rance. Our men are apparently not as yet civilised to such an extent as to be able to repose implicit faith in the fidelity of their women. Though we are by nature extremely averse to this system of seclusion, yet it has been so blindly and cruelly enforced upon us by many who have either no idea or conscience to realise the horrible outrage they commit on nature, that we cannot help it, but succumb to this cruel treatment in the best way we can. We are too weak to rebel against the injunctions of the stronger sex, no matter how ignominious they may be. Yet when we think of some of our sisters' struggles for freedom, we cannot help but regard the world as a picture of hell. Our men enjoy all the freedom of the bird, but love to keep their women in seclusion as tortured slaves of custom. It is idle to think that our Indian women are content with their treatment; they have resigned themselves to their fate. Our rights have been utterly ignored, while our men have not forgotten to prefer preposterous claims on us, so as to render us powerless to plead on our behalf. We are the weaker sex, and instead of being helped and respected on this account, we are ill-treated, tortured, and repudiated, as though we were enemies of the human race."

With regard to the *Theosophist*:—If the natives of India do not know by this time that it is their friend, it is a hopeless case with them, for then indeed they must be suspicious beyond redemption. But they do know it, and they also know perfectly well that while the mouth of a false friend is full of honied flattery, a true friend gently und lovingly points out their faults to them in order that they may mend their ways.—*Ed.*]

POLYANDRY.

CAPTAIN BANON writes to the Editor to repudiate the insinuation, which he thinks was contained in Professor Chakravarti's letter in the May *Theosophist*, to the effect that he (Captain Banon) advocates polyandry. This imputation he denies most emphatically, and he is surprised that the Professor, or any one else, could for an instant suspect him of such an enormity. The Editor, however, does not think that any reader really viewed Captain Banon's playful remarks about Theosophical Nairs and Thairs as an advocacy of polyandry.

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. X. No. 119.—AUGUST 1889.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[*Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.*]

LE PHARE DE L'INCONNU.

(*Continued from page* 586.)

III.

DO our benevolent critics always know what they are laughing at? Have they the smallest idea of the work which is being performed in the world and the mental changes that are being brought about by that Theosophy at which they smile? The progress already due to our literature is evident, and, thanks to the untiring labours of a certain number of Theosophists, it is becoming recognized even by the blindest. There are not a few who are persuaded that Theosophy will be the philosophy and the law, if not the religion of the future. The party of reaction, captivated by the *dolce farniente* of conservatism, feel all this, hence come the hatred and persecution which call in criticism to their aid. But criticism, inaugurated by Aristotle, has fallen far away from its primitive standard. The ancient philosophers, those sublime ignoramuses as regards modern civilization, when they criticised a system or a work, did so with impartiality, and with the sole object of amending and improving that with which they found fault. First they studied the subject, and then they analysed it. It was a service rendered, and was recognized and accepted as such by both parties. Does modern criticism always conform to that golden rule? It is very evident that it does not.

Our judges of to-day are far below the level even of the philosophical criticism of Kant. Criticism, which takes unpopularity and prejudice for its canons, has replaced that of "pure reason;" and the critic ends by tearing to pieces with his teeth everything he

does not comprehend, and especially whatever he does not care in the least to understand. In the last century—the golden age of the goose-quill—criticism was biting enough sometimes; but still it did justice. Cæsar's wife might be suspected, but she was never condemned without being heard in her defence. In our century Montyon prizes* and public statues are for him who invents the most murderous engine of war; to-day, when the steel pen has replaced its more humble predecessor, the fangs of the Bengal tiger or the teeth of the terrible saurian of the Nile would make wounds less cruel and less deep than does the steel nib *(bec)* of the modern critic, who is almost always absolutely ignorant of that which he tears so thoroughly to pieces.

It is some consolation, perhaps, to know that the majority of our literary critics, trans-atlantic and continental, are ex-scribblers who have made a fiasco in literature, and are revenging themselves now for their mediocrity upon everything they come across. The small blue wine, insipid and doctored, almost always turns into very strong vinegar. Unfortunately the reporters of the press in general—hungry poor devils whom we would be sorry to grudge the little they make, even at our own expense—are not our only or our most dangerous critics. The bigots and the materialists—the sheep and goats of religions—having placed us in turn in their *index expurgatorius*, our books are banished from their libraries, our journals are boycotted, and ourselves subjected to the most complete ostracism. One pious soul, who accepts literally the miracles of the Bible, following with emotion the ichthyographical investigations of Jonas in the whale's belly, or the trans-ethereal journey of Elias, when like a salamander he flew off in his chariot of fire, nevertheless regards the Theosophists as wonder-mongers and cheats. Another—*âme damnée* of Hæckel,—while he displays a credulity as blind as that of the bigot in his belief in the evolution of man and the gorilla from a common ancestor (considering the total absence of every trace in nature of any connecting link whatever), nearly dies with laughing when he finds that his neighbour believes in occult phenomena and psychic manifestations. Nevertheless, neither the bigot nor the man of science, nor even the academician, counted among the number of the "Immortals," can explain to us the smallest of the problems of existence. The metaphysicians who for centuries have studied the phenomena of being in their first principles, and who smiles pityingly when he listens to the wanderings of Theosophy, would be greatly embarrassed to explain to us the philosophy or even the cause of dreams. Which of them can tell us why all the mental operations,—except reasoning, which faculty alone finds itself suspended and paralysed,—go on while we dream with as much activity and energy as when we are awake? The disciple of Herbert Spencer would send any one to the biologist who squarely asked him that question. But he, for whom digestion is the *alpha* and *omega* of every dream,—like hysteria, that great Proteus with a thousand forms, which is present in every psychic phenomena—can by no means satisfy us. Indigestion and hysteria are, in fact, twin sisters, two goddesses, to whom the modern psychologist has raised an altar at which he has constituted himself the officiating priest. But this is his business so long as he does not meddle with the gods of his neighbours.

* [Prizes instituted in France during the last century by the Baron de Montyon for those who, in various ways, benefited their fellow men.—*Ed.*]

From all this it follows that, since the Christian characterises Theosophy as the "accursed science" and the forbidden fruit; since the man of science sees nothing in metaphysics but "the domain of the crazy poet" (Tyndall); since the "reporter" touches it only with poisoned forceps; and since the missionaries associates it with idolatry and "the benighted Hindu,"—it follows, we say, that poor *Theo-Sophia* is as shamefully treated as she was when the ancients called her the TRUTH,—while they relegated her to the bottom of a well. Even the "Christian" Kabbalists, who love so much to mirror themselves in the dark waters of this deep well, although they see nothing there but the reflection of their own faces, which they mistake for that of the Truth,—even the Kabbalists make war upon us. Nevertheless, all that is no reason why Theosophy should have nothing to say in its own defence, and in its favour; or that it should cease to assert its right to be listened to, or why its loyal and faithful servants should neglect their duty by acknowledging themselves beaten.

"The accursed science," you say, good Ultramontanes? You should remember, nevertheless, that the tree of science is grafted on the tree of life. That the fruit which you declare "forbidden," and which you have proclaimed for sixteen centuries to be the cause of the original sin that brought death into the world,—that this fruit, whose flower blossoms on an immortal stem, was nourished by that same trunk, and that therefore it is the only fruit which can insure us immortality. You also, good Kabbalists, ignore,—or wish to ignore,—that the allegory of the earthly paradise is as old as the world, and that the tree, the fruit and the sin had once a far profounder and more philosophic signification than they have to-day,—when the secrets of initiation are lost.

Protestantism and Ultramontanism are opposed to Theosophy, just as they are opposed to everything not emanating from themselves; as Calvanism opposed the replacing of its two fetishes, the Jewish Bible and Sabbath, by the Gospel and the Christian Sunday; as Rome opposed secular education and Free-masonry. Dead-letter and theocracy have, however, had their day. The world must move and advance under penalty of stagnation and death. Mental evolution progresses *pari passu* with physical evolution, and both advance towards the ONE TRUTH,—which is the heart of the system of Humanity, as evolution is the blood. Let the circulation stop for one moment, and the heart stops at the same time, and it is all up with the human machine! And it is the servants of Christ who wish to kill, or at least paralyze, the Truth by the blows of a club which is called "the letter that kills!" But the end is nigh. That which Coleridge said of political despotism applies also to religious. The Church, unless she withdraws her heavy hand, which weighs like a nightmare on the oppressed

bosoms of millions of believers whether they resent it or not, and whose reason remains paralyzed in the clutch of superstition, the ritualistic Church is sentenced *to give up its place to Religion* and—to die. Soon it will have but a choice. For once the people become enlightened about the truth which it hides with so much care, one of two things will happen, the Church will either perish *by* the people; or else, if the masses are left in ignorance and in slavery to the dead letter, it will perish *with* the people. Will the servants of eternal Truth,—out of which Truth they have made a squirrel that runs round an ecclesiastical wheel,—will they show themselves sufficiently *altruistic* to choose the first of these alternative necessities? Who knows!

I say it again; it is only theosophy, well understood, that can save the world from despair, by reproducing social and religious reform—a task once before accomplished in history, by Gautama, the Buddha: a peaceful reform, without one drop of blood spilt, each one remaining in the faith of his fathers if he so chooses. To do this he will only have to reject the parasitic plants of human fabrication, which at the present moment are choking all religions and churches in the world. Let him accept but the essence, which is the same in all: that is to say, the spirit which gives life to man in whom it resides, and renders him immortal. Let every man inclined to go on find his ideal,—a star before him to guide him. Let him follow it, without ever deviating from his path; and he is almost certain to reach the Beacon-light of life—the TRUTH: no matter whether he seeks for and finds it at the bottom of a cradle or of a well.

IV.

Laugh, then, at the science of sciences without knowing the first word of it! We will be told, perhaps, that such is the literary right of our critics. With all my heart. If people always talked about what they understood, they would only say things that are true, and—that would not always be so amusing. When I read the criticisms now written on Theosophy, the platitudes and the stupid ridicule employed against the most grandiose and sublime philosophy in the world,—one of whose aspects only is found in the noble ethics of Philalethes,—I ask myself whether the Academies of any country have ever understood the Theosophy of the Philosophers of Alexandria better than they understood us now? What does any one know, what can he know, of Universal Theosophy, unless he has studied under the masters of wisdom? and understanding so little of Iamblicus, Plotinus and even Proclus, that is to say, of the Theosophy of the third and fourth centuries, people yet pride themselves upon delivering judgment on the Neo-Theosophy of the nineteenth!

