher degrees of intelligence" ("Five years of Theosophy," p. 274).

‡ Thus enunciating a general law—there are no special clauses in Nature.

§ That is to say the material fabric of the *Manas* serves as a channel through which *Fohat* energises at the moment of thought and sets molecules in motion. But "what sets *Fohat* in motion—the subject?" Necessarily. "But," it may be replied, "how can mind act on matter—this brings us back to the old difficulty, and your *Manas* is only a sort of buffer between the two?" Exactly; the preservation of the fabric of the *Manas* is preservation of Personality; Subject *does* act on object in a Five dimensioned space (see for this McTaggart's "Hylo-Idealism.")

man-birth. The tendency towards segregation into individual monads is gradual, and in the higher animals comes almost to the point." (Five years of Theosophy "The Mineral Monad," p. 275.)

Individuality—the capacity of the Mind-Fabric or *manas* to exist as an entity independent of brain first sets in among the highest animals. Mind-matter is segregated into a permanent fabric (rudimentary 5th Principle) at that point—wherever it be—where self-consciousness, the consciousness of its own consciousness, supervenes in the organism. The relatively undeveloped brains of the higher vertebrates are thus the instruments of Nature for focalising the diffused Mind-matter into fabrics capable of a further metaphysical evolution. In the case of the lower animals the temporary 'soul' formed by the aggregation of mind-matter in simply constituted brains dissolves with its physical basis—its molecules have no cohesion.*

But what is SELF-consciousness? Is it merely the welling up of the Absolute Spirit through the fabric of the *manas*? No; it is something more—the presence of the irradiating *buddhi*, or transcendental and *per se* impersonal subject. Just as a highly developed animal brain focalises into a 5th principle, the diffused 5th state mind-matter; so the rudimentary 5th principle attracts to itself the finely-differentiated matter, which serves as the vehicle of the spiritual consciousness or *buddhi*. And this transcendental subject hovering, so to say, above all the future incarnations of the evolving *manas*, which serves as a channel for those countless experiences which colour the spirit with individuality—absorbs and transmutes into its own essence the story brought back to it by the mind at the close of every life. The *manas* is not the true self, but the *instrument* employed by the *buddhi* to build up its own individuality out of its primary impersonal unconsciousness. The acquisition of self-consciousness is then the proof of individualization.† A not altogether dissimilar conception is formulated by Professor Huxley in his lecture on "The Physical Basis of life". When, having led his hearers into the "materialistic slough" as he himself expresses it—he suggests that the soul comes in somewhere, but that as we do not know the rationale of the causation of spirit and matter, it is impossible to do more than hope. Our view also derives great strength from the following quotations culled from the writings of the late Mr. G. H. Lewes—a Monist:—

"The animal feels the kosmos and adapts himself to it. Man feels the kosmos, but he also *thinks* it.....the boundaries of the animal and the human may be found insensibly blending at

* Mr. Norman Pearson's able article in the *Nineteenth Century*, Sept. 1886, embodies many aspects of the Esoteric Philosophy, though it is to be regretted that he failed to recognise the source of his inspiration. He however falls into two great errors. He (1) makes "Mind stuff" conscious, whereas it is only a *form of matter*, the rough material out of which the 5th Principle is built up; (2) Resolves *self-consciousness* into a structural-peculiarity in the evolving "Mind-structure." Nor does his imagination seem to have soared as high as the conception of a spiritual Self.

† With the evolution of the "Ego," automatism *potentially* ceases—the organism acquiring the power to control its mental states according to its respective evolution.

certain points, but whenever the 'animal circle' becomes transformed into the 'human ellipse' by the introduction of a second centre the difference ceases to be one of degree and becomes one of kind—a germ of infinite variations.....there is a gap (between the animal and human kingdoms) which can be only bridged from without." (Problems of Life and Mind.) What are all these admissions but a clear confirmation of our position? What is this second centre, "this germ," "this gap which only be bridged from without", but an unwilling testimony to the existence of a self-conscious Ego distinct from its mental states in man? This is indeed Kant's "principle of life independent of my animal nature and indeed of the whole material world."

Whether however the men of science reject occult philosophy or not—trace the emergence of consciousness how they may—the reality of the "Ego", the "I am I" distinct from our varying states of consciousness, is a datum of experience. Man is no mere congeries of mental states. We cannot but conceive of some link running through them all. The "Ego" is no mere "bundle of sensations", "the harmony of the nerve-fibrils", or "synergy of the faculties", as Comte terms it. If, as Dr. Bain tells us, the notion of a Self is a "fiction coined from nonentity", how are we to imagine that our states of consciousness *can cognise themselves*?* Moreover, the principle of Association of Ideas is quite incompetent to account for all the phenomena of thought—profound metaphysical speculation, original research, etc., etc. The Ego reaches forward, passes from one mental state to another, holding them, at it were, in review, classifying and comparing, in a manner that demonstrates its existence. Dealing with Mr. Herbert Spencer's doctrine of consciousness, the Rev. James Iverach† well observes:—

"He (Mr. Spencer) continually *assumes* that man has the power of looking before and after; that states of consciousness can be compared, classified and arranged, and that somehow there is a principle of continuity in knowledge. We find a vivid contrast between what Mr. Spencer declares consciousness to be and what consciousness is able to accomplish. He will not allow us to regard consciousness as anything but a series of successive states; while he continually uses language which implies a permanent self who is conscious of these states." The following admission of an influential negationist—the late Mr. G. H. Lewes—is also noteworthy:—

"There was a period when I was very near a conversion. The idea of a noumenal mind distinct from mental phenomena and something diffused through the organism giving unity to consciousness quite different from the unity of a machine flashes upon me one morning with a sudden and novel force quite unlike the

* This is unthinkable. But it is only the *reflective*—as opposed to the *direct* consciousness of animals—consciousness of man which possesses this power to turn over the mental record like the leaves of a book. J. S. Mill himself wavers on this point. (See the Chapter "Psychological Theory of Mind" in his Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy.)

† "Examination of Mr. H. Spencer's Philosophy."

shadowy vagueness with which it had heretofore been conceived. I seemed standing at the entrance of a new path leading to visions of a vast horizon. The convictions of a life seemed tottering. A tremulous eagerness suffused with the keen delight of discovery yet mingled with cross-lights and hesitations stirred me, and from that minute I have understood something of sudden conversion."

But the philosophical evidence, he says, proved too much for him. What was clearly an intuition was stifled and smothered out of existence—a species of mental suicide. The physiological evidence can only demonstrate the intimate connection of mind (5th principle) and brain during life. "The smallest brain-lesion," says the materialist or monist, "destroys mind likewise." Not always, we answer, even in appearance; witness the celebrated "crow-bar" case. But in other cases the psychological deficiencies ensuing on physical injuries to the brain are very simply explicable. The brain of man is a harp, the nerve-fibrils the harp-strings and the mind the player. If the strings are out of order, the tune is discordant. In the case of idiots and cretins the mind is wholly unable to manipulate its instrument.

Admitting then the existence of the "Ego," Philosophy must seek to discover its whence and whither. The whole analogy of Nature decides so definitely and categorically against any theory involving leaps and bounds, that we must trace its genesis to a humble origin and a most rudimentary manifestation. In this paper the writer has attempted only to sketch the probable birth-process of the soul—in one aspect and that perchance an imperfect one—in the primitive groupings and aggregation of the molecules of the 5th principle, the vehicle of *Parabrahm* in that phase of its subjectivity. On the formation of the fabric of the *Manas* the spiritual self dawns on a higher plane, and constitutes the line on which the endless series of future *personalities* is strung. The *Buddhi* cannot evolve, as it is absolute intuition—a ray from the parent fount—but its essence is coloured again and again by the absorption of the experience of countless incarnations, until a glorified INDIVIDUALITY emerges at the close of the Planetary Rounds.

One word more; the bearing of the following extract from Mr. Spencer's "Principles of Psychology" on the doctrine of esoteric evolution is noticeable. The "soul" (rather its part or grade Mind), it is argued "flows into" the organism of the infant parallel with the development of its brain. Let us adduce the testimony of the great Agnostic:—"If at birth there exists nothing but a passive receptivity of impressions, why is not a horse as educable as a man? Should it be said that language makes the difference, then why do not the cat and the dog, reared in the same household, arrive at equal degrees and kinds of knowledge?"

Mr. Spencer's answer is that the brain of a child is the organized register of the experiences received during the upward ascent of organisms to man. But it is quite inconceivable that *forms of thought* can be inherited except on a grossly materialistic assumption. Whence the "innate" ideas then of Time, Space, etc?

They must be attached to the experience of a conscious Ego to appear in thought. The doctrine of Re-births offers us a solution that the Generalized Experience of a former incarnation rises once again into the field of consciousness. This constitutes a complete solution of one of the greatest problems of contemporary metaphysics.

E. D. FAWCETT.

KAIVALYANAVANITA.

OF SRI THANDAVARAYA SWAMIGAL.

PART I.

(Continued from page 418.)

28. "Through the grace of Iswara playing with the curtain-like¹ *Maya*, the *Tamó-guna* divides itself and appears as two *Saktis* (i. e., energies) called the dreadful *ávarana*² and the multiform *vikshepa*,³—to the end that instruments of enjoyment may accrue to the beautiful Jivas.

29. "In *Vikshepa-Sakti* (originates) what is called *Akás*; ⁷in *Akás*, air; in air, fire; in fire, water; and in water, earth. These praiseworthy five (*tanmátrás*⁴) are called *Súkshma Bhútas*.⁵ Out of these so-called (*Súkshma Bhútas*) originates the body⁶ adapted to experience sensations.

30. "The first (mentioned) triple *gunas* continue through all these *Bhútas*. Five (*viyashti*⁷) portions of the blameless white *guna*⁸ form the (five) organs of perception. Then what are called (*Samashti*⁹) five (portions) become the two *Manas* and *Buddhi*.¹⁰ These seven (principles) owing to (their) being distinguished by the *Satwa-guna* constitute the instrument of knowledge.

31. "Five *Viyashti* portions and the (*Samashti*) five of the *Rajo-guna* are extensively named the (five) organs of action and the vital airs¹¹ (respectively). These seventeen (*tatvas*) constitute the *Linga Deha*¹² with regard to all Jivas appearing as *Devas*¹³ *Asuras*,¹⁴ men and beasts.¹⁵

1. The Tamil word *Emam* which is here rendered 'curtain-like' also means 'bewildering.'

2. i. e., Enveloping or obscuring energy.

3. i. e., Expansive power. It is this *Sakti* that causes the One Brahman to appear as the manifold objective universe.

4. i. e., Rudiments.

5. i. e., Subtle elements.

6. viz., The *Súkshma Sarira* or the subtle or astral body.

7. i. e., Single, separate, individual.

8. i. e., The *Satwa guna*.

9. i. e., Collective or whole; that is the five parts together.

10. The two together are called the *antahkarana*. Some writers enumerate four of these *antahkaranas*, viz., *Manas*, *Buddhi*, *Chitta* and *Ahankara*. But our author includes *Chitta*, in *Manas* and *Ahankara* in *Buddhi*.

11. These are five, viz., *Prana*, *Apana*, *Udana*, *Vyana* and *Samana*.

12. Known also as the *Súkshma deha*. This must not be confounded with the third principle of the septenary classification.

13. i. e., Gods or Dévachanic beings, having forms.

14. Elementals having human forms.

15. Elementals of the lower order connected with the different elements and animals. The *asuras* and *beasts* will be developed into future men. Vide "Man: Fragments of forgotten History."

32. "The (name) of Jiva (when) regarding this body (as the Self) is the brilliant *Taijasa*.¹ (The name) of Iswara in connection with this body is *Hiranyagarbha*.² This body is, with regard to both, *Linga* (or) *Sūkshma sarira*. The *kósas* (i. e., sheaths) are three³ belonging (to) this body; belonging (to) it (the plane of activity) is *Swapna avesta* (i. e., the state of dream.)

33. "We have thus far spoken about the *sūkshma* (subtle) universe. Now hear (me) describe methodically the *áropa* that produced the gross (universe). This preserving Iswara made the *Panchikarana*⁴ to the end that the gross body and enjoyments might accrue to the *Jivas* connected (with *Sukshma sarira*).

34. "(He) divided the five *Bhútás* into ten parts (i. e., by halving each), (then) sub-divided their halves into four parts (i. e., only one half of each was thus sub-divided), and leaving out the pure (un-sub-divided) half of each blended the (other) four with (the sub-divided) four⁵; the result (of this) was the gross *Bhútás*. From these *mahábhútás* resulted the four (things namely) gross body, *anda* (i. e., the mundane egg), this world and sensations.

35. "The Jiva regarding the gross body (as the Self) is the so-called *visvan*⁶ and Iswara in connection with the gross body is called the all-embracing *Virát Purusha*.⁷ (The plane) of *Sthúla's*, (activity) is *Jágra avesta* (i. e., the waking state). The said (gross body) is the incomparable *annakósa*. Deposit in thy memory what has thus been classified as *sthúla kalpana* (i. e., illusion of gross matter.)

36. "If (thou) dost say: If *upádhi*⁸ is one and the same to (both) the excellent Iswara and Jiva, pray, O Intelligent Master! how am (I) to know the difference? (I answer.) To Jiva (belongs) the *upádhi* of effect, and to Iswara, the *upádhi* of cause.⁹ The difference (moreover) arises (in the one being) *viyashti* and (the other) extensive *samashti*.

37. "The *viyashti* distinction is represented by (single) trees; and the *samashti* distinction is (when we) say 'Forest.' They call the individual bodies of the various moveable and immoveable (things) *viyashti*. They (also) say viewing all multiple bodies as one aggregate is *samashti*. This is the difference between the many merciful *Jivas* and Iswara.

38. "We have (now) shown how *Kalpana* originated. He, who has become (so far) determined as to see the whole visible

1. There are two other names, viz., *Pratibhasaka* and *Swapna kalpita*.

2. Known also as *Sutratma* and *Prana*.

3. Viz., *Pranamayakosa*, *Manomayakosa* and *Vignanamayakosa*.

4. i. e., Dividing the elements and combining them in such a way that each compound may contain all the five elements.

5. If A, V, F, W and E represent respectively the undivided half of each element, and a, v, f, w and e, the sub-divided portion of the other half the five gross elements or *maha bhutas* will be represented thus: Avfwe; Vafwe; Favwe; Wavfe; and Eavfw.