Theosophy, we say, comes to us from the extreme East, as did the Theosophy of Plotinus and Iamblicus and even the mysteries of ancient Egypt. Do not Homer and Herodotus tell us, in fact, that the ancient Egyptians were "Ethiopians of the East," *who came from Lanka or Ceylon*, according to their descriptions? For it is generally acknowledged that the people whom those two authors

call *Ethiopians of the East* were no other than a colony of very dark skinned Aryans, the Dravidians of Southern India, who took an already existing civilization with them to Egypt. This migration occurred during the prehistoric ages which Baron Bunson calls *pre-Menite* (before Menes) but which ages have a history of their own, to be found in the ancient annals of Kalouka Batta. Besides, and apart from the esoteric teachings, which are not divulged to a mocking public, the historical researches of Colonel Vans Kennedy, the great rival in India of Dr. Wilson as a Sanskritist, show us that pre-Assyrian Babylonia was the home of Brahmanism, and of the Sanskrit as a sacerdotal language. We know also, if Exodus is to be believed, that Egypt had, long before the time of Moses, its diviner, its hierophants and its magicians, that is to say, before the XIX dynasty. Finally Brugsh Bey sees in many of the gods of Egypt, immigrants from beyond the Red Sea—and the great waters of the Indian Ocean.

Whether that be so or not, Theosophy is a descendant in direct line of the great tree of universal GNOSIS, a tree the luxuriant branches of which, spreading over the whole earth like a great canopy, gave shelter at one epoch—which biblical chronology is pleased to call "antediluvian"—to all the temples and to all the nations of the earth. That gnosis represents the aggregate of all the sciences, the accumulated wisdom (savoir) of all the gods and demi-gods incarnated in former times upon the earth. There are some who would like to see in these, the fallen angels and the enemy of mankind; these sons of God who, seeing that the daughters of men were beautiful, took them for wives and imparted to them the secrets of heaven and earth. Let them think so. We believe in Avatars and in divine dynasties, in the epoch when there were, in fact, "giants upon the earth," but we altogether repudiate the idea of "fallen angels," and of Satan and his army.

"What then is your religion or your belief?" we are asked. "What is your favourite study?"

"The TRUTH," we reply. The truth wherever we can find it; for, like Ammonius Saccas, our greatest ambition would be to reconcile the different religious systems, to help each one to find the truth in his own religion, while obliging him to recognize it in that of his neighbour. What does the name signify if the thing itself is essentially the same? Plotinus, Iamblicus and Apollonius of Tyana, had all three, it is said, the wonderful gifts of prophecy, of clairvoyance, and of healing, although belonging to three different schools. Prophecy was an art that was cultivated by the Essenes and the *B'ni Nebim* among the Jews, as well as by the priests of the pagan oracles. Plotinus's disciples attributed miraculous powers to their master; Philostratus has claimed the same for Apollonius, while Iamblicus had the reputation of surpassing all the other Eclectics in Theosophic theurgy. Ammonius declared that all moral and practical WISDOM was contained in the books of Thoth or Hermes Trismegistus. But Thoth means "a college," school or assembly, and the works of that name, according to the *Theodidactos*, were identical with the doctrines of the sages of the extreme East. If Pythagoras acquired

his knowledge in India (when even now he is mentioned in old manuscripts under the name of Yavanachârya,* the Greek Master). Plato gained his from the books of Thoth-Hermes. How it happened that the younger Hermes, the god of the shepherds, surnamed "the good shepherd," who presided over divination and clairvoyance, became identical with Thoth (or Thot) the deified sage, and the author of the *Book of the Dead*,—the esoteric doctrine only can reveal to Orientalists.

Every country has had its saviours. He who dissipates the darkness of ignorance by the help of the torch of science, thus discovering to us the truth, deserves that title as a mark of our gratitude quite as much as he who saves us from death by healing our bodies. Such an one awakens in our benumbed souls the faculty of distinguishing the true from the false, by kindling a divine flame hitherto absent, and he has the right to our grateful worship, for he has become our creator. What matters the name or the symbol that personifies the abstract idea, if that idea is always the same and is true! Whether the concrete symbol bears one title or another, whether the saviour in whom who believe has for an earthly name Krishna, Buddha, Jesus or Æsculapius,—also called "the saviour god" Σώτηρ,—we have but to remember one thing: symbols of divine truths were not invented for the amusement of the ignorant; they are the *alpha* and *omega* of philosophic thought.

Theosophy being the way that leads to truth, in every religion as in every science, occultism is, so to say, the touchstone and universal solvent. It is the thread of Ariadne given by the master to the disciple who ventures into the labyrinth of the mysteries of being; the torch that lights him through the dangerous maze of life, for ever the enigma of the Sphinx. But the light thrown by this torch can be discerned only by the eye of the awakened soul—by our spiritual senses; it blinds the eye of the materialist as the sun blinds that of the owl.

Having neither dogma nor ritual,—these two being but fetters, the material body which suffocates the soul,—we do not employ the "ceremonial magic" of the Western Kabalists; we know its dangers too well to have anything to do with it. In the T. S. every Fellow is at liberty to study what he pleases, provided he does not venture into unknown paths which would of a certainty lead him to *black magic*,—the sorcery against which Eliphas Levi so openly warned the public. The occult sciences are dangerous for him who understands them imperfectly. Any one who gave himself up to their practice by himself, would run the risk of becoming insane; and those who study them would do well to unite in little groups of from three to seven. These groups ought to be uneven in numbers in order to have more power; a group, however little cohesion it possesses, forming a single united body, wherein the senses and perceptions of those who work together complement and mutually help each other, one member supplying to another the quality in which he is wanting,—such a group will always end by

* A term which comes from the words *Yavana* or "the Ionian," and *achârya*, "professor or master."

becoming a perfect and invincible body. "Union is strength." The moral of the fable of the old man bequeathing to his sons a bundle of sticks which were never to be separated is a truth which will forever remain axiomatic.

H. P. Blavatsky.

(To be continued.)

[The foregoing article is a rough translation of an article in the *Revue Theosophique* for June.—*Ed.*]

A MUMUKSHU'S DAILY LIFE.

THE following are some of the hints given me by one whom, of all human beings, I revere most, about the rules which should guide an aspirant after truth in his daily life. By this I do not mean to back these rules by his authority, but I request my brothers to take them for what they are worth. My object in writing this is the same as that expressed in the following lines:—

If I am right, thy grace impart,
Still in the right to stay;
If I am wrong, O teach my heart,
To find the better way.

"Rise at four in the morning. Rise as soon as you awake, without lying idly in bed, rolling about, half waking and half dreaming. Then earnestly pray that all mankind may be spiritually regenerated; that those who are struggling on the path of truth may be encouraged by your prayers and work more earnestly and successfully; and that you may be strengthened and not yield to the seduction of the senses. Choose a clean spot somewhat distant from your house, and having answered the calls of nature, cleanse your teeth. Then retire to a quiet place in your house, and having saluted Ganesa and your master, do as follows. If you are a Raja yogi, picture before your mind's eye the form of your master as engaged in Samadhi; or of some god whose image you have seen frequently. Fix it before you, fill in all the details, circle him thrice and prostrate yourself before him; then worship him as you would your household god; having prostrated again, pray that all mistakes of omission and commission might be forgiven (all this mentally, of course). This will greatly facilitate concentration, purify your heart and do much more. Or reflect upon the defects of your character; thoroughly realise their evils and the transient pleasures they give you, and firmly will that you should try your best not to yield to them the next time. This self-analysis and bringing yourself before the bar of your own conscience facilitates in a degree hitherto undreamt of your spiritual progress. Or if you practice Yoga, do so, but in practising restraint of breath, do not allow your mind to wander on any other subject, but fix it on any part of your body, as for example on one of the lotuses. This concentration can also be practised without restraint of breath. Bathe afterwards, exercising during the whole time your will, that your moral impurities should

be washed away with those of your body. This is effected in the case of Brahmins by the sprinkling of the magnetised water over them before bathing, and by the Purusha Sukta and other mantras pronounced while bathing; but they should do this with a knowledge of their meaning and their effects. Then wearing a silk cloth or one that was not touched by others since it was dried, perform your Sandyavandanam. Many do not know the immense spiritual truths contained in it and the incalculable good it would do them. Perform it properly and with a knowledge of its esoteric significance, and it forms a yogic practice in itself. You may then enter upon your daily avocations. In your relations with others observe the following rules:

1. Never do anything which you are not bound to do as your duty; that is, any unnecessary thing. Before you do a thing, think whether it is your duty to do it.

2. Never speak an unnecessary word. Think of the effects which your words would produce, before you give utterance to them. Never allow yourself to violate your principles by the force of your company.

3. Never allow any unnecessary or vain thought to occupy your mind. This is easier said than done. You cannot make your mind a blank all at once. So in the beginning try to prevent evil or idle thoughts, by occupying your mind with the analysis of your own faults or the contemplation of the perfect ones.

4. During meals, exercise your will that the food which you take should be properly digested and build for you a body consonant to your spiritual aspirations, and not create evil passion and wicked thoughts. The five oblations to the five Pranas which are offered before eating, the rule enjoined that we should not speak during our meals and that every mouthful should be taken after pronouncing one of the sacred names of Vishnu, effect this in the case of the Brahmins. Eat only when you are hungry and drink when you are thirsty and never otherwise. If some particular preparation attracts your palate, do not allow yourself to be seduced into taking it simply to gratify that craving. Think that the pleasure which you derive from it had no existence some seconds before, and it will cease to exist some seconds afterwards; that it is a transient pleasure; that that which is a pleasure now, will turn into pain if you take it in large quantities; that it gives pleasure only to your tongue; that if you are put to a great trouble to get at that thing; that, if you allow yourself to be seduced by it, you will not be ashamed at anything to get it; that while there is another object that can give you eternal bliss, this centering your affections on a transient thing is sheer folly; that you are neither the body nor the sense, and as such, the pleasures or the pains which these enjoy can never affect you really, and so on. Practise the same train of reasoning in the case of every other temptation, and though you will fall often, you will effect a surer success. Do not read much. If you read ten minutes, reflect for as many hours. Habituate yourself to solitude, and to remain alone with your thoughts. Accustom yourself to the thought that no one beside yourself can assist you and wean away your affections from all things gradually. Bathe in the evening after you come home from your labours (this is said only of those whose health would allow them —I. N.). Before you sleep pray as you did in the morning. Review the actions of the day, see wherein you have failed, and resolve that you will not fail in them to-morrow."

Iswar Nisna, B. A., F. T. S.

ABOUT THE KABBALAH.

THE tendency of knowledge is to pass into oblivion.

The tendency of the revivers of knowledge is to give utterance to the voiceless forms of the past, and inspire them with the spirit of the present.

The pioneers of knowledge are few in number. The knowledge they acquire and transmit is apt to lose distinctness while widening the area of its influence; is often misunderstood as it increases in distance from its source; and is only too frequently misrepresented by those who desire to harmonize it with views which are gradually taking its place, until completely transformed into a more acceptable shape.

The receivers of knowledge seldom realize the sense in which it is imparted. Each has a personal standard of comparison, an individual way of viewing to which he conforms what is submitted to his understanding, a habit of judging for himself; and it is only in the experimental, the exact sciences, where there is a possibility and power of verification, that general agreement is possible.

It is owing to this constant change in the character and course of knowledge, as it descends the stream of time, that the science of the ancients, thus rendered transitional, is lost sight of, the past by transmutation progressively vanishing in the present; and this has led modern theorists to believe that the ages preceding the present era were void of scientific knowledge—although the monumental witnesses scattered over the world bear silent testimony to the contrary.

Among the most interesting of these monumental records are the ancient scriptures of the different races of mankind.

Some of the most remarkable of these—amongst them those of the Hebrews—because read through misrepresenting translations, are only too often made the subject of coarse and vulgar ridicule and abuse. This is greatly to be regretted, but the course thus pursued is not without a certain value, for it marks the utter incompetence of the ridiculers for the task they have undertaken.

When the Hebrew scriptures are rightly studied, apart from the misleading traditional interpretations which so completely misrepresent their meaning and value, they are seen to abound in significant indications as to the knowledge and science which prevailed when they were commenced, with the transmutations these passed through during their progressive composition.

The sacred writings of the Jews were at one time even more closely and minutely studied than they usually are at present, and

some of the results of the researches thus pursued have been carefully preserved and more or less accurately handed down.

The Kabbalah—an embodiment of the mystical views of mysticising inquirers—is one of the great witnesses to this.

It is true the study of the Kabbalah,—like that of the scriptures it undertook to interpret,—long since fell into desuetude; but of late the investigation of the body of doctrine known by this designation has found place in the general revival of mysticism, and the favour this branch of study is regaining in the eyes of many will, it is to be hoped, lead to a reinvestigation of the several systems of reading and interpreting the Hebrew scriptures.

The all-important point to be remembered by those proposing to commence the study of the Hebrew Kabbalah is, that it is impossible to acquire a judicial knowledge thereof without perfect familiarity with the original works from which that knowledge can alone be derived. Translations are utterly worthless here, and can but be misleading. Hence those who have not the necessary facilities for acquiring this familiarity will be only wasting their time and involving themselves in a labyrinth of confusion by attempting such inquiries.

Thus the study of the Hebrew Kabbalah is only for the few: for those who have the requisite means at their disposal, as well as a natural aptitude in making use of them—for this also is indispensable.

Such students will soon perceive that the *Science* of the Kabbalah must be carefully distinguished from the *Processes* by which it has been sought to graft it on to the Hebrew scriptures. These are peculiar, but the fact that they have been found necessary for the purpose for which they were devised and to which they are applied, shows, when its significance is duly weighed, that the Kabbalah, regarded as a Hebrew science, is more recent than the scriptures to whose interpretation it has been adapted.

The fundamental principle of the interpreting method of the Hebrew Kabbalah—with which alone I am at present concerned—is very simple and perfectly intelligible. The complications which obscure it and have given the science its abstruse and occult character are due to, and have grown out of, the application of that method to the textual details, of whose significance the science professes to treat.

This principle is—since every letter of the Hebrew alphabet has had a numerical as well as an alphabetic value attributed to it, —every Hebrew word-sign has its own proper number: so that, in Kabbalistic diction, every Hebrew word is a number, and every number expressed in Hebrew characters a word.

This principle, as thus evolved, is affirmed to carry with it the correlative consequence, that every Hebrew word-sign is associated by its own proper number with every other word-sign bearing the same number. Then the inferential consequence is held to follow, that all such numerically allied word-signs mutually interpret each other. After this they are regarded as interchangeable, so that the one can be read instead of, and as replacing or taking

the place of the other, or even the whole, through their several thus allied significances, be read in the one.

The subtle principle embodied in and veiled under this rule is that of substitution with a view to supplanting. That is to say, where a word whose natural and proper meaning is unsuitable to the doctrine sought to be drawn from the text is present therein, all possible words of a similar number are brought together and compared, until one is found (or has been imagined and devised) whose meaning, or attributed meaning, is adoptable to the end in view. When a suitable word has been discovered (or determined on), this word is assumed to have been charged with and to express the occult reading originally committed to the text, and is then used as the doctrinal or indoctrinating interpreter of the word whose meaning it is thus to change, and practically substituted for the word it thus occultly replaces—this that its own meaning may supplant the original and natural meaning thereof. In practice this method is carried so far that, when necessary, every word in a sentence traditionally regarded as of special importance is thus changed, to give that sentence the requisite Kabbalistic value.

The basis of this artificial and artful process is the numerical value of the individual letters of the Hebrew alphabet. These, in their thus transformed character, are the bricks, so to say, out of which the designed structure is built up. The constructive potency thus imparted to them expresses itself through the combined numerical value of the letters which enter into the formation of the word-sign under analysis. By this number an affinity is claimed with all other word-signs denoting a similar number. Thus identity in number is made the source of an occult affinity in words. And then through this thus acquired occult affinity the occult meaning desired is sought for and gained.

But, until their numerical value was imparted to these letters, the system of interpretation resting on it could not have existed. While, if the Hebrew scriptures were written before the letters of its text had a numerical value attributed to them, they could not have been composed with reference to such a system of interpretation, and therefore could not have been intended *by their writers* to embody an occult teaching whose doctrine was to be reached in this way.

This position cannot be gainsaid.

And yet it formulates the crucial difficulty here.

In giving form to their mystifying pretensions, the devisers of the Jewish Kabbalah seem to have taken too much for granted. Hence they omitted any inquiry into the period when the Hebrew letters were first used as numerical signs, and the relations in date of that period to the time during which the scriptures they thus reinterpreted were coming into existence. And yet, *unless and until they proved that the numerical was cognate with the literal value of these letters, and not a subsequent attribution to them, dating long after the completion of the Hebrew Canon, the whole structure they were erecting on this basis in reality rested only on a foundation of assumption.*

Perhaps they were wise in their generation with regard to the end they had in view, in taking for granted a position which it was beyond ther power or outside the scope of their design to establish. But bare presumption could not not give stability to such a fabric as they were constructing, and the fact that they rested their teachings on a mere tacit assumption shows that they were void of the judicial faculty, through the exercise of which alone trustworthy results could be drawn from such an investigation as they undertook to carry out.

When this is realized and the text is carefully examined in that regard, it will hardly surprise the inquirer to find that not a trace of the number-value of the letters is discoverable throughout the whole range of the scriptures, though their enumerating use would have greatly facilitated the labours of the scribes and of the searchers of the sacred writings. So far from this being the case, evidence is not wanting to show that the enumerative value of the letters was absolutely unknown. This is found in those passages of the text where it deals either directly or indirectly with numbers and subjects relating thereto; is emphasized by the absence of an enumerative usage in the divisions introduced for ceremonial and devotional reading; and culminates in the fact that even up to the writing of the Talmud all commentators make their references by quoting the opening words of the sentence or paragraph they are illustrating; and there is every reason to believe, a thorough examination of this question will place beyond doubt that, just as the Hebrew scribes followed the example of the Arabs when they added vowel-points to the text of their scriptures, so did the Hebrew arithmeticians borrow the idea of using the letters of their alphabet to denote numbers, and that it was only subsequent to this that the Kabbalistic association of words, through the numerical value of their letters, was devised by the Hebrew mystics and applied to the interpretation of their sacred writings. At any rate the enumerative value of its letters, like the vocalization of the text, cannot be traced back even to so early a date as the closure of the Hebrew Canon. And this is the crux of the Kabbalists; for *if the letters did not possess the value of numbers when the scriptures were written, and had no such value attributed to them till many centuries later, it is evident that the writers of those scriptures could not have written them with a view to their interpretation by a system of which they had no knowledge, and which did not even exist in their days.*

But, the admission of this fact completely sets aside the possibility of an intended relation between the doctrine set forth by the Kabbalah and the scriptures on to which it has, by the Kabbalistic use of the relation of letters and numbers, been so cunningly grafted; and finally separates the one from the other as far as any such relation is concerned.

And yet, great as were the powers gained by the Kabbalists for changing the meaning of the text through the ascribed numerical value of its words, they were found to be inadequate to the needs of the position. Hence yet further to widen their interpreting basis, they next treated the word-signs or some of them, as a

form of short hand, under which each letter was taken to be the initial of a word. In this way each word, so viewed, could be made to represent a sentence, or many sentences upon occasion.

With this was combined the formation of other series of words—(1) By the bringing together of the initial, the final or the medial letters of the words of a sentence, or any of these, and so forming other words through the meanings of which the utterance of the sentence was expanded and otherwise changed: and (2) By the blending of the letters of the words of successive sentences together in divers ways.

To this was added a system of permutation of the letters of any and every word requiring such treatment for Kabbalistic purposes; by means of which the power of entirely transforming the text was rendered absolute and complete.

Under this system each letter in a word could have another letter substituted for it, according to certain ingeniously devised rules.

Thus from one word another of totally different orthography could be formed; and in this way one sentence could be changed into another with the greatest facility.

This power of change was only limited by the number of letters of the alphabet and the particular rule or rules under which it was applied. Hence it was sweeping in character. Its thoroughness will be evident when it is remembered that the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet, for either of which any one of the others could be thus substituted, sufficed for the writing of the entire scriptures; so that, simply by the permutation of the letters of the words of which these were composed another set of scriptures wholly different in character could be produced. Indeed, under an analogous system of permutation applied to writings, in any of the dead, or for matter of that of the living languages, it would be possible and even easy to change the works of one author into those of another of similar extent, or to make any and every writer say the exact contrary to his actual utterances.