6. Called also *Vyāvaharikā* and *Chidābhāsa*.

7. *Vaisvánara* and *Vairājasa*.

8. That which conditions a thing.

9. In *Karana deha*, Maya is cause and *avidya*, effect; in *Sukshma deha* the subtle elements are cause, and *manas* effect; in *Sthula deha*, the *mahá bhutas* are cause and the gross body effect.

(universe) in the light of a dream, is the (real) *gnāni*. Listen (now) to my explanation of the way of *apavāda* which leads (one) to the most precious emancipation (which means, becoming) like the *Akāsa* clearing up (after) the passing away of the cloud-covered rainy-season.

39. "(With the spiritual eye furnished) by the oral instruction of the master and by the light of the *Shastras* said (by Mahátmas), to perceive lucidly,—as (when) shown 'This is not a serpent but a rope, this is not a man but a post,'—(the fact that what is called 'I') is not the body, is not the world, is not the elements but is substantial wisdom and Brahm, is alone *apavāda*. (This) know thou.

40. "When properly considered, cause and effect are one—as for instance cloth and yarn, jewel and gold, pitcher and earth. Now perceiving (Truth) by involving in order (upwards one in another) from body first to the Self-existent (Being) at the end just as they have been evolved (downwards) one from another, is called the method of *apavāda*."

41. (Now the pupil) said, "you have (hitherto) spoken about the modifications of *Ishana* (i. e., desire) produced by *Vikshépa Sakti* springing from the reproachful *Tamó guna*. You have (however) mentioned two *Saktis*. O Lord! O master free from destruction! Explain also the illusion created by the (other) *Avarana Sakti*." (Then the master) deigned to reply (as follows).

42. "Without (obscuring) the Iswara comparable to (none but) himself and the sages that have known themselves, (*Avarana Sakti*) veils so as to blind the internal spiritual eye of the flesh—inhabiting *Jivas* who say 'It (i. e., Brahm) exists not; (for) it is not visible,' just as the midnight-darkness of the rainy season envelopes the sky and earth, and the points of the compass.

43. "It is that very *upadhi* which completely veils the difference that exists between the all-full Brahm and the external *Vikaras*¹ (on the one hand) and between the excellent *Kutasta*² and the internal *Vikaras*³ so as not to allow (that difference) to appear in the least and which engenders the stubborn disease of conditioned existence.

44. "If (thou) dost ask 'If the basis is veiled (by *Avarana Sakti*) where will the *áropa* appear? and if the basis⁴ is not obscured, there can be no *áropa*' (I answer:) The basis has a twofold relation, namely, *samam*⁵ and *visésham*⁶. The basis is *samam* everywhere while *áropa* is *visésham*.

45. "The Absolute⁷ which cannot in the world be pointed out

1. i. e., Modifications. They are Iswara and his *upadhi*, *guna* and works.

2. i. e., *Pratyéhátna*.

3. viz., Jiva and his *upadhi*, *guna* and works.

4. The Tamil word is *ádaram*, i. e., cause or hypostasis. His objection is this: Brahm is the basis of all objective phenomena (i. e., *áropa*). If therefore *avarana* obscure the basis Brahm itself there is no reason for *áropa* making itself felt. Again, if it is said that Brahm or *Kutasta* is not so obscured, then too there is no room for the appearance of the phenomenal universe.

5. i. e., the absolute or universal.

6. i. e., the relative or special.

7. Another reading is "the *samanakkan*, i. e., the absolute eye or perceptionwill not be veiled, (whereas) the *viséshakkan*, i. e., relative or special appearances such as, &c."

as 'this' will not be veiled, (whereas) the Relative, (such as) the often mentioned 'rope' and 'serpent,' will be veiled. (Similarly) ignorance can never obscure the *samam* called 'I' (but) it will veil, what is called *visésha*, namely, Jiva and Iswara.

46. "Listen thou O (my) son that hast asked 'O master rare to be obtained ! is not that, which hinders the state of perfect isolation from becoming conspicuous and (thus) ruins (man) rather the *vikshépa* that has sprung up as the five *kósas*, as Jiva and as the universe ? Why then did (you) say that *ávarana* alone is desolation and disadvantage ?"

47. "Even though *vikshépa sakti* is itself (instrumental in bringing about) painful conditioned existence, it still affords a most gracious assistance to those desiring to attain to emancipation by perseverance. Does midnight afford so much help as the clear noon ? How can I, O son ! (sufficiently) characterise the enmity (of *ávarana*) ? That which veils is the most mischievous.¹

48. Even though the phenomenal universe perishes in *Shúshrupti*² and *Pralaya*,³ is there any one who, (merely in consequence of that dissolution) being freed from the strong conditioned existence, has attained to emancipation ? Everything belonging solely to *vikshépa* will lead towards emancipation ; but *ávarana* (in ignorance) is the ruin that so corrupts as not to lead towards *mukti*.

49. "If (thou) dost say 'If *vikshépa sakti* appearing in (*Chaitanya*) is false like the silver (appearing) in the conch-shell, then (surely) also the emancipation obtained through the instrumentality of (that) *sakti* is illusive,' (I answer : No.) Just as by the (illusive) lion (appearing in one's) dream, (one) is completely roused from sleep (to the real waking state), so is the state of *Nirvana* real, (though reached through the instrumentality of false *vikshépa*).

50. "In this world, they destroy poison by poison, iron by iron, the discharged arrow (they meet) by (another) arrow and dirt that has settled, by dirt (*i. e.*, by another substance which though comparatively purer is not absolutely pure). Similarly (sages) destroy impure *Máya* by (pure) *Máya*. Then even this stable (pure) *Máya* will perish with (the impure *Máya*) like the stirring-stick that helps to burn the corpse.⁴

51. By these *Máyas* (pure and impure) seven *avestás* (*i. e.*, states) happen to jivas. Now hear me explain these seven *avestás* in order. (Their names are :) First *agnánam*,⁵ (second) *avarana*,⁶ (third) *vikshépa*,⁷ (fourth) *parólkshagnánam*,⁸ (fifth) everlasting *aparólkshagnánam*⁹ (sixth) annihilation of sorrow, and (seventh) unrestrained bliss.

1. *i. e.*, Subjective obscuration, namely, *avarana*, and not objective development (*vikshépa*) is the greatest evil.

2. *i. e.*, Dreamless sleep.

3. *i. e.*, Universal dissolution.

4. The stick not only helps the corpse to burn but also is itself consumed

5. Ignorance.

[by the fire during the operation.]

6. Obscuration.

7. False appearance.

8. Mere intellectual comprehension ; the knowledge obtained by study.

9. Actual realization.

Of these seven *avestás*, the first three belong to impure *Máya* and the remaining four to pure *Máya*.

52. "The folly of (thy) forgetting (thy) self which is *Brahm* is *agnánam*. Saying 'there is no *Brahm* (for I) see (him) not' is the obscuring *ávarana*. A man, in his one-sided thoughts, declaring and holding 'I am *Jíva*' (instead of I 'am *Brahm*') is *vikshépa*. From the instruction of the master, getting (merely) an idea of (thy) self is *parólkshagnánam*.

53. "(Thy) Self becoming non-dual (*i. e.*, *advaitam*) by investigating *Tat* and *Twam*¹ and all doubts vanishing is *aparólkshagnánam*. The passing away of (thy viewing) agent *Jívas* as different is annihilation of sorrow. When (thou), as *Jívan-Mukta* hast finished performing all (thou wert bound to do, then) unrestrained bliss ensues.

54. "To illustrate these (seven states more clearly) to thee (I shall tell thee) as an example a very curious tale which is as follows. Listen. Ten persons swam through a river and (after) reaching the (other) bank, one (of them) counted (but) nine persons ; not understanding that with it (*i. e.*, the nine) he himself made the tenth, (he) stood quite perplexed and alarmed.

55. "The delusion of not knowing (the tenth) is *agnanam*. Saying 'he is not (for he) appears not' is *avarana* inseparable (from ignorance). Weeping with sorrow (over the tenth as having been carried off by the current) is *vikshépa*. 'Taking the word of a passer-by 'the tenth exists ; there he stands' and having a hazy conception is *parólkshagnanam*.

56. "When the virtuous traveller again says 'thou who hast counted the nine persons art thyself the tenth,' seeing himself is *aparólkshagnanam*. The passing away (then) of lamentation is annihilation of sorrow. The clearing up of doubt in the vigorous mind (by actually seeing the tenth) is unrestrained bliss."

57. (Now the disciple said) "O venerable master ! you must show my real form so that I may see (it) just in the same way as that tenth person saw himself." (Whereupon the master replied), "Hear then that wonderful fact how, (according to) the purest esoteric meaning, the term *Asi* unites the term *Twam* and the term *Tat* (together).

58. Like the illusion of conceiving the one *Akasa* as *Maha-akasa*², as *Meha-akasa*³, as *akasa* in the pitcher made of what is in the world called earth, and as *akasa* (reflected in) the water contained (in the pitcher),—the one (*chaitanya*) becomes (*i. e.*, is regarded as) the four *chaitánýas*, namely, the all-pervading *Brahm*, *Iswara*, the ever-existing *Kútasta* and *Jíva*.

59. "The exoteric meanings of the (above) mentioned two words (*Tat* and *Twam*) are the phenomenal *Iswara* and *Jíva* (respectively) ; while the esoteric meanings are the stainless *Brahm* and *atma* (*i. e.*, *Kútasta*). Perceiving thyself which is mixed up (with matter) as one, like the butter in the boiled milk, separate thyself (from non-spirit) like (the butter) which is separated (from the milk) by churning.

1. *Tat* = It, *i. e.*, *Brahm*. And *Twam* = *Kútasta*.

2. *i. e.*, grand *akasa*.

3. *i. e.*, *akasa* reflected in the clouds,

60. "If (thou) dost ask 'how is that separation to be effected?' (I shall tell you). The knowledge, *i. e.*, *ahankara*, that regards the corpse-like body as 'I' must be killed; for is not this (*i. e.*, the body) a mere modification of the five elements? Thou art neither the *Prāna* (*i. e.*, breath) cast out through the nose like the insentient bellows respiring (air); (for) it is (simply) a modification of the *Rajō-guna*.¹

61. "The *antahkarana*,² namely, *Manas* and *Buddhi* are agents and form the two *kōsas* ranking (third and fourth),³—can these be *atma*? (No; for) they are a mere modification of the *sātwa-guna* and (refer to) the worthless state of dream. Even the *ānandamaya*⁴ (*i. e.*, *Jiva*) being a modification of the activity of *avidya* of the non-existent *Tamō-guna*—call not (this) thy 'I.'

62. The *atma* is *sat*,⁵ *chit*,⁶ *ananda*,⁷ uniform, unchangeable, witness, One, eternal and all-pervading. Realizing that thou art it, come out forsaking the deceitful cavern of the five *kōsas* which possess the distinction of being *asat*,⁸ *jada*,⁹ *duḥka*,¹⁰ and so on."

63. "When seen beyond (after) crossing the five *kōsas*, (nothing) but a vacuum is left. I do not see anything else appear. Is it this black darkness, O guileless master, that I should enjoy as my 'I'?" (Thus) spoke the son. (Now the master) replied so as to enlighten the mind (of his Spiritual Son.)

T. M. SUNDERUM PILLAI.

THE IDEAL AND THE REAL.

A Dialogue.

MUNDANUS.—Ah, Mysticus, a word with you. It is said that you are well versed in the so-called occult system of philosophy. I should be glad to hear what place your school of mysticism would assign to art and beauty. For the Bhagavad Gita seems to include them among 'objects of the organs' from which he who would be a disciple must remove his mind. Now, although my little friend Jones never tires of saying that art is merely a matter of fashion like French millinery, as indeed it is with him, yet there are not a few men of the world who hold all true art in the deepest reverence, and feel that there is in the work of a master a divine element, which soothes and purifies the heart from the dust and dross of the city, and draws the mind in the direction of the Supreme. This æsthetic pantheism has certainly saved many from a grossly

1. *Rajō-guna* in *Tamas*. Vide stanza 31.

2. *i. e.*, The intellectual faculties.

3. Viz., *Manomaya* and *Vignanamaya*. In the previous stanza the first two *kōsas*, viz., *Annāmaya* and *Prānamaya*, and *Jagravesta* have been referred to by implication, for they all belong to the physical body.

4. The *sushupti* state must be understood.

5. Being. Essence.

6. Intelligence.

7. Bliss.

8. Opposite of *sat*.

9. Opposite of *chit*.

10. Opposite of *ananda*. By 'so on' is meant the opposite of all the other qualities mentioned of *atma*.

sensual life devoid of any ideal, and has, I believe, prepared the ground for a higher philosophy. Are we then to include that, which has raised us above our purely animal instincts, amongst those very objects of desire, which it has enabled us to transcend?

Mysticus.—Whilst I admit, Mundanus, that the artistic sense is an important factor in the higher evolution and in some cases lifts people above gross objects of sense, I am inclined to think that there comes a time, after the critical faculty is developed, when it is apt to degenerate into mere dilettanteism, and to take the place in the life of men of cultured intellect which is held by less refined indulgences among those of coarser fibre. Moreover, I do not think there is quite a true ring in much of the talk about higher culture, that is so much in vogue in certain European capitals. It is too often but the sugared cake adorning a rich man's table. Now, in spite of their advanced civilization, the gentle folks of the West have strong natural affections, but, instead of expending them upon the struggling units composing the back-wash of society, they pay men of art and letters to contrive machinery for diverting such feeling into artificial channels. Thus they waste upon the sentimental heroine of a three volume novel, or a harmonious bit of colour in some picture gallery, much sympathy that should rightly flow into the hearts of men. This to my mind is but a form of fetish worship. Leave the tinsel, my friend, and play your part on the world's stage. I think you will find, when you can bear its radiance, that the sun above is better than the foot-lights, and that the song of life contains a deeper melody than the verses of your poetaster. After all the compass of art is limited. The whole body of academicians cannot reproduce all the poses and shades of expression which one man presents in an hour. Your finest picture shows but a glimpse of nature's face, as she appeared to the artist for a moment of time. Behold how Nature smiles on one quarter whilst she frowns on another, and for no two seconds seems the same. The undying power behind her is the reality, so why should you worship what is only a fleeting shadow of it? You would find it better to work for Nature, keeping your mind upon the goal before you and rejecting all that is untrue. You would then soon find how shallow is the enthusiasm called forth by artificial beauty.