It thus appears that the interpreting system of the literal Kabbalah in its three forms, Numerical *(Gematria)*, Expanding *(Notaricon)*, and Permutative *(Temurah)*, was devised for the express purpose of changing the text of the Hebrew scriptures in an unperceived and, for the most part, unsuspected manner, or substituting one set of readings—thence termed occult—for another, and so supplanting the earlier by a later teaching. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the fragmentary grafting of the doctrine of the Kabbalah on to the Hebrew scriptures by these processes is of comparatively recent date. Everything tends to show this—even the mystical view drawn from the form of the accepted Hebrew letters; for these are Chaldee characters which were borrowed by the Jews from their captors during the Babylonian captivity, and therefore can have no symbolical bearing in regard to the doctrine of the text they have been used to preserve and hand down, though this attributed symbolism does suggest the source from which the Jewish doctrine of the Kabbalah was derived.

Perhaps the most instructive fact which emerges from the study of the Hebrew Kabbalah is the evidence that under it also two

schools are merged in one, of which again the earlier has been absorbed into and supplanted by the later.

Even a superficial comparison of the *Sepher Jetzirah*, or manual of the earlier Hebrew Kabbalists, with the *Zohar*, or storehouse of the teachings of their later supplanters, is sufficient to show this: for the *Sepher Jetzirah* bases its views on the non-identity of numbers and letters; associates the former (numbers) with the ten Sephiroth, which are never represented by the letters of their respective numbers, as idealizations of number; says that the 22 letters of the alphabet proceed from or are formed by the first Sephirah; and then claims that the ten Sephiroth, or idealizations of number, and the 22 numbers (thus distinguished from the idealizations of number and regarded as without numerical value) constitute the 32 ideal paths of wisdom, of the teaching concerning the transmission of which by these signs and symbols it then proceeds to give a compendium: whereas the *Zohar* rests its doctrine on the identity of the letters with the numerical value which had come to be attributed to them. Thus the fundamental principles of these two schools were, as those of their preserved manuals are, diametrically opposed, each to the other; and then, their relative ages being unquestionable, the *Sepher Jetzirah*, as the elder of the two, becomes through its teachings a witness to the fact that the system of *Zohar* had not come to light when it was written.

* * * * *

It is a necessary consequence of things terrestrial that they are always in a transitional state.

Owing to this general instability the teachings of science are progressively mutable, as the consecutive results of its researches change the views of their advancers.

Even that most exact of all modern sciences, astronomy, has not been able to free itself from this liability.

Sir Isaac Newton taught that the attraction of gravitation was proportionate to the mass.

Galileo demonstrated that the attraction of the earth acts equally on all bodies at the same distance, irrespective of their mass.

Sir Isaac Newton held that the mass of the earth was a determinate quantity, which could be neither increased nor diminished without danger to the stability of the system of which it is a member; and the possibility of the falling of meteoric stones to the earth was therefore denied.

It has been since recognized that meteorites, sometimes of large size and great weight, have fallen and are from time to time falling on to the surface of the earth, and in so far causing a variation in its mass.

Sir Isaac Newton affirmed that space was a vacuum, and based his calculations on that view under the impression that the presence and action of a resisting medium therein—a medium resisting the movements of the heavenly bodies—would be ultimately fatal to the orderly motions of the universe.

The presence of a resisting medium in space has been proved and is admitted, and yet the resulting of a universal chaos therefrom is not apprehended.

The science transmitted as of the Kabbalah has not been exempted from this liability to change.

The teaching of the Elohist, reduced to its simplest proportions, was, that electrical, igneous and solar energy—three modes of a single force, or one acting through three—having evolved the three physiological elements, water, air, earth, out of the terrestrial planetary body, produced, through these, three orders of cells, the inorganic, the organic, and the psychic, by the instrumentality of which it introduced and developed the mineral, the vegetal and the animal kingdoms, with their culmination, the human, in which the transmuted three act as one.

The earlier Jehovist saw in this conception three purely spiritual energies proceeding from a single hidden source, which produced three materializing forces by which were generated three organizing agencies, the outcome of whose action was a threefold materialization of spirit by the clothing thereof in a triple garment of matter, of which the mikrokosm or individualized and personalized incarnated spirit of man was constituted. This represented to the earlier Jehovist the preliminary stages of a spiritual evolution as a materialization of spirit or fall thereof into matter, under which the concealed source of the All, and Sole Unity, subjectively passing through a triad of threes, remained hidden in the personality of each individual human being, awaiting such an advance in the evolution of the spirit of man as would enable that spirit to recognize the presence of and aspire to co-operate with its true source—by complete reunion with which it could alone regain its pristine perfection and so be reabsorbed into the original Unity of the concealed one from which, in the first instance, it had proceeded.

The later Jehovist, as the earlier or Jetziratic Kabbalist, fascinated by the numerical relations thus brought out, classified these energies, forces and agencies, with their triune outcome, as idealizations of the ten numbers (*Sephiroth*), and then treated them as at once sources and vehicles of spiritual intelligence, proceeding as emanations from the one concealed intelligence through a series of materializing processes and materialized forms to incarnate manifestation, that in the production of language and computation of relations they might formulate and give expression—by the ten numbers and twenty-two letters—to divine wisdom, through its thirty-two paths or channels, as the word incarnated in man.

The later or Zoharistic Kabbalist, still further developing the symbolism of the Sephiroth—which in his hands ceased to be mere vehicular idealizations of spiritual relations and characteristics—imputed Divine attributes to them as channels for the evolution of Deity; declaring that through these the unmanifested God passed subjectively into the manifested state as one veiled in many. In this way the ten Sephiroth were separated in semblance from their numerical associations and transformed into spiritual entities with Divine attributes, while the relations of numbers were subordinated to the interpreting office which then devolved on them.

These successive doctrinal transformations were, for the most part, suggested by spiritualizing influences acting on individual human beings, whose natural genius fitted them to become the teachers and leaders of others. These were induced to believe that the doctrine they were transforming had been misunderstood, as handed down, and in this way corrupted; and that they, as reformers, were simply bringing it back to its original form and value.

The Jewish rabbis received the doctrine embodied in the Hebrew Kabbalah from Eastern mystics during the Babylonian captivity.

To be able to do this they were bound to find it in their sacred writings.

Told that Light was the first emanation from the darkness of the unknown, they read the Elohistic declaration, *Yhi aor*, "Let there be Light."

Learning that the One Deity was to be regarded as male and female, they divided the Ineffable name IEVE (*Jahveh*) into *Jah*, *Vah*, and said that the male principle was expressed by *Jah*, the female by *Vah*—thus, by ignoring the relations of that name to its source, the causative verb "To be," of which it is an inflection, bringing out the doctrine sought.

Hearing the doctrine concerning the heavenly man, they found the realization of this conception in the Adam of Gen. i.—the unfallen man—who they thereupon affirmed was created in the image of his maker, or was both male and female in a single personality.

Then in the creation of Eve from Adam they saw the separation of bi-sexual humanity into man and woman, consequent on which came the fall of the one, thus made two, into sexual relations. But here they permitted themselves to fall into a singular incongruity, for in the earlier Jehovist's statement (Gen. iii. 21), "Jehovah Elohim made hairy the skin of Adam and of his wife, like the beasts, and veiled their shame," they read that God made coats of skin for the man and his wife, and clothed them, and affirmed that these coats of skin were the natural body in which mankind was thereupon for the first time clothed. And yet in adopting this interpretation they passed over the declaration (Gen. ii. 7) that man was then and there made of the dust of the earth, and quickened with the breath of life, and became a living soul—so that the clothing of the heavenly man with a natural body then took place; and as the woman was not created till later (Gen. ii. 21, 22), and was taken out of Adam's side—for which reason he was assumed to have been bi-sexual hitherto; and as until their fall the heavenly man remained incarnate in his earthly counterparts, Adam and Eve, who passed an indefinite time in their earthly paradise before the fall took place, the fall—which was of the heavenly man in his incarnated form—cannot have been into the sexual relation, which belonged to the order of nature previously introduced and continuously working.

Seeing the sacredness attributed to all forms of life, and that the practice of asceticism, which they then learnt to value, was necessarily associated with an exclusively vegetable diet, they read the announcement of the Elohist (Gen. i. 29, 30,) that not only vegetables and fruits, but the vegetable feeders of the animal kingdoms, were to be the food of man, in its received traditional rendering, by turning the statement,—"and of every beast of the earth, and of every fowl of the air, and of everything that creepeth upon the earth wherein is life, every vegetable feeder is for food"—into the accepted reading.

Then, overcome by the prevalence of the phallic element in Eastern worship, they attributed phallicism to their own scriptures, which, as first written and rightly interpreted, are wholly innocent of any such teaching or taint.

In this way and by these processes were doctrines absolutely foreign to the tenor of their teaching grafted on to the Hebrew scriptures.

* * * * * * *

The same spiritualizing influences, acting through kindred agencies on the same unstable elements and producing the same tendency to instability, are still operating: the same liability to change is still going on. Hence the modern representatives of the Hebrew Kabbalists, unable to free themselves from the impulses which overruled the action of their predecessors, are slowly subjecting the science of their predilection to yet further change.

This they are doing by the developments of its doctrines which they draw from misapprehensions—(1) of the documents they are dealing with; and (2) of the methods by which these should be interpreted.

In this they follow closely on the lines laid down by those who have gone before them on the one hand, while diverging widely from them on the other.

Under the primitive science of the Elohist man and woman were held to be the two co-equal members of a perfect whole.

The Jehovist held that woman was inferior to man, and made her his tempter.

Jehovah, when solemnly giving the law on Mount Sinai, classed her with the chattels of man.

This revolted the Deuteronomist, who re-arranged the Decalogue in consequence.

Thereupon the earlier Kabbalists rejected the book of Deuteronomy, declaring that the doctrine of the Kabbalah had been excluded from its texts.

The later Kabbalists found it convenient to pass over this declaration, and then had no difficulty in unveiling what they said was its Kabbalistic teaching: for indeed their methods applied to any writings were fully equal to extracting the Kabbalah, or anything else that might be thought desirable, from their diction.

Now the modern Kabbalists, under the pressure of the universal conscience, are falling back on the original view of the Elohist, if indeed not going a little beyond it; regardless of the fact that in so doing they are flying in the face of that Jehovah whose name is still to them the ineffable Tetragrammaton and, in its manifold combinations, the key to all their mysteries; and that the teachings of the prophet of Islam in this regard are the genuine outcome of the tendencies of the original Kabbalah.

The methods of these modern Kabbalists furnish the measure of their competence to deal with the documents in which they think to have discovered the germs of their transforming conceptions.

A few examples will suffice to bring this clearly under the notice of the reader.

In the opening word *B'rasit*, of Genesis they, amongst other significances, read "To create six," to which rendering they attach a mystical import. But to draw this meaning from it they treat *B'rasit* as *B'ras's*, and think they are justified in doing this because the Aramaean word for six is *s't* or *sit*, whereas the Hebrew for six is *s's* or *ses*, and yet in so claiming they introduce another mystifying principle to the more than sufficiently complex transmuting apparatus of the Kabbalah; add a further potency to its already all but omnipotent magical transforming wand: for in thus translating the Hebrew as though it had been Chaldee, they assume the right of reading one language through or turning it into another.

In the word ALEIM *(Elohim)* whose numerical value is A=1, L=30, E=5, I=10 and M=40 (or as a final 600)—which added together give the number 86 or 646—they find the number 31,415, a number of considerable mystical import in Eastern metaphysics. But to force this number into the word they change the value of L=30 into 3, and the value of I=10 into 1, by omitting the cyphers of each of these numbers, and then transpose the order of the letters of the thus deduced numerals, to be able to read them in arithmetical series as enumerating signs. And yet, so to read and enumerate, *Aleim* is transformed into *Lamie* or *Limae*, whose real Kabbalistic number is, like that of *Aleim*, 86; while the numbers of the letters, stated in arithmetical series, 30, 1, 40, 10, 5 or 30, 10, 40, 1, 5, are, by the omission of the cyphers, reduced to 3, 1, 4, 1, 5, which in 31,415 gives the required number. Thus to effect this arithmetical juggle either of the two words above noted is substituted for *Aleim*, so that the number thus arrived at is in no sense that of *Elohim*; and, even while so reading, the devisers thereof forget that the letter *Iod*, to which they would attribute the value of *Aleph*, represents the word *ten*, not the arithmetical sign 10, that *Lamed* signifies *thirty*, not 30, and that there is no possibility of reducing the numerical power of these letters to 3 and 1 respectively *in Hebrew*, the language with which the Kabbalah deals. There each is a symbol of a definite value; and *that value is unalterable.*

In the fifth word, *Ha-Shamaim*, of the first verse of the same book (*Genesis*), they see two words, *Esh*, "Fire," and *Maim*, "Water;" and thence assume that "the Heavens" consist of fire and water. But to find *Esh* in *Ha-Shamaim* they must introduce the letter *Aleph* (A) between the definite article and the noun, and deal with the word as though it had been written *Ha-ash-maim*, and yet in so doing they claim the right to add letters to the text which are not in the original, and moreover coin a non-existent word which could not mean "the heavens." In the *Zohar* this view of the constitution of *Shamaim* is gained by regarding the initial S as the emblem of fire. But this is to fall back on the symbolism of the letters, to the significance of which act I have already alluded, and suggests that the Chaldee characters were borrowed by the Hebrews because of the symbolic value attributed to them.

In the ninth section of the first chapter of the *Sepher Jetzirah* it is said of the *Sephiroth*, "These are the ten emanations of number. One, a spirit of *Elohim Chajim*." (The *Elohim Chajim*, from being first regarded as the energy of vital or rather of vitalizing forces, were subsequently individualized as 'Life giving Deity," and then personified as "the Living God;" upon which *Ruach* became "Spirit," and *Ruach Elohim Chojim* "Spirit of the Living God.")

It is not necessary to be a very profound Hebraist to see that the word *Achath*, "One," is used here in the sense "Emanation one," for "the first emanation" or, in brief, "The first;" that the word "One" is consequently used in its feminine form, *Achath*, to agree with the understood feminine word *Atsilah*, "Emanation," and that the word *Atsilah* is understood, and not expressed, as an idiomatic usage to avoid redundancy. Hence the idiomatic translation of *Achath* here is "First."

Even to the non-Hebraist the English rendering, as given above, will make this clear. And yet, closing their eyes to this, the modern Kabbalists, or some of them, have complacently adopted the reading, "*One is She the Spirit of the Elohim of Life.*"

Curiously enough, to obtain this singularly significant result, each of the four Hebrew words in the sentence has been misrepresented and mistranslated.

Achath (used in its masculine form in *Gen.* i. 5, and there translated "first" in the Anglican authorized version) is made to include the substantive verb "is" and the personal pronoun "She."

Ruach is read with the definite article "the spirit," as though it had been written *Ha-Ruach.*

Elohim is translated as if used with the definite article and in the construct state, *Ha-Elohei*, "the Elohim of."

Chajim, a plural form, is given as a singular, and that not of the masculine adjective *chaj*, but as though of the feminine noun *chajah.*

It is hardly surprising to find that those who so read the Hebrew, and also desire to prove that God is at once male and female, should see in *Elohim* a feminine plural conventionally treated as a masculine singular by translators who ignore the feminine aspect of the God-head. Had they affirmed that the archaic EL should be viewed as representing a masculine Deity which had evolved ELOAH from itself as a feminine counterpart, and then assumed that this was why the designation ELOAH was derived from EL, they would at any rate have kept within the lines of Hebrew orthography. They might, indeed, have carried such fanciful derivations and mystical interpretations much further. Why do they call Jehovah "the son" in his human incarnation, in the Christian acceptation of the Trinity? Surely Jehovah is a feminine form, according to their way of reading the Hebrew, and ought therefore to represent "the daughter" in her human mani-

festation. Then again, why should not AB, mystically viewed, be the contracted form of an archaic ABAH, crowded out of existence by those who maintain that Deity is masculine, and be therefore treated as a feminine word? As a feminine word it should have a feminine significance. Hence it could of course no longer mean "father" and must therefore signify "mother." Very plausible reasons could be advanced in favour of such a derivation and rendering. The plural of AB is the feminine ABOTH, as though formed from ABAH; and AB is given as ABBA in the New Testament. To read *Ab* as mother, *Jehovah* as daughter, and *Ruach* as the female spirit of both, with *Elohim* as the feminine Three in One, ought to commend itself to the modern Kabbalist as a very suitable prelude to the inauguration of the coming era of "Our Lady of Grace."

* * * * *

Traces of the influence of Eastern mysticism are to be found, in a more or less masked form, in the Gospels. These have imparted to them certain esoteric characteristics, but, as they are only present in passages of more than doubtful authenticity, they really testify to an early effort to subvert the teaching handed down as of Jesus of Nazareth.

The key to this teaching is the text, so to say, of the "Sermon on the Mount"—*Blessed are the poor in spirit.*

The antagonism between a teaching resting on such a basis, and a doctrine whose sole aim was spiritual development, is self evident. The would-be subverters were, however, only partly successful in their efforts, and failed to mysticise the gospel whose bases they nevertheless completely obscured: but they were the founders of the religion known as Christianity.

Their successors, the modern Kabbalists, are treading closely in their footsteps.

One of the latest of their discoveries is very remarkable.

Because, at the close of the final trial preceding initiation, the candidate for adeptship in the "Secret mysteries" is instigated to exclaim, from a cruciform couch on which he is extended and addressing the "Higher self," *My God, my God, how thou dost glorify me!* and because Jesus of Nazareth is reported to have cried out, when suspended from the cross, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* They see in this, and seek to read it as the conventional exclamation of the successful initiate and treat the crucifixion as a parable of initiation.

But the words put into the mouth of the crucified Jesus are quoted from the Targum or Chaldee version of Psalm xxii. 1. Their sense is, therefore, undoubted and above question. Thus their meaning is determined by the verse of the Psalm, of which they are a translation, their orthography by the Targum from which they are quoted.

From these it is learnt that, while the meaning of the verb, as here used, is "forsake," not "glorify," its orthography is SBQTNI, *not* SBCHATNI.

The mistake has been fallen into here through overlooking the Targumistic source of the exclamation in the Gospels and following

the orthography of the Greek as though representing the Hebrew language. But the words preserved in and transmitted through the Gospels were Chaldee and not Hebrew. The Targum of the Psalm and not the Psalm itself was their source.

The adoption of this imputed rendering moreover introduces the further anomaly of making the initiate use a Hebrew exclamation—of which usage no instance can be cited: whereas the language of initiation would have been that of "the mysteries."

It is greatly to be regretted that those unfamiliar with the language of the Hebrew Kabbalah should profess to teach what they do not understand.

HENRY PRATT, M. D.

SELF-KNOWLEDGE AND SELF-CULTURE.

MANY of our friends crave for self-knowledge and work for self-culture. Natural and useful as these propensities really are, they carry with them an element of failure. "Virtue itself," says Shakespeare, "becomes vice when misapplied."

Working after self-knowledge and self-culture is no doubt a virtue, but it becomes vice when misapplied; in the former case it is sure to be a success, since it contains within itself the chief element of success in work, viz., action in the right direction, while in the latter case it is sure to be a failure, because it embraces a most potent germ of disappointment, viz., action in a wrong direction. Which is the right direction to work in? This question deserves foremost attention, since a mistake in direction turns everything upside down. Unfortunately, at this great threshold of progress, where the greatest care and caution are absolutely necessary, many of our friends are hasty and careless. We must think well what we are about, before we are up and doing. 'Well begun is half done,' says an English proverb; and the converse of that is equally true. Now, the direction we take depends upon the motive with which we work. Persons working with different motives may go the same way at first, but in the course of time they take different directions according to their motives; on the other hand, persons working with one and the same motive may at first proceed by different ways, but they always take the same direction and reach one and the same place in the end. The best way to go by is not the same for all, it varies with the nature of the aspirant and his surroundings. Let us have a clear and correct idea of the working motive and hold fast to it; let that be our guiding star, and we may safely trust to its light to lead us aright. It is a mistake to persuade our friends to act just as we do, since what we do may be the best for us to do and yet not the best for him to do. Take, for instance, the zeal with which some induce their friends to follow the particular Yoga practice that is supposed to have done them good, without due consideration of temperament and motive. The advice is given in confidence to be followed in secresy, and thus the poor brother is deprived of judicious friendly counsel upon a point of the most vital importance.

With what motive shall we work? That is the question, the first question, the great question, the all-important question, for all good workers.