Mundanus.—There is no doubt much truth in what you say, and you have given me excellent advice. But, my friend, I alluded to the work that is wrought for the ages, whilst you have condemned merely the ephemeral productions of to-day. It seems to me, that there are other aspects of the question, which you have not touched. You say that we must keep our minds on the goal. Now, in order to do so, we must first see the goal, or get some idea of its nature and place, and it seems to me that it ever eludes the grasp of the subtlest and strongest intellect, and like the will-o'-the-wisp ever dances further and further ahead of its pursuer. That first step is, I should imagine, the most difficult of all; for we are born blind like puppies, and until our eyes are opened we tumble and grope about, having only a vague consciousness of our existence as souls in the world of souls. It is said, that what is light to the man of

spiritual perception is darkness to the man without it. Naturally the majority of men cannot unaided see anything beyond the range of their physical senses. But there is an ancient belief among the people of all countries, that the artist is of finer clay than common folks, and by reason of this difference of constitution is enabled to catch glimpses, even if it be only as reflections and shadows, of existence on a higher sphere, which he endeavours with the poor materials of earth to render intelligible to his fellow men. This idea, moreover, finds support in the fact that musicians, poets and painters, have sometimes obtained their conceptions in a state of dream or trance, when the coarser nature slept. It is a favourite fancy of mine, that the works of such men are like curtains surrounding a light, which invisible hands draw back for him who wills to see. Contemplating the work of a great master of the Purist School, often have I felt that all consciousness of myself and my surroundings died away,—and that I looked through the canvas into another world, peopled by the heavenly forms of the saints and martyrs who sacrificed their lives for humanity. Is it your opinion that such love of art is mere dilletanteism, and should be eschewed as an attachment to the objects of the senses, for to my mind it is a stepping stone to that which is beyond their grasp?

Mysticus.—I grant you that painting, or any other art, may act as a vehicle of thought, a garment to clothe an idea or an ideal, but I cannot admit that it is itself an object for worship. Even among the masterpieces which have come down to us, there are not a few that are decidedly more suggestive of the flesh than the spirit. Their artificers doubtless had glimpses of another world, but not one that you or I would wish to live in. Consider the history of the mighty races that have held the stage in the past, the culture of Greece and Rome, and anterior to them of Egypt and the East. The tree of art grew and came to fruition, then like any other tree decayed and died. It scattered seed destined to bring forth future growths in distant lands when the cycle reached their shores. Then it withered, or was hacked to pieces by some northern barbarian. Yet in the glory of their golden age the Greeks and Romans, even whilst drinking their fill out of the jewelled chalice, were sunk in corruption and effeminacy, and rotting for want of the true Elixir.

Mundanus.—Whilst demolishing my temple, you do not deny that it may contain a god. You speak of it as a garment. Surely it does not always adorn a tailor's dummy. You practically admit the existence of ideals. Tell me, I beg of you, something more about them. What are they and where? What is the ideal, what the real?

The so called ideal and real, cause and the power of effecting, the theoretical and practical are realities, and their mutual action and reaction upon each other through time and space around the centre of equilibrium, which is consciousness, is the universal law, on which hangs all kosmic manifestation, from the highest emanation from the Ancient of Ancients to the lowest element of earth. They are the positive and negative, the male and female principles

of the universe, God and the garment of God. Yes, the ideals are real, and the kingdom which contains them is a reality, compared to which this globe with its mighty armies and hungry proletariat is but a phantasmagoria. The man, who has overcome desire and passed into the region where ideals exist as realities, may listen to the melodies the poet vainly strove to sing, and meet face to face in all their natural loveliness the types the painter and the sculptor felt rather than perceived, and feeling strove to clothe in the forms of earth. He who gains admittance to the gardens of the soul, wanders through flowery meads by lotus-bearing pools, and, it may be, even penetrates to the sacred grove containing the Trees of Life, and Knowledge, and their five companions which bear the fruits of science. In this sphere he may witness the mighty drama of Evolution and the march of Progress to the final act when Truth and Universal Brotherhood overcome the brood of Discord, whilst the heavenly orchestra peals forth in one triumphal pæan.

In one of the gardens the daughter of the king awaits the soul that has attained its manhood, the divine Sophia, whose transcendent loveliness surpasses aught in all the worlds. She is no fancy of a poet's brain, but a reality of consciousness as well as an ideal. Companionless in her marble tower she watches for the coming of the bridegroom. The Kingdom is yours, my brother, and any other man's who will banish illusion and fight.

Mundanus.—Your words intensify a thousand-fold the longing for the beautiful, which just now you bid me set aside. Your paradox is hard to comprehend: *to obtain the beautiful I must verily sacrifice the beautiful.* Interpret I pray you, this mystery in words that can penetrate the density of my dura mater and suggest some clear idea to my mind. What is beauty? What and where is the way to this Garden of Life, Wisdom, and Beauty, which is 'such stuff as dreams are made of'?

Mysticus.—The types of beauty are immortal, though, when darkness is spread over the face of the great deep, they exist only as the seed, which will again shoot forth with the first rays of the new Sun. The law of beauty is the law of harmony which rules all manifestation, though the harmony cannot be perceived except by those who have eyes to see. The path to the Gardens of Eternity passes through the depths of the Valley of Shadow. Pause and consider well, and do not attempt the perils of the way under the influence of emotion, which blazes for a little space and then goes out. The pilgrim who dares the passage indeed stands in need of all his nerve and judgment. Myriads of unseen foes dwell on the threshold. They have keen senses to perceive any weakness, and any thought or act for the benefit of one's self is a source of human weakness. The powers of darkness endeavour to lure or frighten the disciple from the path, lest he become their master, and frequently they attack him through the objects of his love. He who enters this vale of bitterness loses all affection and love of beauty. He feels nought but an appalling emptiness, the negative aspect of his *self*, which makes him feel that he has cast out his humanity and got nothing in its place: that he is a

wretched outcast with no place either on earth or in heaven. Many men enter the Valley full of courage and hope; but most of them rush headlong back into the noisiest places of the world to drown in its busy hum the voices of the fiends that are ringing in their ears. If once the traveller lets go the idea that there is light beyond, he is lost. A very few tried and trusty souls pass unscathed through all the trials and tribulations of the way, and gain the heaven-kissing hill, purified by the fires through which they have passed. They have reached the Eternal and can sin no more, for they are one with nature. If, my brother, after full deliberation, you are determined to fight the darkness, choose as your battle-field the haunts of men. For both the Eternal and the darkness are within you and around you, and are subjective to the ordinary senses. Toil cheerfully and manfully for your fellow men, dispersing ignorance by the light of truth, and relieving suffering, undeterred by the sickness at your own heart. Thus you will help both yourself and others. In the solitude of the hermit's cell the horrors of the vale and its gloom are intensified. If eventually you overcome all the difficulties of the way and attain the Kingdom beyond, great will be the welcome you will receive from your brothers who have gone before. You will then be prepared for evolution in the higher plane of being.

Mundanus.—It is well! I will gain those noble portals, come Satan and all his host! 'What man has done, man can do!'

HENRY MERVYN, F. T. S.

THE SABDAKALPADRUMA.

ONE of the most important works, if not the most important, now in progress connected with the study of Sanskrit literature is the new edition of Raja Sri Radhakanta's celebrated Sanskrit lexicon, the Sabdakalpadruma. The recently issued tenth part of this lexicon completes the first volume and contains all words beginning with vowels. The remaining portion of the work will be continued in monthly parts.

The first volume of the original edition of the Sabdakalpadruma appeared in 1822 (though it seems it had been commenced some three or four years earlier) and the last, which is a supplement, in 1858.

The book was printed in the Bengali character and on this account, as well as from the fact that the Raja distributed it gratis and did not allow it to be sold, its circulation was very limited. Some years ago, a second edition (also in the Bengali character) was published by Messrs. Baradakant Mitra and Co., and though it was only a reprint, it was soon sold off, perhaps mostly in Bengal. The present publishers are printing their edition in the *Devanagari* character, and have fully explained in their prospectus its aim and scope, and the additions and improvements contemplated by them. They have also pointed out in what the peculiar merit and usefulness of this *magnum opus* consists, how it has benefited Sanskrit scholars and promoted the cause of Sanskrit

literature, and in what high estimation it is deservedly held by the learned world. We refer therefore those who desire more detailed information to this prospectus which the publishers readily supply on application.

A cursory view of the scheme under which the learned author attempted to accomplish his task, will enable us to understand how far he succeeded in realising his grand idea. In modern glossology a trenchant distinction is drawn between the lexical and cyclopædic departments, but at the time the Raja formed the first conception of his work, a simple dictionary of the Sanskrit language, arranged on the usual European alphabetic method, was itself a novelty. All previous Sanskrit word-books in MSS., belonging to different literary periods, were metrical and mnemonic, and formed distinct vocabularies together with commentaries relating to a few special branches of knowledge. They were in every respect inconvenient as books of ready reference. The alphabetic arrangement was, as far as we are aware, first introduced by the Raja into the domain of the Sanskrit language, and this particular aspect of the Sabdakalpadruma was specially noticed in one of the English antiquarian journals in 1835 as "not the least part of its superior character to the generality of Indian printings."

This arrangement led the author to note against each word its grammatical character, to define its meaning in Sanskrit, to give sometimes its Bengali or Hindi equivalent, to supply copious synonyms and to explain the different significations in which it is used, and in almost all cases to support these explanations by quoting the approved *Koshas* or old glossaries and dictionaries with their commentaries. In indicating conjugational classes and other peculiarities of roots and their derivatives, as well as in special grammatical observations, the system of Vopadeva, prevailing in many parts of Bengal, has been generally followed, but there are also references to the *Sankshipta Sara*, *Supadina*, *Kalapa*, *Siddhanta-kaumudi* and other grammars. The Raja gives references to twenty-nine principal *koshas* (dictionaries) which he has consulted. He regards the vocabulary contained in the *Agnipurana* as the most ancient, and the dictionary of Amara as the best. Besides these he cites thirty-two more *koshas* on the authority of *Visva-pragasa* and *Medini*. So that altogether the number of lexical works upon which he founds definitions, and synonyms assigned to words, amounts altogether to sixty-one.

Among the numerous commentaries of Amara, thirty-five of which are enumerated in the preface, many have been quoted from the works themselves, and those which could not be procured on account of their rareness are quoted on the authority of other writers. Some very old *Koshas* are named by these commentators in support of their interpretations, and these authorities are sometimes given in this work. It should also be mentioned that in addition to the information derived from the *koshas*, words have been culled from a mass of classical compositions, and their explanations and equivalents have been supplied on the authority of the works in which they occur. In respect of Vaidic voca-

bles, the Raja had no opportunities of consulting any other works except the *Veda Nighantu* of Yaska. The radical terminology of verbs, which has been adopted from the system of Vopadeva, as set forth in his *Kavikalpadruma*, and which the Raja thinks the most convenient, has been alphabetically arranged by him in the preface, and the meanings attached to their symbolical forms have been there explained and illustrated.

With reference to the examples, which, upon the plan of Todd's Johnson's Dictionary, have been copiously exhibited, these have been extracted from such works belonging to post-Vedic literature as could be obtained or were thought useful in Bengal in early days.

The cyclopædical portion of the work gives it its peculiar value and renders it unique in the domain of Sanskrit literature in spite of the many years that have elapsed since its first appearance. Although during this period dictionaries purely in Sanskrit, in Sanskrit and Vernacular, and in Sanskrit and European languages, of various degrees of merit, have been published, not a single work partaking of the comprehensive character of the *Sabdakalpadruma* has as yet been given to the public. The great scholar completed his labours single handed by having recourse to a *modus operandi* which few can avail themselves of, and by a persevering, life-long devotion. The result was a work in seven thick quarto volumes besides an appendix. The innumerable articles which are subjoined under important words, embrace the whole range of mediæval and modern Sanskrit literature and science, and all departments of knowledge of the post-Vedic period both sacred and profane.

The great lack in the work relates not only to the *Sruti* or *Veda Sanhita*, but to the *Brahmanas*, the *Sutras* and *Upanishats*, which comprise a class of studies that were very little appreciated in Bengal half a century ago, and with which moreover the Raja, as the esteemed head of the orthodox Hindu Community, could not meddle without incurring some opprobrium, and we may quote observations on the Gayatri as giving colour to this supposition. Excepting in this department of ancient Sanskrit learning the *Sabdakalpadruma*, when it made its appearance, proved as its name implies a veritable tree yielding every desired fruit of knowledge represented in words treasured in the sacred language of India. Religion (including esotericism), philosophy in its various divisions, mythology, history and antiquities, so far as can be gleaned from Pauranic legends, the sciences of mathematics, astronomy, astrology, Indian botany and medicine, rhetoric and logic, jurisprudence and law, architecture, poetry and music, in their various subdivisions, have all been represented in the work by extracts from treatises on these subjects. The extracts have often been pieced together and so harmonised as to form short essays, and not a few of the articles have extended over upwards of a hundred pages. In this way there are presented to the reader specimens of the contents of a large number of important books, and a whole cycle of Sanskrit learning. In respect of the names of plants, not only have their ordinary designations been given,

but all their synonyms which the exigencies of metrical compositions had called into being, have been set forth in one view; when they happen to be drugs, their virtues and properties and remedial applications under the therapeutical systems of different medical authorities have been copiously described. When names of diseases occur, their symptoms, etiology and mode of treatment, with recipes for their cure, are also given. The very interesting and useful information on such topics has been gathered from a large number of medical vocabularies and treatises collected by the Raja. Every such article should be studied by itself to obtain an idea of the exhaustive way in which its subject has been treated. In connection with this part of the subject, we may quote the following translation of an extract from a letter of Professor Rudolph Roth:—

"Permit me on this occasion to direct your attention to a department of Indian lexicography for which you would be in a situation to give efficient help. I mean the so uncommonly numerous names of plants in Sanskrit. It would be of great importance for the understanding of medical books rightly to identify these names with the Latin names given by Europeans. I know that in this direction many meritorious things have been done, and although Wilson's Dictionary gives much information, yet there remains still more to be accomplished. Roxburgh has in his *Flora Indica* and Ainslie in his *Materia Medica*, very frequently collected Sanskrit names, but how much is still wanting. I think however it would not be difficult specially on the basis of Wight's *Icones* to perceive the correct namings of plants by native physicians. The synonyms one learns from such catalogues as *Rajanirghanta* (from which your *Sabdakalpadruma* gives such desirable extracts and of which I have not seen a manuscript) and from the *Ratnamāla* (of which I have a copy) and from others. Many Bengali names which may often lead to old Sanskrit names are to be found in Voigt's *Hortus Suburbanus Calcuttensis*, a very useful work."