First as regards self-knowledge. The right motive is that which pertains to knowledge and not to self. Self-knowledge is worth seeking by virtue of its being knowledge and not by virtue of its pertaining to self. If we attach greater importance to self-knowledge than to other knowledge, it must be because it is higher knowledge, since it pertains to higher truths and reveals deeper mysteries of nature. Many err here at the very threshold. They value self-knowledge because it is knowledge of *self*. They seek knowledge of self, and the very fact of their seeking such knowledge is proof postive that they do not know *self*. They seek knowledge of *that* which they do not know, in other words, they are groping in the dark.

Not knowing *self*, they run after diverse appearances of self. Thus running after shadows, they are sure to be disappointed. On the other hand, if one seeks knowledge as knowledge, he comes to self-knowledge since that is knowledge, and having reached there he knows himself. Unfortunately, some of our learned friends make a distinction here which tends to create confusion. For self-knowledge we are asked to look within, while for knowledge we are said to be looking without. The current method of seeking knowledge is discarded and we are asked to retire within ourselves. That there is a step in the acquisition of knowledge which may well be termed 'Retiring within ourselves' we do not mean to deny. Moreover, the association of ideas that the term carries in its train is well suited to help the student in his work, at any rate, it is very suggestive. But, there is a pit-fall in the way, and so great is the risk of hasty travellers falling into it, that it is better not to show this way than to show it without due care and working. The pitfall we refer to is this. *The student who seeks self-knowledge by trying to retire within himself, unconsciously turns his attention to self and keeps it there.* It is true that he tries to turn it upon the *higher* self and not upon the *lower* self, but his idea of the higher self is hazy if not erroneous, and on that account, it is not the *higher self* that he actually attends to, although he means to attend to that. Before one can properly turn his attention to his *higher self*, he must have a clear idea of his *higher self*. In the absence of such an idea, he runs the risk of going astray. On the other hand, the student who seeks knowledge for love of knowledge, unconsciously retires within himself in the act of seeking knowledge. Here, he runs no risk of going astray since he acts unconsciously under the intuitive guidance of love. Now the question is how to secure this guide. Love of knowledge is inherent in the human breast. Every one can, if he likes, cherish it, attend to it, and work under its impulse. By working under its impulse he gives it free scope, whereupon it grows stronger and stronger day after day until it becomes his guiding motive in life. Whoever studies for love of knowledge, works with the right motive.

Prompted by love, sustained by love, plunged by it deeper and deeper day after day, his study is truly theosophic, even if he has never heard the word theosophy; and sooner or later this love alone uplifts him all round and leads him to self-knowledge. Byron says:—

> Yes, love indeed is light from Heaven,
> A spark from that immortal fire;
> With angels shared, by Allah given,
> To lift from earth our low desire.

To sum up:—The main requisite for acquiring self-knowledge is pure love. Seek knowledge for pure love, and self-knowledge eventually crowns the effort. The fact of a student growing impatient is proof positive that he works for reward and not for love, and that in its turn goes to prove that he does not deserve the great victory in store for those who really work for pure love. We see here the great value of the first object of the Theosophical Society. It is the grand doctrine of love, the master-key to nature's occult room laid before the unprepared mind in a suitable form. The object of forming a nucleus of the Universal Brotherhood of Humanity gives at first sight a very faint idea of its hidden grandeur, and that is all that can be expected from new lookers on, but they make a serious mistake when they believe there is nothing more at the bottom of it than they have seen upon the surface at first sight and quietly pass on to the second object and sometimes hastily to the third. Embracing as it does the other two objects within its folds, the first object may be called the only object of the Society, and it is capable of giving every earnest member all that is worth having.

J. K. DAJI.

A STUDY IN SYMBOLISM.

ALL the religions of the world are chiefly the representation of one and the same truth in various ways by different methods suited to the intellectual capacity of the people, and the chief mission of "The Theosophical Society" is to point out this fundamental identity of truth running like a silver thread through the different coloured beads of religious differentiations. Many of my friends ask me whether several societies, headed by their respective teachers, have not been doing the same moral and spiritual work, and whether "The Theosophical Society" is not a superfluity? Even granting for argument's sake (while really it is not so) that each society preserves the purity of its original founder and of his doctrines, yet a connecting link is highly essential to preserve all these in a common bond of reciprocity. Hands of themselves are useless, and in like manner all the organs of the body are useless considered alone, but when the second principle joins all these organs together, each member becomes full of use, and what a wonderful mechanism is presented to the human eye, concealing within it the genius of an Isaac Newton, of Socrates and others. This connecting link is sorely wanting in all the

religious societies, which have divided the whole world into so many antipathic and selfish sections, and this long-felt want is supplied at last by "The Theosophical Society" alone. All the non-materialistic Hindus had an idea, that occultism belonged exclusively to Aryavarta and the Hindus; but this one-sided and selfish idea has been removed by the advent of "The Theosophical Society," by proving that there are "Rosicrucians" and other sages of all nationalities, and that truth is not the monopoly of any one nation and country, and it is therefore high time for us to compare notes rather than to cry out that our next-door neighbour is a fool. After these preliminary remarks, I mean to examine, in this article, some of the religious observances of the Hindus, and to bring to the surface as far as possible the precious philosophical truths that are embedded underneath these symbols, and thus to prove that the Hindus are not idolaters in the proper acceptation of that term, and if they are so, there is not a nation which can extricate itself from this reproach. Of all the Hindu religious observances which strike a foreigner, as most curious, the temples and their idols are the most prominent objects of criticism to the Christian missionaries and the mainstay of religion to the Hindus. In this connection I may quote some lines from the pen of "The Solar Sphinx," (vide "Places of Pilgrimage in India," Vol. VII of *The Theosophist.*)

"I will add a few remarks to the foregoing communication. It will be no exaggeration to say that the secrets of the ancient archaic science, for which an enquirer will search in vain the mystical books of the East, are often symbolically represented in some of the most celebrated places of pilgrimage in India. The mysterious ideas generally associated with the position of Benares, its past history, and its innumerable gods and goddesses, contain clearer indications of the secrets of final initiation than a cart-load of books on Yoga Philosophy. Look again at Chidambaram and examine carefully the plan on which its celebrated temple was built by Patanjali, by the light of the Cabalistic, the Chaldean, the Egyptian, and the Hindu doctrines relating to the great mystery of the "Logos." You are far more likely to penetrate this mystery by such a course of study than by examining all the obscure statements of ancient initiates regarding the sacred voice of the great deep and impenetrable veil of "Isis." Masons are searching in vain for the golden delta of Enoch; but an earnest enquirer of truth who has comprehended the rules of interpretation which are applicable to such subjects, will not find it very difficult to discover this Delta in Chidambaram."

An idea underlies even an insignificant act, and considering the vast amount of money and energy expended in the construction of temples by a highly philosophical nation, it naturally suggests itself to the earnest and enquiring that the grandest motives must have moved those master minds to such a work, and this conclusion irresistibly prompts us to attempt a solution of a mystery rather than to indulge in disdainful ridicule and inaction. Some may say that no Hindu understands all these things in their true sense, and that they remain only in name, the meaning being gone, and hence useless for the present generation. Even in ordinary material education a certain amount of faith is required of the student. A Chemistry Primer is first introduced into a middle class and the students study the principles contained therein, not at once intellectually and with conviction, but by cramming and getting by heart, and as knowledge in that department is once awakened, the

very same non-understood principles turn out to be full of suggestions and natural verities. But if the beginner would not begin the subject, unless he gets positive assurance that chemistry is a true science and the principles contained therein are the enunciations of simple natural phenomena, progress becomes impossible. Faith, if wrongly directed, is more powerful than intellect without faith. A man of poor intellect, but endowed with instinctive belief in a soul, its hereafter, and the laws of Karma, and who attributes the miseries and misfortunes of his life (patiently bearing them) to "the will" of God, is a great deal better than any of the modern brightest intellects whose possessors mention "civilisation and progress" a million times, and God not even once, or than the greatest leaders of the modern Agnostic school, who having "beaten about the bush" for the last half century, have simply "caught a Tartar" by positing a vague negative "unknowable" in the place of "atoms," thus throwing science or philosophy "out of the frying pan into fire." A sick man places himself under the treatment of a doctor and gets a certain prescription from him; but if the patient will not take the medicine, unless he is convinced of its efficacy and properties, he will have simply to suffer, and death will be the consequence. Mere faith is of some use till the required quantity of intellectuality is developed, and when once this is developed, mere faith becomes intellectual faith, and forms the prime motor of every true advancement. "There is no excellence without faith in this world." Further, the majority of Hindus have not developed in them that amount of spirituality which could enable them to see the interior through the exterior, and even in this state it is really a compliment to the Hindus, that with a firm belief in a soul and its after existence, they choose to worship these idols in temples blindly and preserve the symbols at least in existence, than remain intellectual, materialistic iconoclasts, or what is worse than that, become actuated with mis-directed zeal which made the Mahomedans and the followers of Luther burn clairvoyants and holy people at the stake as heretics, and the precious archaic occult records as books of superstition and of fetish worship, and pull down the occult seminaries, as a duty of religious obligation. As "K. H." writes:—"Iconoclasm from its very destructiveness can give nothing, it can only raze. Periods of mental and moral light and darkness succeed each other as day does night. The major and minor yugas must be accomplished according to the established order of things." These temples with their idols were introduced as symbols at a time when the symbols were universally perceivable, but in course of time, mental and moral darkness set in, in obedience to cyclic laws, and the symbology was consequently lost. Now the time is come to hope for the best, and it is the duty of every Hindu to vindicate his forefathers, who were not intellectual maniacs, but sages who worked according to the needs of the times for the good of humanity; and to restore the proper philosophic meaning of all the archaic symbols instead of trying to demolish them and of "joining with those modern critics who wise only in their own conceit, denounce old customs and laws, beliefs and traditions, as vestiges of the ignorant past, before

they have investigated with impartial care, and learnt whether they embody important truths and should be clung to rather than discarded." To quote again the words of "The Solar Sphinx." "As no writer was permitted in ancient times to divulge in clear language the secrets of occult science to the public, and as books and libraries could be easily destroyed either by ravages of time or by the vandalism of barbarous invaders, it was thought proper to preserve for the benefit of posterity, in strong and lasting edifices of granite, some of the greatest secrets known to the designers of these buildings in the form of signs and symbols. The very same necessity which brought into existence the Sphinx and the great Pyramid led the ancient leaders of Hindu religious thought to construct these temples and express in stone and metal the hidden meaning of their doctrines." The Christian who mocks at his brother Hindu is himself an *idolater of the Cross*, because he does not understand its hidden or esoteric meaning. To a man who cannot understand the property of triangles, squares and other geometrical figures, they may be of no use and meaning, and it does not follow therefore that geometry should be blotted out of existence. When we are young we contract good habits under proper parents, and though we may not be able to understand and appreciate them then, yet when we grow and intellectually perceive the beneficient effects of those habits, we are really thankful to our parents, and so shall be with us our "superstitions" and beliefs. If a man perverts wisdom, it does not follow that wisdom is a mischievous factor in man. If I see my neighbour's son squandering and mis-using the prudently and lawfully stored up wealth of his forefathers, neither the fathers nor the wealth are to blame, and it is the duty of every right-minded man to suggest to him what motive actuated his forefathers to leave this precious legacy to him, and to thus set him right by making him value it at its real and intended worth. Things should be viewed in their true light and interpretation, but not in the accepted usage of the uneducated public. The real mission of "The Theosophical Society" is to be learned from the disinterested motives and actions of the founders, which proves the utter falseness of the notion that it is a masked propaganda of Buddhism. A man with certain principles, though unable to realise them, is better than one without any principle whatever; and so, though all the Hindus repair to temples and worship idols blindly, without understanding that they are external symbols of internal manifestations, yet if the symbols be preserved, there will rise up in course of time, according to cyclic law of necessity, a spiritual teacher who will point out to the public the real dignity and significance of these symbols, and thus justify both the worshipper and the worshipped.

To return to the subject of this article. All the temples of Puranic existence, if critically examined, consist of seven Mantapams (stone halls with open sides) and three Prakarams (rectangular open paths around the idol); and of all the idols in temples, two are the foremost in worship, the one known as "Mulavar" (literally, he—the original cause) and the other as "Uthsavar" (he of festivals and adoration). The place occupied by the former is the seventh and that by the latter is the sixth Mantapam counting from the entrance. The first is fixed to the ground, whereas the second is moveable and portable. The first represents Para Brahm and hence motionless, permanent, immoveable, and the second is the Logos or Ishwara, which is capable of consciously manifesting itself and overshadowing humanity, and for a clear position of this Logos the reader is referred to Mr. Subba Row's Bagavad Gita lectures. The other idols in the temples are so many auxiliary spiritual forces in the human body, being placed in the several localities of the temple corresponding to their positions in the human body, and the temple is the body itself. The three Prakarams represent the three bodies of Sthula, Sukshma and Karana (the gross, the subtile and the causal), and the three states of Jagrata, Swapna and Sushupthi, (waking, dreaming and dreamless sleep). To sum up. The seven mantapams represent the septenary principles in man, and the two chiefest idols represent the 7th and the 6th principles, being rightly placed in the 7th and the 6th mantapams respectively, and the three Prakarams represent the three bodies and states of Pragna, thus briefly noting that man is a septenary, having Para Brahm and Logos in him, and that the said Para Brahm is beyond the three bodies and states. The seven mantapams further teach that man has 7 spiritual centres in him : (1) Mulatharam, (2) Swadhi Shtanam, (3) Manipurakam, (4) Anahatam, (5) Agia, (6) Vesudhi and (7) Sahasram, and that man should rise up from one centre to another until final emancipation is completed in the 7th centre, wherein "the causeless cause" resides, and this is represented by the Hindu going from the 1st mantapam to the 2nd, and so on to the 7th, paying worship to the idols in each. Further, the more you penetrate into the Hindu temples, the greater darkness you find in them, very unlike the Christian churches which are streaming with light. The 2nd mantapam is less bright than the 1st, and the 3rd than the 2nd, and the 7th is completely dark, and it is therefore usually lighted with other lights, as else the idol placed there is entirely non-perceivable. This signifies that the more you rise in the spiritual centres and initiations, the more your passions will be lashed as trials, and the more responsible and incomprehensible you will find your position to be unless you call forth all your spiritual capabilities to your aid. Further, this idea of darkness corresponds to the saying of the Bible, "There is darkness around the pavilion," and means that the universal Jyotis or principle is complete darkness to the profane, and for a right perception of it no mortal eyes and mind can be of any use unless all the latent spiritual forces are lighted up in the temple of human bodies. Some of the modern religious Hindus like their brothers who madly rush into reforms without considering the social, the religious and the philosophical aspects of every proposition, have pulled down the darkest parts of temples, and have substituted in their stead halls with windows and doorways, according to the principles of physiology and sanitation, and in my humble opinion they are wrong. By so doing they demolish a principle which that darkness was intended to

convey. If they want to enjoy ease, let them have it in their nicely built bungalows, built according to their own whims and caprice. Since every Hindu temple is a symbol of eternal truths in nature, any mischief done to it is done to the principle itself. A reference to the fact that Yogis live in Guhas with a small doorway admitting only a little quantity of light and air (curious to a modern scientist), and that they make wonderful advancement, will show that the symbol is a right one. I may here point out to those readers who are not acquainted with Hindu temples that a stone bull is placed in the 6th mantapam facing the idol Siva, and the worshipper is required to touch below the root of the bull's tail and directing his sight through the back and between the horns of the bull, he sees the idol and exclaims "Sadasivoham." This is automatically done by all the Hindus without trying to know what it means. The bull represents Pranava, (vide, "The twelve Signs of Zodiac,") its two horns, Ida and Pingala, and the line running through the back is the Sushumna. At two fingers distance above the tail Mulatharam is situated. The meaning is that he who wants redemption from the trammels of matter must rouse up the latent divine spiritual forces from the 1st centre, Mulatharam (typified by the touching of that position in the bull), and directing it through Sushumna artery (represented by the back of the bull) which lies between Ida and Pingala (the two horns) centres his Pragna in the 7th centre, Sahasram, and thus becomes enabled to see Siva—the Divine principle—face to face, and no sooner does he so see than all conditioned existence ceases, and the natural exclamation is "that he is God," being merged in the universal principle. (Refer to Kasi Sankalpam, in "Places of Pilgrimage in India"). I cannot say what more meanings are hidden underneath, as most probably "the key may be turned seven times," in the interpretation of ancient archaic symbology.

Thus far I have briefly and, I fear, feebly sketched out the meaning of these symbols as embodiments of highest abstract philosophical truths, and of the way how to attain to these. But no instruction is complete unless the process of evolution and involution be included in it as completing the spiritual instruction given by a guru to a chela. How is that symbolised in Hindu temples? Everybody knows (at least it is so here) that in all the biggest temples, 7 brass circular plates are placed one above the other with interspaces between, with a brass rod connecting them perpendicularly in a spiral manner—only one light is shining in the 1st plate, in the 2nd 4 or 5, and so on till in the 7th, 28, 36 or 48 lights are burning, and at every time of Pooja these lighted plates are shown before the idol, and no worship is complete without this. What does this signify? It clearly indicates that the single light or Jyotis in the first plate is Para Brahm, and how that one, non-dual Jyotis descended lower and lower and manifested itself in so many individual lights or Jivathmas, owing to its being encased, as it were, in 28, 36, or 48 Thathwams or Upadhis. All the innumerable lights in the lower plates (each plate represents one plane of consciousness) are lit in the single light of the 1st plate. Analysis downwards from the 1st leads to all the varied manifestations of the divine principle, and

synthesis upwards leads to that single universal divine light of which all other lights are manifestations. The seven plates represent the seven creations, corresponding to the seven places of consciousness, (vide "The Secret Doctrine," Vol. I. "The Seven Creators") and the arrangement of the plates signifies that evolution is spiral. This, in short, is its philosophy, and the temple with its idol worship, stands for a spiritual Asramam (hermitage), and a Guru initiating those that come to it into spiritual truths by means of symbols.

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

THE PROVINCE OF THEOSOPHY.

WE are frequently told that such or such a subject is outside of the legitimate province of theosophical discussion. This idea appears to be a bugbear to some people, and for others a convenient thorn to stick in the sides of their neighbours. This question is a very important one, involving as it does the whole work and life of the Society, and it should be candidly examined in its various aspects; not for the purpose for laying down hard and fast lines in the matter, but in order to give to each person interested an opportunity of considering the subject in its different bearings, so that he may be able to exercise his own judgment and use his own conscience in the matter, with a clear conception of the discussionary rights and duties of not only himself but his neighbours.

"Politics" are and have always been debarred to Fellows of the Theosophical Society "as such" by the Rules, and nobody has ever objected to that prohibition. One may go farther and say that, so eminently wise and satisfactory has the Rule appeared to every one concerned, nobody seems ever to have taken the trouble to ask what it really meant. The Revised Rules state the prohibition thus: "The Theosophical Society does not interfere with politics, and any such interference in its name is a breach of its constitution;" and it is one of the offences involving expulsion. Now the question has arisen: What is to be understood by the word "*politics*?"

The object which the Fellows of the Society are taught to keep before them is "to make Theosophy a factor in their lives." Those who go a little deeper into the "waters" endeavour to make it the "ruling power" of their lives. It is absurd to suppose that in one and a somewhat important department of the lives of Theosophists Theosophy should not be a "ruling power," nor even a "factor."

The truth is that politics is a word that may mean anything or nothing. It is used in two senses, and the dictionary definition pretty accurately reflects the meanings popularly attaching to it. Webster defines the word thus:—

"1. The science of government; *that part of ethics which has to do with the regulation and government of a nation or state*, the preservation of its safety, peace, and prosperity, the defence of its existence and rights against foreign control or conquest, the

augmentation of its strength and resources, and the protection of *its citizens* in their rights, with *the preservation and improvement of their morals.*

"2. The management of a political party; the advancement of candidates to office; in a bad sense, artful or dishonest management to secure the success of political measures or party schemes; political trickery."

Now, many people believe that the Rules of the Society distinctly forbid Fellows from interfering with politics, and they think that any Fellow who *does* interest himself in "that part of ethics which has to do with the regulation and government" of the country in which he lives, or who takes any part in "the preservation and improvement" of the "morals" of his fellow countrymen, incurs, not the *risk*, but the *certainty* of expulsion.

Of course this was never the intention of the Rule, but the fact that it seems to many to cover the above case, shows that there is something wrong somewhere in this idea of the subject. Wherein lies the fallacy or confusion? It seems to consist in a want of perception of the fact that, in our present civilization, every institution is connected with, and to some extent dependent upon every other; that every institution or "interest" has elements in it drawn from various sources; and that none can be said to be purely what its name might at first sight imply. That, in fact, there is no such thing as politics as distinguished from ethics, or sociology as distinguished from jurisprudence, nor is there any other human interest which can be isolated from all others, if it is to be properly understood or adequately dealt with; and if Theosophists are to eschew everything that comes under the definition of "politics," a big slice is at once cut away from the department of ethics, with which it is confessed on all hands that Theosophists are eminently concerned.