In the department of the *Karmakanda*, or ritual comprehending the duties of a Hindu householder from birth to death, the ceremonies he has to perform daily or periodically, the sacraments which constitute Hinduism, marriage, funeral ceremonies, and *Śraddhas*, each and every topic is treated with a fullness enabling a Hindu to derive every desirable information for storing his mind and guiding him in practice—and a foreigner, to understand the religious phase of a Hindu's life. The *Smritis* consulted in respect of these matters, are, besides Manu and Yajñavalkya, the other current works included in the category of the eighteen *Smritis*, the compilations of Raghunandana and others, and a large number of commentaries. Cosmogony, the origin and subdivision of castes and their various assigned occupations and all requisite knowledge appertaining to the subject, have been dwelt upon in all their details with, of course, the different opinions of the authors who have written on those subjects. In connection with this branch may be mentioned the information which has been given regarding the system of *Kulinism* which originated in a peculiar form under the reign of Adisura of Ganda and exercises its

influence in Bengal in a curious way. This information has been derived from such books as the *Kuladipekas*, *Karikas* and *Kalapanjikas* of Ghataks, to which European scholars have not as yet had access.

In the disquisition on music many articles have been derived from the *Sangita Ratnakara*, *Sangita Damodara* and many others. These articles treat of songs, of different kinds of singing, of the modulations of the voice, time and measure, and take cognisance of the different kinds of instruments and many other cognate subjects.

Topics of all imaginable descriptions relating to miscellaneous matters are enumerated under the word *kalá* or *silpa* which includes sixty-four classes of arts, that under modern classification would come under the division of fine arts, mechanical arts, and many other things. Beside the Great Epics, the Ramayana and Mahá Bhárata, the principal Puranas from which extracts have been given are, Garuda, Devi, Vishnu, Agni, Matsya, Varaha, Brahmabaiivarta, etc. Among the Tantras there are references to Matrika, Kámadhenu, Varnamala, Tantrasara, etc.

Such are some of the principal points in the original work of the Raja to which we would draw the attention of readers interested in such subjects.

When the Raja commenced issuing his volumes and they began to reach (though but in a few cases) the hands of savants, there was a regular outburst of well merited laudation and appreciation and of grateful acknowledgments in the most enthusiastic terms, and even a kind of struggle to obtain the precious gift.

The earliest recognition, as a matter of course, came from the veteran Sanskritist Dr. Horace Hayman Wilson who was then (1819) engaged in publishing the first edition of his well known Sanskrit English Dictionary, in the preface to which he generously acknowledges his indebtedness to the Raja and speaks of his work "as a compilation of a superior character to any of these modern works and indeed to any of the more ancient works." Long afterwards he elsewhere says, alluding to the activity in the prosecution of Sanskrit studies, "Foremost amongst its results, we may place the completion of a voluminous Sanskrit Lexicon by Raja Radhakant Deva," and again in his latest notice:—"Raja Radhakant who adds to the distinction of rank and station that of a foremost place amongst Sanskrit scholars as evinced by his great Sanskrit Lexicon or literary encyclopædia of the Sanskrit language..... which enjoys an European as well as Indian celebrity." The Rev. Mr. Morton, while publishing his Sanskrit and Bengali Dictionary, speaks in similar terms and acknowledges the benefit he derived from the Raja's work. In the annual report of the Proceedings of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1834 it is described "as a very learned and elaborate work." In 1835, when the first three volumes had reached England, Dr R. Lenz, in reviewing it in the pages of the above Journal, dwells at great length on its extraordinary merit. In the same year one of the most celebrated savants of Europe, Professor Eugene Burnouf, spoke of it as a "veritable trésor philologique, philosophique et religieux de l'Inde," and

again in 1840 "Je ne puis me servir de votre excellent lexique sans vous remercier de cœur du service que vous avez rendu à la connaissance de l'Inde en le composant et à mes études particulières." In 1837, Major T'royer of the Asiatic Society of Paris wrote to the Raja that the Sanskrit scholars of Europe were awaiting with great impatience the continuation of the Sabdakalpadruma, "honorable mention of which was made in several philosophical journals of the continent, and that it renders a great service, and will for ever render such, to Sanskrit literature." Again in 1847 he wrote: "Mons. Gorressio" (the editor and translator of the Rámáyana Valmike) "desires to carry with your name your excellent Dictionary to Turin..... your work will be the only one in Italy which country will not then have to envy France and Germany where your merit is already justly appreciated." In 1838 Dr. Nathniel Wallech writing from London and alluding to the Sabdakalpadruma applied to the Raja the Motto "*Exergiste monumentum ære perennius*," and went on to say, "I cannot conceive a more stupendous and noble undertaking than your Sanskrit Dictionary, all who have any respect for literature, all who have the least pretension to judge of the sublimity of the Sanskrit language, and all who not knowing the least of it, have at least the decency to suppose that the admiration for the venerable language expressed by such men as Colebrooke, Jones, etc., is well founded—all I say must feel the deep gratitude that is due to the great and learned author of such a work as the Sabdakalpadruma." In the same year Dr. Roer expressed his acknowledgment to the Raja in the following terms "I owe to it already a great debt of gratitude for the assistance I received from it when all other resources failed me. When translating the Bhashaparichheda, the technical terms of which I had sometimes great difficulty in understanding exactly, I found always my doubts removed on referring to the Dictionary, when the Pandit whom I consulted could not give me a satisfactory explanation." Dr. Herman Brockhaus, writing from Leipzig in respect of 'the inestimable Sabdakalpadruma,' remarked: "Astonishing is the learning displayed in this great work, so rich in its contents, so invaluable as the most complete collection of the most valuable results of the Indian mind, &c." In 1850 Professor Salisbury as Secretary to the American Oriental Society contributed his share of high praise.

Besides these appreciative admirers of the work, may be prominently mentioned the names of Lassen, Weber, Max Müller, and Roth and Böhtlink—names whose authority carries the highest weight. These great scholars, in the journals of learned societies, in the prefaces to some of their works, or in their communications to the author, have borne the highest testimony to its great merit and usefulness:—a few instances are here adduced.

Dr. Weber says—"The Royal Academy of Sciences, &c., elected you as an Honorary Member on account of your merits as author of the Sabdakalpadruma. It is one of the highest honours our Academy can invest you with, &c. &c. The Sabdakalpadruma will remain for ever a monument of your industry and perseverance, a valuable mine of useful information about the later Hindu notions and literature."

Lassen says:—"By this performance your Highness has rendered your name immortal amongst those of the patrons of Sanskrit philology, and proved to the present age, that India still possesses luminaries of science which may vie with the most celebrated Hindus of yore for glory.....I have, by frequently referring to it, after having in vain sought for the desired information in other works, found that which I wanted in your Sabdakalpadruma, and convinced myself that it is a rich source of information on a multitude of subjects,.....the cultivators of which (Indian philology) will for ever venerate your memory as that of one of their greatest benefactors."

Roth and Böhtlink say:—(Translation of extracts from the Preface to their Dictionary) "Radhakant's Sabdakalpadruma, a work which in many respects reflects the highest credit on the learned Indian, has enabled us to make use of a great number of edited and unedited Indian Dictionaries and of commentaries to these Dictionaries of which we possess no copies. It is very useful likewise for its reference to edited and non-edited manuscripts containing all the copious synonyms of plants. This precious work &c."—.....

Böhtlink says:—"How much benefit my friend Professor Roth and I am drawing from your excellent work your Highness must observe by looking at our Dictionary almost every page of it gives evidence thereof."

Max Müller says:—"The Raja who by his Dictionary has acquired the lasting gratitude of all Sanskrit scholars.....a work which by its comprehensive range and its excellent arrangement stands unrivalled in Indian philology.....I also felt it my duty to express publicly my personal obligation to you for the valuable present which you made me of your magnificent work the Sabdakalpadruma, a work which does infinite credit to your public spirit, your reverence for the antiquities of your own nation and your comprehensive knowledge of all that is truly valuable in the literature of your ancestors. The work will make your name for ever revered among your countrymen and highly respected among the scholars of Europe."

The reasons which operated to limit the circulation of the previous editions of the book have already been set forth, but wherever it found its way in other parts of India beyond Bengal (in which it was largely distributed) words of enthusiastic welcome came from those distant provinces with expressions of regret that the work was not published in the *Devanagari* character. The venerable Pandit Radhakrishna of the court of Maharaja Ranjit Sing of Panjab got all the eight volumes transcribed in that character, and another Pandit attempted to copy it in the Telugu.

These interesting notices will show how greatly the Sabdakalpadruma is esteemed throughout the learned world.

When the learned Raja undertook the preparation of the work he had to contend with great difficulties, and he could at best with his Herculean labour give to the world a proportionably small portion of the treasures of Sanskrit learning accumulated in India during thousands of years with a literary activity unparalleled in

any part of the civilised globe before the days of printing. Moreover the nature of a lexicon or cyclopædia must be necessarily progressive. The Raja has laid the plan which must be continuously followed and improved. The nature of some of the omissions, which, as a matter of course, cannot but be found in such a book; and how far and in what way the present publishers intend to supply the desiderata, are briefly set forth in their prospectus, from which we give the following extracts.

It should be observed that though within little short of three-fourths of a century which has elapsed since the issue of the first volume of the Sabdakalpadruma, many Sanskrit Dictionaries of great merit have been poured out of the Press both in India and Europe, none have superseded the Sabdakalpadruma in its peculiar cyclopædic character. It is therefore still sought after with avidity.

To supply this want we have, after obtaining the copyright from the original donees, determined to give to the public a third edition of the Sabdakalpadruma. But in trying to do so, we do not intend only to reprint it. Incalculable as is the value of the work, it is from its very nature and in view of the exhaustless stores of Sanskrit learning, only a strong foundation upon which it is intended that structures must be continuously built. The activity of the Press in India and in Europe, the researches of learned bodies and investigations conducted under liberal Governments have brought to light and rendered available not only a large number of indigenous *Koshas*, and produced new diglots rich with words, but have rendered accessible a large mass of Sanskrit literature and science, which makes it possible with some labour and perseverance to supply an instalment of the omissions in the original work within a reasonable time. The principal omissions relate:—

Firstly, to many words and phrases in literature proper and hence to citations illustrating their use and application.

Secondly, to a large number of proper names of persons not of a mythical or mythico-historical character.

Thirdly, to proper names of places, mountains and rivers, with such identifications or suggestions at identifications as in these days may be practicable.

Fourthly, purely historical and biographical matter, which may, though in a sparse way, be constructed.

Fifthly, a considerable class of technical terms of philosophy, science and arts.

Sixthly, bibliographical accounts for which the publication of descriptive catalogues of books and MSS. in some European and Indian libraries, affords ample facilities.

Seventhly, the entire body of words and their significations peculiar to Vedic literature.

Eighthly, many important significations and applications of words already occurring in the work.

Ninthly, etymologies or derivations of words.

In order to expedite the publication of our forthcoming edition, we intend to introduce into the body of the work the last two classes of improvement. The new significations will be given with illustrations of their use and citations of authorities, and the derivations will be shown according to the system of Panini as being understood throughout the greater part of India and Europe. The Raja, in his general grammatical expositions, has followed Vopadeva, which we leave undisturbed. Such additions will be found included within brackets.

To supply the desiderata with reference to the first seven classes of omissions and others that may occur or be suggested to us, we contemplate the publication of an Appendix, which would constitute in effect, a new work. We do not leave this task for the future, but we wish to go on with its preparation so as to enable us to publish it timely, as the concluding volume or parts of the main work. This Appendix will also contain a compendious grammatical disquisition in which will be given an exhaustive list of verbal radices with indication of their conjugational classes, of the forms of in-

flexions appertaining to them in their different moods and tenses, as well as a clear exposition of the rules for the determination of genders of nouns, and the formation of derivations and compounds. The uses and significations of prefixes and affixes with other important matters will also be set forth.

We may now give some account of the new edition from an examination of the initial volume. The first thing that strikes us is its size which is double royal quarto and consists of 345 pages with the old Preface and Biography and the new prefatory introduction. The paper is also good, obviating a great objection to the old editions. The printing matter, which very economically occupies three columns of each page containing 52 lines, is excellent and generally very correct. The long metrical extracts confusedly intermingled with prose compositions in the original have been carefully separated in metrical lines, with such divisions as are necessary.

As regards intrinsic improvements we must remember, first, that the editors propose to interfere with the arrangement of the main body of the original work only within definite limits. We find they have introduced into the volume 1,400 new significations of words with their authorities, 11,000 additional examples and illustrations with their references, and 8,500 etymologies, generally according to the system of Panini. Many original articles have also been added, and among them those under the heads of *Udara Roga* and *Upāsáná*, have taken up nine and nineteen columns respectively.

It also appears that, although the larger size of the pages and smaller types of the new edition make the matter comprised in one page of the old edition occupy only three-fourths of a column of the new one, yet the contents of a page of it (the former) have sometimes been so developed as to take up three pages of the latter in the volume before us.

In summing up it will be found that the new publication brings out its first volume with 49,140 lines in *Pica*, while its prototype, containing words beginning with vowels, consists of 42,579 lines of *Great Type*, and its second reprint consists of 33,000 lines of *English Type*.

Thus we are glad to see that the improvements promised in the Prospectus have been realised, so far as the work has appeared. We hope, as is generally the case with all Lexicons, the succeeding volumes will show larger and larger improvements in quantity and quality.

We would suggest to the editors, that they should in giving the significations of words and synonyms as well as in accounts and descriptions of persons, places, things and events, arrange their references to authorities according to some rough historical and chronological order, which, with the aid of the results of the patient and ingenious researches of Western scholars, can, to some extent, be done, as shown in the Sanskrit and German Wörterbuch compiled and published by Professors Rudolph Roth and Otto Böhtlingk under the auspices of the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg, and which, at any rate, in well ascertained cases and accepted instances or with the light of tradition, can be easily effected.

In respect of the Appendix, for which the editors say they are even now collecting materials, and in which they intend to supply the larger classes of omissions set forth in their category, they seem to be unappalled by the hugeness of the work before them, but judging from their earnestness in carrying out the undertaking so far as they have taken it in hand, and by the measure of success that has as yet attended it, we are assured they will be able to accomplish their task successfully.

It is now the duty of the literary public, the lovers and patrons of Sanskrit learning, the patriot and the philanthropist, and the British Indian Government, to accord to Messrs. Baroda Prasad Bosu and Hari Charan Bosu that generous help, which their very laudable and beneficent project richly deserves, and which may be commensurate with its large dimensions—a project which ensures the production of a work most highly appreciated by the best judges for its great value and usefulness even within limits originally given to it, that are also being enlarged and expanded to embrace knowledge and wisdom stored in a language which is the oldest of the Aryan stock, and the early literary monuments of which are admitted to be the oldest records of the human race, while the latest reach recent times.

We cannot be too lavish of our praise, and cannot measure our indebtedness towards the Bosus for the precious treasures they are offering to the public.

They have not only been thus doing credit to themselves, and benefiting the world, but in a manner carrying out as trustees the will of the learned author and of a race of scholars. The former wishing to see it re-edited in the Devanagari character and with the incorporation of Vaidic Vocables, but regretting the impossibility of accomplishing it within the short remains of his terrestrial life, a Wilson desiring to see it printed on more lasting paper and in smaller types, and a Burnouf and Lassen expressing a yearning for the sale of the work, whereby they said the Raja would benefit the literary world more than by the exercise of his generosity in distributing it gratis. All these longings are now being fairly responded to, and we need only await the completion of the work to see them fully realised. Meantime let us also lend our aid by ourselves subscribing and inducing our friends to do the same.

A.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE MICROCOSM.

THE few remarks which I made in my first lecture on the Bhagavad Gita published in the February issue of this Journal, on the septenary classification of the various principles in man hitherto adopted in theosophical publications have elicited a reply from Madame H. P. Blavatsky which appeared in the last issue of this Journal under the heading of "Classification of Principles." This reply was apparently intended to explain away the remarks which fell from my lips and justify the classification hitherto advocated. I feel extremely thankful to the writer for the friendly tone of criticism which she has adopted. I cannot however fail to see that the line of argument which she has followed is likely to create a wrong impression in the minds of her readers regarding my real attitude in this matter without a few words of explanation on my part. And moreover the important questions raised by the controversy which is set on foot by the article under consideration deserve a thorough investigation. I think it necessary therefore to define clearly the position taken up by me, and examine how far the arguments now advanced in defence of the septenary classification are calculated to remove the objections raised against the said classification and weaken the force of my criticism. Looking at the tenour of the reply it becomes necessary to decide at the outset whether my remarks were intentional or whether they were due to a *lapsus lingue* as my critic is pleased to assert, and formulate the real question at issue in case there should be found a serious difference of opinion between us. I cannot but confess that my remarks were deliberate and intentional. I thought it fit to condemn the seven-fold classification after serious and anxious consideration, and I duly weighed my words in using them. It will be easily conceded that my evidence is the best and the most direct evidence available as regards my own states of consciousness which accompanied the expressions used. The term unscientific is characterized as a thoughtless expression. Whether the epithet was rightly or wrongly applied is the very issue to be settled between us; but it was certainly not due to any negligence or carelessness on my part. It is further alleged in the article under examination that when I said that the seven-fold classification was conspicuous by its absence in many Hindu books, I must have meant "some special orthodox books." This allegation has no foundation whatsoever. I was not speaking from the stand-point of any special orthodox system and could not have referred therefore to any special orthodox books. The word many is taken advantage of by my critic for the purpose of attributing to me an intention which I never had. I could not very well have said that the classification was absent in the whole range of Sanskrit mystic literature unless I had examined every book on the subject. I did not come across this classification in any book that I have read, though I have perused many of these books. If my learned critic means to assert that it would be found in some book which I have not read, she ought to name the book and the author. A classification like this should not be allowed to rest

merely on the basis of a theoretically possible inference without some clear and definite proof of its existence. And, again, I really cannot see what authority my critic has for asserting that, in making the remarks commented upon, I desired to remain strictly "within theoretical and metaphysical and also orthodox computations" of the microcosmic principles. For the purposes of this controversy a distinction is drawn between occult theories which are theoretically and metaphysically good, and those which are good for "practical demonstration" whatever the expression may mean. This is simply absurd. Occultism is both a science and an art. Its scientific principles, if they are correct, must be consistent with the rules of their practical application which are as it were but matters of inference from the said principles. Any system of occultism which has got one set of principles for its theory, and another set of principles inconsistent with the former for its practice, would be but an empirical system which could hardly be called scientific.

Fortunately for the occult science of the ancients such a distinction does not exist. I am obliged therefore to repudiate the specific motives and intentions attributed to me and frankly confess that the difference of opinion between us is not merely apparent but real. Such being the case I am fully prepared to justify my assertions.

Any further discussion of the subject will of course be out of the question if it is asserted that I am not at liberty to question the correctness of the so-called "original teachings." Some have argued, it would appear, that a slur was thrown on "the original teachings" by my remarks, thereby implying that I had no business to make them and contradict these teachings. The author of the article probably endorses this view, as she virtually informs her readers, in the footnote on page 450, that they must either adopt the seven-fold classification or give up their adherence "to the old School of Aryan and Arhat adepts." I am indeed very sorry that she has thought it proper to assume this uncompromising attitude.

It is now necessary to examine what these "original teachings" are and how far they must be considered as conclusive on the subject. The "original teachings" on the subject in question first made their appearance in an editorial headed "Fragments of Occult Truth" published in the issue of the *Theosophist* for October 1881. They were subsequently referred to in various articles written by the Editor, and additional explanations have been given from time to time. These teachings were also embodied in Mr. Sinnett's "Esoteric Buddhism," which has been put forth as an authoritative book. They were further alluded to in "Man," which has been considered equally authoritative, but whose teachings are materially inconsistent with those of "Esoteric Buddhism."

As far as I am in a position to see, these are the authorities on which these so called "original teachings" have their foundation.

In my humble opinion it would be highly dangerous for the future well-being and prosperity of the Theosophical Society, if it were to evolve, so early in its career, an orthodox creed from the materials

supplied by the above mentioned sources and raise the publications above named to the dignity of an original revelation. Most of the members of the Theosophical Society know full well the circumstances under which these teachings were given. Their fragmentary character has been repeatedly acknowledged. Their defective exposition is apparent on their very face; and their imperfection can be easily detected by a careful examination. It was also pointed out, I believe, that these teachings were derived from teachers who could not and would not reveal their real secrets, and *fully* explain their doctrines except to real initiates. The writers of these various publications had to work according to their own lights on a few hints thrown out to them. It was often pointed out that the real teachings of the ancient Arcane Science had to be approached very gradually and that the line of exposition followed was of a tentative character. It will be found on examination that the teachings connected with the seven-fold classification have gone through various changes since the appearance of the first article on the subject; and it is in my humble opinion premature to say that we have arrived at the end of our labours in this direction and ascertained the true constitution of the Microcosm. Under these circumstances it will be inconsistent with the policy which has been hitherto adopted to declare now that these "original teachings," which have already gone through so many transformations, should be accepted as an infallible revelation. Such a declaration will effectually prevent all further progress in the work of investigation which the Society has undertaken and perpetuate the blunders already committed. The introduction of any thing like an orthodox dogmatic creed at this stage of our progress will simply be ruinous to the cause of our Society. It is submitted that under such circumstances it will be no crime on my part to maintain the correctness of my remarks regarding the unsatisfactory nature of this seven-fold classification, and I am not in the least afraid that by doing so I shall forfeit my right to follow the teachings of "the old school of Aryan and Arhat adepts." I am yet to be convinced that the seven-fold classification we have adopted was the real seven-fold classification of this ancient school of occultism.

I have characterized this seven-fold classification as misleading and unscientific. It is admitted in the reply that the classification is really misleading but the blame is thrown on Western materialism. This is putting the blame on the wrong party. If the classification has misled no less a person than its original exponent herself, and made her change her conceptions about the nature of the various principles from time to time, it is pretty nearly certain that the classification itself must be held responsible for all the confusion it has created.

I must now invite the attention of my readers to the "Fragments of Occult Truth" (p. 17, *Theosophist*, Oct. 1881) which contains the "original teaching" on the subject and the other articles and publications herein referred to. I shall take up principle after principle in the order of enunciation, and point out what new ideas have subsequently been introduced into the conception of these various principles.

The *first principle* is here described as the physical *body*. It is made to correspond to *Rupa* or *form* in "Esoteric Buddhism" (p. 21). It will perhaps be said that both mean the same thing. But a distinction is drawn in the original article between the astral *body* and the astral *shape*. They are counted as two *distinct* principles.

The *second principle* is herein called the vital principle or Jiv-Atma. It is differentiated from the *astral elements* in the human constitution and is described as a "form of force." It is however identified in an article headed "Transmigrations of Life Atoms" (p. 535, "Five Years of Theosophy") written by the same author, with *anima mundi* which is equivalent to *astral light* (See p. 301, vol. I, *Isis Unveiled*). And again the same author has identified this very principle with *karana sarira* in an article on "The Septenary Principle in Esotericism" (p. 193, "Five Years of Theosophy"). Here then we have a mysterious principle which was at first described as an indestructible force different from astral light, which was afterwards identified with the astral light itself, and which was ultimately transformed into *karana sarira*. And yet we are bound to accept the classification, it would appear, as thoroughly scientific and correct.

The *third principle* of the original classification is stated to be the astral body otherwise called therein *Linga Sarira*. It is considered as *sukshma sarira* in "The Septenary Principle in Esotericism" above referred to; in another place (p. 197) however, in the same article, it is considered as a part of the *manomaya kosa*. The "original teaching" places this principle in the *second group* which represents the Perispirit of man. It is apparently transferred to the first group representing the physical man in the "Transmigrations of Life Atoms" (p. 538). It is brought back into the second group subsequently (see p. 235, "The Path," November 1886, and p. 70, *The Theosophist*, Nov. 1886). In the present article it is again retransferred to the first group (p. 451, l. 23). It will be interesting to notice further in this connection that this principle is described as something different from the astral body in "Esoteric Buddhism." More than five years have elapsed since the appearance of the "original teachings," and yet we are not quite certain whether this third principle is a part of the physical man or of the astral man. Moreover the "original teaching" says that this principle dies with the body. "Esoteric Buddhism" repeats the same lesson. But this principle is made to survive the dissolution of the physical body in "The Theories about Reincarnation and Spirits" (Paras. 3 and 4, p. 235, "The Path," Nov. 1886). My critic however reverts to the original view in her present article (p. 451, lines 3, 4, 5). In spite of all these contradictions we are assured that this seven-fold classification is the right one for explaining the phenomena "especially of *post-mortem* life."

The *fourth principle* is described as the astral *shape* in the "Fragments" and as something different from the astral *body*. The reason for this distinction is not yet clear. It has subsequently usurped the place of the astral *body*. The original teaching seems to imply that it is *astral* in its constitution. Curiously enough, however, the present article divides the seven principles into two

groups; the three principles of the first group are described as "objective and astral," and the four principles of the second group as "Superterrestrial and Superhuman." Is this fourth principle then to be removed from the plane of astral light? If not what is the reason for drawing a line of demarcation between the third principle and the fourth principle which are so intimately connected with each other according to the "Fragments?" In this connection a strange blunder has been committed by my critic. The following statement occurs in an article by me published in "Five Years of Theosophy" (p. 185):—"It will also be seen that the fourth principle is included in the third Kosa (sheath), as the said principle is but the vehicle of will power, which is but an energy of the mind." Now see what my critic says in her present article: "As to the remark in the same article (the one above referred to) *objecting* to the fourth principle being included in the third Kosa, as the said principle is but a vehicle of will power which is but an energy of the mind, I answer! Just so." In saying so she is misquoting my statement and contradicting the assertion which she made in her article on "The Septenary Principle in Esotericism" (p. 19, "Five Years of Theosophy") to the effect that this fourth principle was a part of the third Kosa. This is sufficient to show how ready she is to change her opinions about these "original teachings" which are declared to be almost infallible.

The fifth principle of the classification originally occupied but a very humble position. It was nothing more than the animal or physical intelligence of man not far removed from "the reason, instinct, memory, imagination, &c.," of the brute creation. No part of it was then allowed to go to Devachan. It was simply a part of the animal soul which was ultimately dissolved in Kamaloka (See Fragments, pp. 18, 19 and 20). The real ego of man—the permanent element in him which runs through the various incarnations,—had not its basis in this principle originally or any part of it. The "Elixir of Life" assigns to it more or less the same position as the following passage shows:—"Each of these (seven principles) has in turn to survive the preceding and more dense one and then die. The exception is the 6th when absorbed into and blended with the 7th." It is partly mixed up with Ananda-Maya Kosa and partly with Vignanamaya Kosa according to the "Septenary Principle" (p. 197, "Five Years of Theosophy"), these two Kosas being described as the "*illusion of supreme bliss*" and the "*envelope of self-delusion*" respectively. It is also to be inferred from the "Replies to an English F. T. S." (p. 274, "Five Years of Theosophy") that it is not the ego or the human monad. It is further declared in the "Transmigration of Life-atoms" (p. 539, "Five Years of Theosophy") that the particles composing this principle disperse after death and "reform after going through various transmigrations to constitute over again" the fifth principle of the next incarnation. The nature of this principle has gradually changed. Though originally it was but the animal consciousness of man it has subsequently been represented as the fully developed human mind. The whole of it used to perish originally, but subsequently a

part of it has been allowed to remain in existence. The whole of it was originally destined for Kama-loka, but a portion has been subsequently lifted up to Devachan. In this connection it must be noticed that it has not up to this time been explained whether after death this principle is physically split up into two parts, or whether the principle merely leaves impressions of its mental activity on the fourth principle taking its physical constitution to Devachan, or whether the sixth principle in conjunction with the 7th takes with it to Devachan the mere *vasana* (aroma) of this fifth principle leaving its material constitution behind with the fourth principle in Kama-loka. If the first view is accepted it must be admitted that the material constitution of this principle is something peculiar and unintelligible. No other similar phenomenon is presented to us by Nature. In case we accept the second view, we shall be placing the Devachanee in a very uncomfortable position as, according to "The Transmigrations of Life-atoms," the particles composing his fifth principle will have to undergo the process of disintegration before the next incarnation. The third view will require us to have the sixth principle for the real seat of the Ego. But it has been declared in an article published in "The Path" (p. 235, November 1886) that Manas or the fifth principle should be considered as the seat of the Ego. The first view is inconsistent with the original teaching, the second view with the philosophy of "Esoteric Buddhism," and the third view with the later developments of the occult theory. And to make our difficulties worse there is no other view possible. The latest change in the doctrine is yet to be noticed. According to the present article this principle is a mere "*correlating state*"—a condition of existence—and not a physical upadhi. It will be very interesting to enquire whether "*correlating states*" are composed of particles which disperse and reform as originally taught. It is further declared in this article that this principle is in its nature "superterrestrial and superhuman." The change from animal consciousness to something that is superhuman is indeed very vast; but it has quietly been effected within the last five years.

Now taking the whole of this teaching into account this principle may be described as follows:

The fifth principle of man is his "animal or physical consciousness" composed of particles subject to *post-mortem* disintegration which is under certain conditions "the illusion of supreme bliss" and under other conditions the "envelope of self-delusion," but which must be conceived as the seat of the Ego, and "a superterrestrial and superhuman" "*correlating state*" corresponding to the dreamy condition.

Let us now turn our attention to the sixth principle. It was originally described as the higher or spiritual intelligence or consciousness in man, and the main seat of consciousness in the "*perfect man*" ("Fragments," p. 19, *Theos.* Oct. 1881). It must be noticed that the expression "*perfect man*" used in this connection does not mean the perfected man or an adept, but a human being who has fully reached the level of humanity in the course of evolutionary progress from the animal kingdom.

According to the original teaching of the "Fragments" the *post-mortem* career of this principle is something very peculiar. It is stated that if this principle—"the spiritual ego"—"has been in life material in its tendencies," it clings blindly to the lower principles and severs its connection with the 7th (p. 19, para. 3). It is further stated that its severance from the 7th principle brings about its dissolution. The author of the "Fragments" writes thus on the subject, "Withdraw the oxygen and the flame ceases. Withdraw the spirit and the spiritual Ego disappears." It is further declared that in such cases the 7th principle passes away "taking with it no fragment of the individual consciousness of the man with which it was temporarily associated." It is also pointed out on the next page that under certain peculiar conditions this principle may remain in combination with the fifth as an elementary. Is Madame H. P. Blavatsky prepared to adhere to this original view at present? If so a considerable portion of the subsequent theosophical literature will have to be thrown to the winds. If the spiritual Ego, the main seat of consciousness in the so-called "perfect man," is liable to be destroyed whenever the man's tendencies in life happen to be material; if the 5th principle is likewise to be dissolved in Kamaloka, and if the 7th principle carries nothing connected with the individual with it, how is the chain of incarnations kept up and sustained?

What becomes of the doctrine of karma then? Now see what changes have been introduced into the conception of this principle by subsequent articles and other publications. According to "The Elixir of Life" the 6th principle does not perish in the manner stated. "The Replies to an English F. T. S." speak of it in conjunction with the 7th principle as the permanent monad which runs through the whole series of incarnations. The teachings of "Esoteric Buddhism" are utterly inconsistent with the original view as may be easily perceived. In the present article my critic identifies it with *Karanopadhi* and calls it at the same time a "correlating state." This very *Karanopadhi* she has some time ago identified with the 2nd principle, as above shown. She has thus contradicted the original teaching any number of times in her subsequent writings. It must also be remembered that in writing these "Fragments" she has made the following distinct declaration: "These are no speculations—we speak what we do know." And yet she herself has treated them as if they were something worse than mere speculations. Nevertheless with all these contradictions and all this confusion people must accept, it would appear, these teachings as gospel truths, and not utter a single word to criticize them.

There is not much difficulty perhaps about the 7th principle as nothing very definite has ever been said about it. One fact about it is pretty nearly certain. It must be considered as the Logos, there being no other entity in the Cosmos which possesses the attributes assigned to it. It has been often declared, as far as my recollection goes, that the ancient occultists regarded this principle as something existing out of the body and not in the body. It was once loosely stated that this principle should be considered as a principle run-

ning through the other principles (p. 197, "Five Years of Theosophy.") This might be true as regards its light or aura; but the Logos itself is never present in the microcosm except when it finally enters into a man before his final emancipation from the trammels of incarnate existence. It is erroneous in my humble opinion to name the Logos as a principle in man. It will be quite as proper to name Parabrahmam itself as a principle in man.

In tracing the course of evolution it is stated in "Esoteric Buddhism" and some other writings, that each succeeding planetary round is calculated to bring about the development of one of the seven principles. But to avoid certain difficulties which are obvious, it is further asserted that the germs of the higher principles in man are present in him at every stage of his evolutionary progress. These various statements when put together are apt to give rise to the belief that the 7th principle is subject to a course of evolutionary development. This difficulty has long ago been pointed out by one or two writers, but received no consideration from the propounders of the original doctrine. My critic calls even this principle "a correlating state." There is no use quarrelling about the nature of this principle when so little has been or can be said about it.

From the foregoing remarks it will be seen that this unfortunate seven-fold classification is misleading, not on account of western materialism as my critic asserts, but on account of its own inherent defects. Its unscientific nature is equally clear from all that has been said about it. A classification which has brought about such a state of things, and required so many alterations in the conceptions associated with it to keep it in existence, must be supported, if it can be supported at all, by clear definitions and powerful arguments. On the other hand my critic virtually evades the real question at issue and undertakes to establish a proposition which I have never denied.

As this article has already become very lengthy its continuation will appear in the next number of the *Theosophist*.

T. SUBBA ROW.

NOTE.

In Mr. Subba Row's third lecture the following corrections should be made.

Page 432, line 48, for Chapter *XII*, read Chapter *XIII*.

Page 442, line 47, for *Mityasamsarikas*, read *Nityasamsarikas*.

Page 442, line 48, for *Intyamuktas*, read *Nityamuktas*.

Page 446, line 46, for *Vachas*, read *Vach as*.

Page 447, line 14, for *Prana*, read *Pranava*.

Page 447, line 3, for *Achidrupam*, read a *Chidrupam*.

PLANT LORE.

IN England three astronomical almanacs, Zadkiel, Raphael and Old Moore are published annually, and command a sale of something under half a million copies between them, principally among the agricultural classes, as a great part of these almanacs is taken up with weather forecasts. Zadkiel in addition publishes political forecasts, and, as a rule, is not very wide of the mark; so far, this year, he has been especially correct. I mention these facts, as I want information as to whether similar almanacs are published in this country; besides wishing to ask many other questions, which I hope some one will be forthcoming to answer, and thus confer on me a great favour.

Does the moon affect the growth of vegetation and to what extent? As she controls the tides, there is no reason against her doing so. Zadkiel and Raphael advise one to sow seeds when the moon is increasing, and particularly when she is in any of the following signs of the Zodiac: Taurus, Cancer, Libra, Scorpio, Capricornus and Pisces. Is this advice good? I am situated, roughly speaking, in Longitude 77 E. and Latitude 32 N. In England the moon passes through the Zodiacal sign Cancer during the 28th and 29th April; as regards my location, does she pass through this sign earlier or later, and how much? Ramesey recommends that trees should be planted when the moon is in Taurus, and seed sown in Taurus or Capricornus. Dr. Goad in his "Astra Meteorologica" enjoins the felling of trees in winter, and during the last days of the moon, so that the timber should last to perpetuity.

The following facts are culled from Martin's "History of the British Colonies." In Demerara each year there are thirteen springs and thirteen autumns, for so many times does the sap of trees ascend to the branches, and descend to the roots. For example, the Wallaba, a resinous tree somewhat resembling Mahogany, when cut down in the dark a few days before the new moon, is not only split with the greatest difficulty, but is one of the most durable woods in the world for house building, posts, etc. On the other hand, another Wallaba alongside, cut down at full moon, can be split with ease into shingles, but, if applied to house building and similar purposes, it very speedily decays. Similarly bamboos, if cut at the dark moon, will last for ten or twelve years; but if cut down at the full moon, will only last two or three years. In Africa, newly littered pups, if exposed to the rays of the full moon, perish in a few hours, and fish become rapidly putrid; and meat, if left exposed, becomes incurable and unpreservable with salt. Do any of the other planets affect vegetation, etc., in a similar way?

Is it lawful, advisable, or expedient for good Theosophists to eat beans? They certainly are a most uncanny vegetable, if ancient writers are to be believed. Mr. Andrew Lang in the January number of Longman's Magazine wants the following questions answered, and they certainly are posers. Some at least of the

readers of the *Theosophist* should be able to answer them; although "Isis Unveiled" throws no further light on the subject, than simply mentioning that Pythagoras once persuaded a bull to give up eating beans. Perhaps in Madame Blavatsky's forthcoming work "The Secret Doctrine" more light will be thrown on all these subjects.

Pythagoras said, (vide Lord Lytton in the Caxtons,) that whatever is written with bean juice on this earth, reappears on the disc of the moon. Why did Pythagoras forbid his "chelas" to eat beans? The Athenians had a hero called Bean or Bean Man. Why was it impious to attribute to Demeter the discovery of beans? Why might not beans be eaten by those initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries? Why did the Shawnee Prophet, (who was he?) in this our century, send round strings of beans, which mystically represented his body? Why did the old Greek author write "It is all one, whether you eat beans or the heads of your parents?" Heraclides attributes to Orpheus the saying, that beans if hidden under manure become human beings. Why were beans thrown on tombs for the salvation of the dead? Why was the Flamen Dialis at Rome forbidden so much as even to mention beans?

Is there any thing in the Hindoo Shastras against the use of bonedust (cattle) as manure; for the agriculture of the country is impoverished by immense quantities being sent from Bombay to England. The people here also are curious in their ways, straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. They have no objection to using night soil as manure, even Brahmans carrying basketfuls of it on their backs to their fields; yet I cannot get them, even the lowest castes, to collect the bones for me (on payment) which lie all round the villages.

A. BANON, F. T. S.

Note.—There have been several letters in the papers lately from practical agriculturists and foresters showing that the sap rises during the bright phase of the moon, that shoots or seeds sown at that time do better than if sown during the dark one, but that wood for timber should be cut during the dark phase, when it does not contain much sap, and also that medicinal plants (Vide *Theosophist*, Vol. VII, p. 670) should be culled at certain periods of the moon and of the day or night, when their properties are much more powerful than at other times. The Hindoos always consider the moon in planting.—Ed.

Reviews.

"UNITED."*

MONTHS have passed since the publication of this remarkable work—remarkable as a psychic production besides its undeniable literary worth—and we have been watching all the time to see the effects produced by it on the Philistine press. The latter forgetting but too often "that it is not the eye for faults, but beauties, that constitutes the true critic," has made us acquainted for years with the spirit with which it generally treats theosophical works. There are not a few reviewers in the Metropolis of England—preeminent among these the literary critics of the *Saturday Review*, who love to proceed in the spirit so sternly denounced by Macculloch. "Fastidiousness, the discernment of defects and the propensity to seek them, in natural beauty, are not the proofs of taste, but the evidence of its absence," he says. And adds: "it is worse than that, since it is a depravity, when pleasure is found in the discovery of such defects, real or imaginary." When no defects can be ferreted out in unpopular works, the press boycotts them in contemptuous silence.

It came to pass as it was expected. Unable to tear the mystic romance to shreds, to find fault with its style, or even to criticize the subject, as its author had wisely screened it behind the privileges of a fancy novel—the Philistines simply ignored it. There appeared two or three short notices in the leading papers in which, with one or two exceptions, chaff—not always witty—was made to stand for a literary notice, and then the press subsided into silence. The novel was seriously mystical, the descriptive portions of the various phases of psychic phenomena were photographed from nature, and it was written by an earnest and a well-known Theosophist. This was, of course, amply sufficient to place the work on the *Index Expurgatorius*. The *Graphic* alone had a few words of appreciation in its columns.

As the present notice lays no claim to an analysis of the literary merits of "United," but means to treat only of the psychic element in it—it may be worth our while to remind the reader of what was said of this novel in one, at least, of the best London papers.

"Mr. Sinnett's new contribution to the literature of transcendental psychology "United," is more than a worthy successor to "Karma." Adepts and disciples will, no doubt, apply to this work as to its predecessor, in order to find freshly suggestive light thrown on the doctrines it illustrates and seeks to popularize. But the ordinary reader is by no means forgotten—quite the contrary: and it is from his point of view that it will be the most prudent to discuss the work. Independently of its subject, then, "United" is a thoroughly interesting romance. Well constructed, and perfectly clear, calculated to exercise a fascination over the most sceptical or indifferent with regard to esoteric theosophy. Moreover, though it is, and should be, no purpose of a story to convince, it is likely to attract, and, in any case, to inspire personal respect for the very obvious earnestness of the author. The main story, little broken by episode, is that of a man who transfers his entire vitality to a girl, in order to save her life, and, by his self sacrifice, not only raises her to a higher scale of being, but has earned the right to her life in return in a loftier sphere. All this sounds very mystical, but the result is a pathos only to be obtained through skill in giving to the mystical the semblance and impression of realism—a very high form of art indeed, and very seldom carried out so well. No doubt faith, in the completest sense, has something to do with the artistic and popular success of Mr. Sinnett's achievement in so exceedingly difficult a field."—(*Graphic*, July 24, 1886, London.)

* By A. P. Sinnett, 2 Vols. George Redway.

The above is not over extravagant in giving a clear idea of the work, but it is fair and honest in its appreciation. No longer notice of "United" has appeared, even in our Theosophical publications. We will not stop to find any valid reasons for it, for there were none; except, perhaps, as regards the *Theosophist*—an instinctive fear of saying too much or too little. It is time that this remarkable novel and its esoteric truths should be more amply analyzed and thus pointed out to the attention of theosophical readers, at any rate. Hitherto there has been too much tendency in the organs of our Society to sacrifice spirit to form, to lay too much stress on isolated cases of the normal manifestations of psychic powers, instead of popularising them as a LAW IN HUMAN NATURE.

This power is "latent in MAN," and not in solitary units of the human family only, though this mystery of *dual* life in every man, woman and child may remain unknown to them ninety-nine times out of a hundred. This ignorance is due to our Western modes of life.

Whether rich or poor, educated or illiterate—we, of the civilized nations, are born, live and die under an artificial light; a *false* light which, distorting our real selves like a mirror cracked in all directions, distorts our faces, and makes us see ourselves not as we are, but as our religious superstitions and social prejudices show us to ourselves. Otherwise—the Ediths and Marstons would be less rare in every class of society than they are now.

For who of us knows, or has any means of knowing *Self*, while he lives in the lethal atmospheres of whether Society or Proletariat? Who, taught from babyhood that he is born in sin, helpless as a reed, whose only true support is the "Lord"—can think of testing his own powers—when even their presence in him is a thought that never could enter his mind? Between the eternal struggle for more gold, more honours, more power in the higher classes, and the "struggle for existence" for bread and life, in the lower ones, there is no time or room for the manifestation of the "inner man" in us. Thus, from birth to death that Ego slumbers, paralyzed by the external man, and asserts itself only occasionally in dreams, in casual visions, and strange "coincidences"—unbidden and unheeded. The *Psychic* or HIGHER SELF as it is called in "United," has to be, first of all, entirely ridden of the soporific influence of *Personal Self*, before it can proclaim obviously its existence and actual presence in man. But once this condition is fulfilled, then truly "he who reigns within himself and rules passions, desires, and fears, is more than a king"—as Milton says: for he is an adept already; the *shell* alone between the inner man and the world of objective as subjective manifestation, is to be overcome; and when it offers no better resistance than a merely passive one, then the higher self is as free as on the day on which that shell will be left behind him for ever. But there are rare individuals who seem born with this capacity for certain mysterious objects of karma, and whose *inner* SELVES are so strong as to actually reduce to nought the resistance of their personal or provisional bodies. Such a "rare efflorescence" of her age is Edith,—first the child, and then the girl heroine of Mr. Sinnett's novel.

The author has enhanced the value of his great services to Theosophy and laid the world of thought under an additional obligation by the publication of the above novel; not as the reviewer in the *Graphic* thinks, because he gave "to the mystical the semblance and impression of realism," but because he clothed REALITY—an actual psychic phenomenon which under *pseudo-impartial* modern investigation and too

scientific treatment could hitherto grow no higher in public recognition than a "telepathic impact"—in such attractive yet natural garb, and presented it in such an easy reading form. To that numerous class of the reading public which has no taste for abstract metaphysical speculation, the interweaving of some *true* occult doctrines into the framework of such an interesting narrative is invaluable. In fact, the mystic bias now tempering so much current light literature, is in a large measure accountable for the rush of spirituality which constitutes not the least noticeable feature of the last few years. Difficult as it is to convey in an intelligible manner to the general reader the more advanced doctrines of the secret teaching, we must make the attempt. In "United," a mass of lucid metaphysical speculation is blended with the subject matter of a story of prosaic, every-day society life.

The story opens with a description of the early life of the heroine—Edith Kinseyle—with her widowed father and a good, simple soul of a governess, in a lonely country house. The father is an ever occupied scholar, an ardent philologist leading his own inner life of study, so absorbed in it, that "he realized for the first time that she (the wife) had been seriously ill" only when "in a gentle, unobtrusive way," Mrs. Kinseyle "had dropped into the grave." The first lines of the work acquaint the reader with the whole character of the heroine's father, and thus lead him to see how much the early surroundings of the child were propitious for the development in her of her *abnormal* powers. She was the only child of a quiet country gentleman, of no large means, whose lack of fortune as much as the retired habits of a book-worm, had narrowed the horizon of her social life from birth, and thus thrown her forcibly upon the resources of a mental, inner world of her own. Her governess, Miss Barkley, "a tall, thin spinster, with very prominent teeth, a mild disposition and a long experience of life"—the latter quality having no effect upon her terror of ghosts—rather developed than checked in the child an early and ungovernable love for the mysterious and the "supernatural," by thus awakening in the girl a natural spirit of innocent combativeness and malice. From the early age of six, Edith manifested an abnormal interest in the occult. She rummaged out all the old books in her father's library to get information upon ghosts in general and "a family ghost" especially; and was frequently found by her governess perched on the entrance gate of the avenue wistfully wanting to catch a glimpse of the family "apparition"—an old knight on horseback whose astral picture occasionally curdled the blood in the veins of the rustic "elect" who happened to see it.

The story of the simply child-life of that young dreamy soul evolving from *without within*, so to speak, and awakening with every day more to an *inner* instead of an outer world under the sole guidance of her own personal instincts—is very beautiful. Till the age of six when her mother died, the child had been left entirely to follow her own quiet tastes. It was only when placed under the necessity of either sending his daughter to school or taking a governess for her, that the widower was brought to a closer acquaintance with his child. He was quite startled and perplexed to discover that the six years old baby had a will in the choice of her future destinies. For when Ferron Kinseyle attempted to argue her into making her choice of rather school than governess,

"Oh, Papa!" she cried, more in sorrow than in anger, "you don't mean that you will send me from you *against my will*!" and with that she melted into tears."

Both will and tears had their desired effect. Miss Edith remained at home, and time rolled on for her, calm but never monotonous, between

her kind father and as kind a governess on the external plane; and the fathomless world within herself she was never tired of exploring till she was seventeen. Her beauty expanded, but she preferred her quiet home to everything else.

"Her love of the quiet seclusion of Compton Wood was born of no shrinking timidity of nature, still less of any morose dislike of her fellow creatures. The sunny brightness of her own temperament gilded the old house with all the gaiety she required....."

Thus she passed her days between her quiet home and visits to an old manor belonging to some relatives whither she was drawn by a "Countess's Study," so called, in it. It was not a "*canny* habitation after dusk" for nervous people; for that "Countess" of old had left a memory after her for having practised the "black art," and after her death her wraith had been seen at the same windows in the moon-light." But it was the more attractive for Edith, who had never been "nervous," to her governess's sorrow. In that large room of the deserted house she used to sit for long hours before dusk, while Miss Barkley ventilated her fidgety fears with Mrs. Squires, the lodge-keeper's wife. During one of such rests in the lodge while Edith is in the "Countess's Study," the governess meets with two young gentlemen—George Ferrars and Marston. After mutual introduction the former gives the curious information that he is at present engaged in following a clue for his sister, Mrs. Malcolm. The latter, who is fond of penetrating into the depths of things occult and who is a clairvoyant, has received a mysterious communication: she must become acquainted with a young girl connected with an old manor called Kinseyle-Court. His companion, Marston—the chief hero in the occult plot—turns out, later on, to be a strong mesmerizer, one deeply versed in the mysteries of psychic lore.

Meanwhile, feeling more brave with two young men to protect her from possible ghosts, Miss Barkley "marvelling at the strange coincidence," proceeds in search of Edith in company of her new acquaintances. But Edith does not answer the call from the hall. In great terror the governess rushes through the old house in search for her and finds her pupil at last,

"Half kneeling, half lying prostrate on the floor, her creamy white dress shining as though luminous in the moonbeams, her hands clasped together and her face turned upwards towards...the Countess' Study....."

"Oh, why did you disturb us?" she said in a dreamy tone..... "I feel as if I had been in Heaven, but now *she* has gone....."

"The beautiful angel has been here just where I am standing talking to me, for I don't know how long, filling my mind with such rapture I can't describe it to you...I have been lifted up out of myself—I can't bear to come down again....."

Edith cannot tear herself away from the spot where she had this first experience of *living in her Higher self*, and outside of her body. A little water brought by Marston, however, who says in a confident tone that—

"It is pure water, with only a little magic in it.....which will not be at war with the vision"

—recalls Edith back to this life, and the two—the natural born seeress and the strong adept and mesmerizer, become linked in the same destiny from that hour henceforward.

It is not mutual love however—as no profane novel writer would fail to make it. On Edith's part it is not even a very acute sympathy or interest. She feels his influence later on, and chiefly during her hours of supersensuous existence, when separating from her body she

lives in her "Higher-Self." Otherwise, this first and several subsequent meetings have no immediate effects upon the girl—though Marston's fate is sealed from that night. He becomes passionately devoted to her, but with a mystic love that has nothing of the terrestrial element in it.

Edith and Marian Malcolm (Ferrars' sister) soon become great friends and feel a passionate affection for each other. Both are mutually attracted at first, because both labour under the impression that they are visited by one and the same "Spirit Queen"—although the latter is only the glorious Spirit SELF of the pure girl, called Edith, who thus strangely mistakes that Higher-Self for a being independent of her own individuality. Marston, the adept in occult mesmerism, finally disabuses her and reveals the truth to the young Sceress. But in doing so he seals his own destiny.

There is a deadly secret in his life, a mystery that is known only to this old and trusted friend of his young days, Ferrars, and his sister, and one that makes him lead the life of a Cain, for no crime of his own. That crime—expiated by his father on the gallows—digs an abyss between himself and the girl he loves. With his mesmeric power over her it would be easy for him, as he says, to Mrs. Malcolm, to have chained her life to his, but he will not do it. "Would it not have been base to do so?" he asks. As for Edith, as she brings back to earth none of the knowledge of persons and things she exhibits while plunged by Marston in her trances, she is ignorant of that great love. None of the terrestrial impurities seem to touch her, and she is wholly absorbed only in her dream-life. She even gets engaged to a worthy Colonel who adores her, but whom she consents to wed, simply because, as she writes, "I have been paired off by my destinies and my friends with Colonel Denby."

In one of her trance states she reveals to Marston and Mrs. Malcolm that her lung is very weak and that she will not live, that in her waking hours, feeling strong and healthy, she is ignorant of the danger; though when the doctors find it out this does not seem to affect her in the least. She remains throughout the same dreamy and, at the same time, merry girl as from the first.

It is this pre-eminently occult feature—the constant, though unconscious longing for deliverance from the terrestrial bonds in every true psychic, all the attractions, happiness and joy of a young life, notwithstanding—that the author has admirably developed and described in his heroine. Her dual nature, so difficult to maintain in contrasted harmony in the same character, is drawn with a masterly hand by the author. He has created a marvellously natural combination in his heroine. Edith longs for the unalloyed bliss of a "Higher-self state" whenever she approaches the arcanum of her own nature, and yet once she is back on earth, she assumes no mystic melancholy airs, shows no disgust for life, but is thoroughly herself each time—the young and joyous daughter of the earth.

"Nobody would live in the body if they knew what it was to live in the world of spirit" she argues, when lying entranced—"but one must never hasten the change," she adds. And yet all the aspirations of her life in her external body seem to make her unconsciously strive after that glorious "change," as "everything else does seem so poor and worthless compared to the glory and joy" of that disembodied yet fully conscious state. Thus, the two parallel lines of life of the illusive, external Edith and her HIGHER SELF as "Spirit Queen" and her own guardian—reminding us of the dramatic interview of Zanon

with his shining and glorious *Augoïdes*—are never blended together, and yet they present an integral whole, an artistic blending of the same spiritual individuality, the immortal reflecting itself in the mortal.

The reader of "United" finds more than one mystic scene in it, whose details are occult truths presented under a semblance of romantic fiction. It is the business of the intuitional and esoteric student to discern the correct doctrine under a slightly modified form for purposes of an easier reading. The sacrifice of Sidney Marston is of an intensely dramatic character and *true to life* in the great and mysterious possibilities of the occult transfer of forces and even LIFE in mesmeric phenomena. In his intense and immortal love for her, his "Soul Queen," who can never belong to him on this earth, Marston wants her to live and even to wed another man as he knows she could never be happy with himself. Hence he resolves to infuse into her veins and rapidly disappearing lungs the breath of life from his own organism, and then to die and vanish from this life to be ever near to her in his invisible soul-body. This he accomplishes notwithstanding her opposition, subduing her will under his stronger energy.

"Be merciful and gracious and do not reject my offering," he pleaded. "For Edith, dearest, I tell you the die is cast—the step is taken. I would not draw back, if I would..... *This day has been spent in work that cannot be undone.....* If I had been dying from common-place illness..... I should not be more free than I am to speak to you as I am speaking. I shall never see you again my beloved, after this night... I give you my life, my own. It is my *supreme act of will.....* It is transfusing into your being as I speak, and my heart, that has been beating for you only for so long, is beating nearly its last now in glad and proud exhaustion for your sake, as it rests for the first and last time against your own. You shall be happy in this life, my glorious queen,—in this life as in the next—and you will not be pained by the recollections of this evening after the first excitement of it has passed..... My beloved, we could not both be happy on this earth, and I choose to stand aside and let you pass. Anyhow I am of service to you in dying, and I can be of no service to you living."

"Whatever influences were working upon her, the intense excitement through which she was passing, or something else as well, were now so powerful that any coherent thought, not to speak of argumentative protest, were wholly impossible for her. She lay in his arms panting, and flushed and giddy with the tumultuous energy pulsing through her veins..... Under the dominion of a different kind of bewilderment his own words become more confused and his own sight uncertain—"Ah! I am staying too long," he stammered.

"I must go, good-bye, good-bye."

He rose to his feet, staggering as if intoxicated, clutched the chairs, and made his way to the door..... Edith came flying through the hall from the drawing-room as he was opening the carriage door.

"Do not let him go!" she cried. "Marian—he is very ill. Stay! I command you to stop. I will not live without you."

"Too late! Too late!" he answered, but rather in exultation than in sorrow. "Drive on," he called in a loud voice to the coachman.

"He has died for me," Edith said almost fiercely. "We shall never see him living again."

They never did; for as Edith explained it:—

"These things which are so strange to you are tremendous realities to him and to me. He had always been able to make me strong—to refresh me by magnetism when I was enfeebled, and that used to exhaust him in exactly the same way it strengthened me. It was a transfer of vitality. He could give it out, I could absorb it. But these small efforts in the past were as nothing to what he found out at last to be possible. He has learned how to pour out his life in a great flood upon me, so that I have been made strong and

well, and he is dead at this moment in the carriage that is driving his body to London!".....

Is this a fiction or a real fact in nature? Perchance, when that which Dr. Richardson calls "etheric nerve-force," the life principle, is better known and accepted, the seemingly impossible phenomenon will become comprehensible. If animal magnetism is a fluid, a force, an energy, call it what you will—can heal diseases by infusing new life-energy into the patient's veins, why *is the transfer of the whole supply of it from one body into another an impossibility?* Truths are stranger than fictions, and very often so. Still they are truths and have to remain facts in nature.

But the sacrifice proved useless. Instead of remaining in her physical organism, the life-energy Marston imparted to her, took another direction, and under the intense spirituality of Edith, loosened still more the bonds of union, between her astral Higher Self and the body. Edith determined to leave her body for good. "Dear," she said consoling Marian,

"Don't you see it must be so? Knowing what I know now, and with the consciousness so vivid of what the other life open to me is like, how can I possibly go on with this one?"

There is a magnificent scene of clairvoyance between the two friends Marian and Edith in the old Manor, near the "Countess' Study," a day or two before the last disembodiment of the latter.

Then, the last scene, after Edith had prepared her father—unconscious of his approaching loss—to separation with his only child. In the night Mrs. Malcolm

"Felt the glorified spirit of Edith besides her, even as she lay in a state of slumber..... It seemed to Mrs. Malcolm when the morning came, that she had passed through years of time, and that the bodily Edith was a beautiful memory rather than a fact of yesterday".....

And then Edith bid her good-bye. The last words the vanishing spirit utters reveal the secret of her determining upon the untimely "change." For she says:—

"It is hardly good-bye from me at all, for I shall scarcely be conscious of missing any part of you from the Higher Self that will be always with me. I shall be none the less with you *because I shall be also with the one other person who has earned so thoroughly the right to blend his existence with mine.*"

Marston and Edith were UNITED in Devachan "from whence no traveller returns." The glorious "Higher Self" with which we are united during life, gathers around itself the Higher selves of all those whom it loved on earth with an immortal spiritual love. Thus the spirit of Edith was right in saying to Marion she would not miss "any part" of her from HIGHER SELF, who would always be present.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

THE FATHERS OF JESUS.*

THIS, the work of an original thinker who had acquired a large amount of material for his task, is a book that will do much good by helping the English reading public to realise more fully than the majority do, the value of some of the older religions. A good many English people are apt to forget that the pagans also had many beautiful ideas which will quite bear investigation at the present day.

* "The Fathers of Jesus, a Study of the Christian Doctrine and Traditions," by Keningale Cook, M. A., LL. D. London, Kegan Paul, 1886.

In reading Dr. Cook's book, however, we cannot but feel that it does not contain his last word, and that had he lived longer the world would have had to thank him for a yet fuller presentation of the truth.

Drawing his examples from Ancient Egypt, Persia, India and Greece; reviewing the teachings of Thoth, Zoroaster, Buddha, Pythagoras and Plato, and comparing them with those of Jesus, the author shows that there is but one truth beneath all forms.

In the last chapter on "The Genius of Parable," our author is seen at his best. He gives a careful explanation of exactly what is meant by the terms allegory, myth, fable, etc., illustrating his point by the parable of the Ten Virgins. He well points out the danger of trusting solely to the explanations of the commentators without using the intuition to interpret texts for oneself, for indeed the same parable, if its foundation be a true one, will bear a different interpretation for every stage of spiritual development.

Correspondence.

THE SEERESS OF PREVORST AND THE HUMAN BRAIN.

SIR,—I have observed your comments on the statements of the Seeress of Prevorst, and wish to say that the Seeress was not mistaken in the statements you quote.*

As to using the back brain for thinking in the state of sleep, I have no doubt of it. When the front portion of the brain is asleep, the pineal gland (as it is called) remains as a centre of spiritual life and a channel of connection with the Divine inspiration. It is not, strictly speaking, the *back brain*, for it is but little behind the centre, but might so be called in contradistinction from the front. This nervous structure, improperly called a gland, is in communication by its pedunculi with the interior seats of spiritual perception and intelligence in front of it, of which the *septum lucidum* is a part, and posteriorly with the central superior portion of the cerebellum, which is intimately associated in action with the coronal region of the cerebrum, the seat of our highest emotions.

Moreover this pineal region, the grand centre of the Divine influx, corresponds, according to sarcognomy, with the solar plexus region of the body, in which also there may be an exalted intelligence and influx, as many experiments have shown. I would not at all deny that the Seeress may in sleep have used the anterior and superior portions of the cerebellum, which are physiologically correspondential with anterior and superior portions of the cerebrum, and which being closely connected with the pineal region, do also receive the influx. She was correct (according to my experiments) in saying that she "thought more with her soul" when using these parts of the brain, for when they predominate we are in our highest psychic condition—the nearest relation to the Divine—a state highly restorative to our health and virtue.

JOS. RODES BUCHANAN.

We believe Dr. Buchanan is correct in saying that the pineal gland is connected with the highest intellection and spiritual sense. But it is not the gland, which is rather a battery supplying force for the *Sahasraram chakram*, which occupies the 5th ventricle between the layers of the *septum lucidum*, and is the highest of the senses of the fully developed astral man. But this could hardly be spoken of as the

* See *Theosophist* for September, 1886. Art : "Seeress of Prevorst," page 761, et seq.

back of the brain, for of the three chakrams of the head it is the foremost. Moreover it is in the highest degree improbable that the Seeress made use of so high a sense, or indeed possessed it in a state of development. It is more probable that she used the *Vasudhi chakram*, which occupies the 4th ventricle—between the medulla oblongata and cerebellum,—which might correctly be spoken of as, 'back brain.' In the state of complete trance, the cerebrum and cerebellum are asleep, as much as any other part of the body, so that she could only perceive and think with the senses and centres of consciousness of the soul (*Sukshma sarira* or astral body) which are the chakrams. Which *chakrams* she used would depend on which she had developed, and apparently her development was very uneven. As to the connexion between the pineal region and the solar plexus region, or, between the *Sahasraram* and *Swadhistanam chakrams*, there is, we believe, a connection between all the *chakrams*, when the buds, as they are called, have fully opened; and the opening of the *Swadhistanam* marks an important stage in the development of the astral senses, but we are unaware of any other connexion than that through Sushumna, or, as the Kabbalists call it, Death.—*Ed.*

THE FORMS OF VAK.

SIR,—With reference to Mr. Subba Row's lectures on Bhagavadgita, published in the *Theosophist* for April 1887, page 446, where he says, "I would here call your attention to the 1st Anhika of Mahabhashya, where Patanjali speaks of three forms manifested, Pasyanti, Madhyama and Vaikhari Vach: the way he classifies is different" I have to state that the 1st Anhika of Mahabhashya does not contain any such particular divisions. Patanjali quotes a verse from Rig Veda "Chatvarivak parimitāpadām, &c.," and interprets "Chatvari vak" nama, akyata, upasarga, and nipāta. The same verse of Rig Veda is interpreted by Yaska in his Nirukta, chapter 12, in the same way as by Patanjali, and he adds some other explanations than those quoted by Mr. Subba Row; nor does Kaita, the well-known commentator of Mahabhashya, give them in his Bhashyapradipa. But Nagesabhatta, a commentator of Bhashyapradipa, gives Mr. Subba Row's sub-divisions in detail, in his Bhashyapradipoth-yota, referring to Harikarika, or Vakyapadiya of Bhartrihari. This Nagesabhatta speaks of the same sub-divisions in the Spotavada of his Manjusha; and some modern grammarians give the same sub-divisions quoting from Mahabharata; Annambhatta, a commentator on Bhashyapradipa, who lived before Nagesabhatta, did not interpret the passage in question in the way that Nagesabhatta did.

I would therefore ask you to draw Mr. Subba Row's attention to the above facts, and to explain the thing in a more acceptable way. I have herewith enclosed extracts from Mahabhashya, Kaita, and Nirukta on this point.

Yours fraternally,

N. BHASHYACHARY.

SIR,—I have to thank Mr. Bhashyachary for having called my attention to the wrong reference given in my third lecture. Instead of referring to Nagesabhatta's Bhashyapradipodyota and Sphotavada, I referred to the Mahabhashyam itself through oversight. I had especially in my mind Nagesabhatta's remarks on the four forms of Vak in his Sphotavada when I made the statements adverted to in your learned correspondent's letter. Patanjali had to interpret the original rik of the Rig Veda from the stand-point of a grammarian in his Mahabhashya; but he certainly recognised the importance of the interpretation put upon it by Hatayogis and Rajayogis as might be easily seen by the symbols he introduced into the mystic arrangements of the Chidambaram temple. Apart from mystic symbology, Nagesabhatta had very high and ancient authorities to

guide him in interpreting this rik. Nearly seven interpretations have been suggested for this rik by various classes of writers and philosophers. The four forms of Vak enumerated by me are common to the interpretation of Hatayogis and Mantrayogis on the one hand and Rajayogis on the other. I request your learned correspondent to refer to Vidyananya's commentary on the 45th rik of the 164th Sukta of the 22nd Anuvaka of the first Mandala of Rig-veda. Most of these various interpretations are therein enumerated and explained. The learned commentator refers to para, pasyanti, madhyama and vaikhari and indicates the order of their development as stated by Mantrayogis and Hatayogis. It will be useful to refer to Yoga Sikha and other Upanishads in this connection. There is still higher authority for the views expressed in my lecture and the statements made by Nagesabhatta in Sankaracharya's commentary on Nrisimhottara Tapani (See page 118, Calcutta edition, from line 14 to the end of the para). These four forms of vak are therein explained from the stand-point of Tharaka Rajayoga. I would particularly invite the reader's attention to the explanation of Madhyama. Madhyama is so called, because it occupies an intermediate position between the objective form and the subjective image. On carefully perusing this portion of the commentary, it will be seen that the explanations therein given form, as it were, the foundation of the various statements made by me in my lectures regarding these four forms of vak. Whether this commentary is attributed to Sankaracharya as many have done, or to Goudapatha as some have stated, its authority is unimpeachable. I do not think it necessary to refer to any works on Mantra Sastra in this connection, as the authorities cited above are amply sufficient to justify my statements. I may perhaps have to refer to the mystic philosophy of vak at greater length in another connection.

T. S. R.

ZOROASTRIANISM.

SIR,—Will you or any of your readers be so kind as to say what the words "a bull and a cow" in the following quotation signify, I mean, esoterically?

"This phase is also applied to Agni in R. V. X. 5, 7, where it is said that that god, being a thing both *asat*, non-existent (*i. e.*, unmanifested), and *sat*, existent (*i. e.*, in a latent state or in essence,) in the highest heaven, in the creation of Daksha, and in the womb of Aditi, because in a former age the first-born of our ceremonial, and is both a bull and a cow." (Progress of the Vedic Religion; Journal A. S. 1865, p. 347.)

Have the words any relation to the words "Gayomard and the ox" (or cow) often used in Zoroastrian books? I give below passages to enable the reader to see what part they play in the Zoroastrian books. I may add here that the words "the only begotten bull" is also often used. According to the Bundais, the theory is that a cycle consists of twelve millenium reigns of Zodiacal signs, a millenium consisting of one thousand divine years. For three milleniums, the creation is "unthinking, unmoving and intangible." During the next three milleniums "was the duration of the Gayomard with the ox, in the world. As this was six thousand years, the series of millenium reigns of Cancer, Leo, and Virgo had elapsed, because it was six thousand when the millenium reign came to Libra, the adversary (*i. e.*, Aharman) rushed in and Gayomard lived thirty years in tribulation."

From the above passages and from others in the Bundais, the inference to be drawn is that up to the time of the millenium's coming to Libra, the creation had developed to a certain stage when there existed in this world two principles (either as one or separate) called Gayomard and the Bull, as well as the elements. On the milleniums coming to Libra, they all come under the influence of planets: the elements undergo change and the Bull and Gayomard disappear. The chaos reigns, but the other influences (*i. e.*) of the constellations acting, order is restored: the cattle proceed from the departed bull and the mankind from Gayomard, the creation in its present form is sustained. The Aharman could not harm Gayomard for thirty years after the arrival of the millenium at Libra, because Saturn, though then at Libra, was counteracted by the good influence of Jupiter (Ahura Mazda) who was in Cancer. It was only when Saturn came again to Libra and Jupiter in Capricorn (period of about 30 common years)* that he (*i. e.*, Aharman or rather Saturn) succeeded.

The first appearance of the word "Bull" is in the most antique writings of the Avesta, which are written in the Gatha dialect. Therein the Bull complains to God that he suffers much misery on account of oppression prevailing, and that therefore a good ruler should be given him. The reply given is that the time was such that misery was to be everywhere expected and that the epoch was not ripe for the appearance of Zoroaster; though he would appear at the proper time.

The words "the only begotten Bull" and "the three-year old Bull," are also to be found in the Avesta.

Yours faithfully,

D.

* After the millenium's coming to Libra, the thousand years between one sign and another are, for historical purposes, considered to be common years. This is corroborated by the Dabestan and the Desatir. The cycles preceded by the present one are stated in those books as having been ruled by Mah Abad and his followers. In the present cycles, the world commences anew with Gayomard as the first man and ruler. This is the reason why the Zend Avesta makes no mention of the Mah-Abadians. The era of Gayomard, according to the Desatir, commences with the first planet, *i. e.*, Saturn, his other followers having as signed to them, each, one of the rest of the planets, or rather signifying thereby the predominating period of such planets as related to the respective religious teachers. The last planet ending with Kai Khosru, the era of Zoroaster appears. It would, I think, have been correct if the Desatir had assigned to each teacher a sign of the Zodiac, though in either case, the millenium assigned to Zoroaster is that of Capricorn, leaving two other signs for the two followers of Zoroaster to complete the cycle. I may add that 12,000 divine years are equal to 4,320,000 common years which are the sum total of the four Yugas and are equal to a Maha Yuga.

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. VIII. No. 93.—JUNE 1887.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

STUDIES IN BUDDHISM.

III.

THE two writers whose book and article were discussed in the last paper could hardly have fallen into the entanglement of misconceptions which their arguments exhibit, if the way had not been prepared for them by earlier critics of Buddhist doctrine. We have seen how strangely Dr. Rhys Davids mis-states that doctrine as it bears on the existence of the soul, in the course of his Hibbert Lectures. The French writer on "The Religions of India"—A. Barth—whose work has been published in an English translation,* has been keen-sighted enough to perceive that the learned Pali scholar has failed to appreciate the spirit of the valuable translations we owe to his erudition. Mr. Barth sums up Dr. Rhys Davids' account of the Buddhist doctrine as follows:—"The Buddhist, strictly speaking, does not revive, but another, if I may say so, revives in his stead, and it is to avert from this other, who is to be only the heir of his Karman, the pains of existence, that he aspires to Nirvana. Such, at any rate, is the doctrine of the Pali books according to the opinion of scholars of the highest authority who have had the opportunity of studying it in the country itself." But Mr. Barth goes on:—"Has this doctrine been as explicitly formulated in the doctrine of the Master? We take leave to doubt this. On the one hand the Sanscrit books of the North appear to concede something permanent, an ego passing from one existence to another. On the other hand, we could hardly explain, it seems, how Buddhism, not contented with having annihilation accepted as the sovereign good, should have from the first rendered its task more difficult, still by in the end representing the pursuit of this good as a pure act of charity."

* By the Rev. J. Wood, published by Trubner and Co. 1882.

Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported

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.