Now, it would be folly to maintain that the dictionary definition of "politics" was present in the minds of those who formulated the Revised Rules of the Theosophical Society, or that it is generally recollected by those who employ the term to-day. Politics now means a different thing to what it meant when the first of the two definitions above quoted was remembered and respected. In ancient Greece or Rome the man who thought he recommended himself in any way by declaring that "he did not interfere with politics," would have been regarded as a very contemptible creature indeed, because that would have been equivalent to a confession that he was devoid of public spirit and of intelligent interest in the moral condition of his fellow countrymen. The degeneracy of the once noble word "politics" is seen perhaps as clearly in free America as it is in the most autocratic country in the old world. In the latter, "interference in politics" means, as a rule, rebellion against the constituted authorities, involving arbitrary arrest, mock trial, and imprisonment or worse. In the former, it means in most cases a selling of the soul to corruption, meanness and trickery of every form. It is no wonder that Theosophists are anxious to disclaim any intention of interfering in politics! Neither hot potatoes nor lumps of pitch are very agreeable things to handle!

Still it behoves us to enquire whether, and how far, we have the right of making our concern the subjects which come under the first and better definition of politics; and the same considerations apply to sociology and legislation, and to every social reform and to almost every attempt at progress in any direction whatever. At present Theosophists in general, and Fellows of the Theosophical Society in particular, are in an anomolous and somewhat ridiculous position. Everything that can, however remotely, be connected with politics, in the good as well as in the evil signification of that term, is tambooed. There is a large section of the Fellows who are almost equally averse to the discussion of social questions. As to discussing any legislative enactment, or venturing to question the supreme wisdom of any Police regulation, or to enquire into the working and effects of almost any other institution whatever, the majority of the Fellows would rather face the Dweller on the Threshold himself, than incur the supposed consequences of so doing.

Now this tacit prohibition which constantly meets the Fellows "as such," whichever way they turn, has an exceedingly discouraging and "lowering" effect upon the vitality of the branches. It is a matter of constant complaint that the members of the branches do not know what to do when they assemble at their regular meetings. There is hardly a conceivable subject that does not come into the "black list" of those which are "not proper subjects for discussion" by Fellows of the Society "as such," and it is certainly "as such" that Fellows attend branch meetings. Perhaps if they could come together "as something else," a little life might be infused into the Society by the introduction of subjects for consideration or discussion that have in them a little "live interest." Inspiring and elevating as it may be to dwell enthusiastically on the glories of old Aryavarta, and to recount the marvellous doings of the ancient Rishis, that kind of entertainment loses its improving aroma after a while and becomes monotonous. The seven Principles, or the Four, do not furnish matter for endless debate. Reincarnation and Karma have been exhausted long ago as subjects of conversation. Even the reading of the Bhavagad Gita or Light on the Path is found to have a depressing effect if continued month after month. And still, if we except the exciting employment of investigating the meaning of Sanscrit terms or phrases to be found in the ancient Hindu writings, these subjects pretty well exhaust the list of those which are open to Fellows "as such."

This kind of thing is ridiculous. The Theosophical Society is not a baby school, or a monastic retreat. Surely if any people in the world have a right to say, "Nothing that concerns mankind is without interest for me," it is Theosophists, who have thrown prejudice away, and have opened their souls to the influence of universal sympathy and kindness, and whose motto and object is Universal Brotherhood.

Are we then to offend against the fundamental principle of the Society which forbids Fellow "as such" from taking part in politics? By no means. But how then can this be avoided if Fel-

lows "as such" take up the position that, since Theosophy is their "rule of life," all that concerns their lives concerns Theosophy?

It is clear that as Theosophists and Fellows of a Society, whose object is to further Theosophy, they have a prior and a larger right to interest themselves in everything of human interest than any set of men called "Politicians," "Legislators," "Theologians," "Doctors" of any degree, or specialists of any class. Those who have assumed the function of laying down the law, and setting the fashion in the various departments of human life, stand towards Theosophy very frequently in the position of defendants—sometimes even of criminals. It is for Politics and Sociology to produce their authority for putting their seal upon this institution, and that one, and then saying, "Thou shalt not touch or question these, they belong to us." For centuries it was Religion that stood guard over prejudice, ignorance and imbecility as embodied in human ideas and institutions. In those days it was the priest, in whose shadow stood the executioner, who struck down those that in the name of Truth and Justice ventured to lift the veil of selfishness and incompetence that shrouded the life of humanity, and dared to long for a happier state of things, or to believe in the possibility of its attainment. The scourge has now been struck from the hand of the priest, his once proud authority has been torn from him, and he stands in our civilization a humble suppliant for toleration,—which he receives only on condition that he will make himself useful in the world and cease from troubling the consciences of men. Are we to grant to the politician and the sociologist the arbitrary and absolute power over our institutions and our lives that we have wrested from the theologian? The right involved is in reality no less than that. There is hardly an action of our lives that does not come within the definition of "politics." Do you love Justice? Well, you must leave that to the politicians, for they provide for it by Act of Parliament. Do you plead for the cause of Mercy, of Charity, of Enlightenment? My brothers of the Theosophical Society, these things do not concern you "as such," for are they not provided for by existing institutions, organized under the law, which, as everyone knows, is "the perfection of human wisdom."

Well, no F. T. S. "as such" wants to interfere in politics, in so far as that interference means, as it generally does, interfering with the schemes of politicians. Neither do they want, by force or fraud, or by any means, direct or indirect, to alter any social institution now existing. But they *do* want, and they claim that right fearlessly and without reproach, to examine every institution that has reference to the moral or spiritual welfare of mankind, and to proclaim them in their opinion *right* or *wrong* as the case may be. It is their inalienable right to do so, not only as Theosophists but as human beings. They do not want to interfere with or to influence *action*, but only *thought*. Their right and duty is to *form the public opinion, which in its turn forms customs and laws.* This is a far higher right and more responsible duty than those of any politician, or of any king or priest that ever lived. Kings, priests and politicians are local authorities and potentates, obliged from

the necessities of their position to act and to govern according to expediency not according to principle. The province of Theosophy is to proclaim what is RIGHT, not what is *expedient*, and it is because this is the case that those who maintain a difficult existence by means of an expediency that frequently flies in the face of principle, try to stand over us as with a club, ever ready to seize an occasion for dealing us a spiteful blow should they find the smallest excuse for so doing. It is not the bigger men, however, that try to do us harm. Those who rise to the position of leaders in politics, or in any other department of human life, are generally men sufficiently large by nature to perceive the existence of the great problems of human existence, and candid enough in their hearts to confess that all their art and all their science are inadequate to deal with these great problems; and such men as these not infrequently respect and sympathize with those whose earnest desire it is to grapple morally and intellectually with the evils which they themselves feel it to be beyond their power to abate. It is the little men, the small fry of society and of the Churches, the fussy, tyrannical, narrow-minded crowd, officious or official, who have no ideas and no opinions of their own, but always run and bark in the direction towards which they fancy the eyes of their leaders or superiors are directed,—it is these men that cry out on every occasion against Theosophy; and it is before them that the Theosophical Society is called upon to quail and bend the knee, and meekly resign a right of free discussion and free opinion which is its inalienable right. Not only the little men in politics, but the little men in every other department of life, are those that malign us, lie about us, and would frighten us away from our lawful domain if, by hook or crook, they could accomplish it.

Well, we need not trouble ourselves about such people if we are true to our objects and our principles. In our own legitimate field they are powerless to hinder or control us, and that field is the moulding of opinion, by the stimulation of thought, and the awakening of conscience and sympathy. These are things which the existing institutions of the world, whether political, religious or educational, are utterly unable to accomplish; for they depend for their accomplishment not upon expediency, but upon principle. Expediency differs with every change of wind, it is not the same in one country as in another. Principle is one and the same in every age and clime,—in calm and storm, in sunshine and in rain. Perhaps the twentieth century may be an age in which Principle will be hailed as the saviour of the world. There are signs of that happy consummation already, for politicians and sociologists see and acknowledge already that they are absolutely powerless to put an end to a state of things they know to be a gigantic evil,—but, on the contrary, as in the case of European armaments, are obliged by the very laws of their existence as rulers of men to exert themselves to increase it from day to day.

Let us, Fellows of the Theosophical Society, therefore claim our right calmly and fearlessly to apply the canons of Theosophic morality to every human institution, for in so doing we are not

infringing any actual or possible rule of the Theosophical Society. But let us also assure those whom it may concern that it is neither our desire, nor in the remotest degree our intention, to try to alter, or cause to be altered, any law, custom, or institution, contrary to the wish of those who live under it. What we desire to do is to influence *that wish* in case the institution or custom is contrary to justice, to reason, and to the advancement of the race. This, our object and desire, against which it would be impossible to raise a valid objection, we endeavour to accomplish by stimulating enquiry. If, as the result of such enquiry, the confessedly imperfect institutions under which we live are found to be the best adapted to the humanity of to-day, then it is no longer those institutions but humanity itself that needs improvement. To do this,—to improve humanity,—is in reality the only practical way in which Theosophy influences, or professes to influence, the world. Better men of their own accord make better laws and establish better institutions; but laws and institutions improved with the best intentions, before mankind has reached a corresponding stage of goodness, are delusions, snares and pitfalls.

And now, let no enemy cry out: "The *Theosophist* is trying to introduce politics into the Society;" or at least, if it be too much to expect from our enemies that they shall abstain altogether from slander, let them define the meaning in which they use that term.

If by "politics" they mean "the management of a political party; the advancement of candidates to office;" or "management," whether "dishonest" or not, "to secure the success of political measures or party schemes;" or, even if they mean any interference whatever with the existing political fabric of the State, or of any State, either in its domestic or foreign relations, then the statement that "the *Theosophist* is trying to introduce politics into the Society," would be a downright LIE, whether it were repeated by a malicious foe, or by a timid and time-serving friend.

But if the word "politics" be used in the perfectly legitimate, but unfortunately somewhat old-fashioned, sense of, "that part of ETHICS which has to do with the regulation and government of a nation or state," and "with the preservation and improvement of the morals of its citizens," then we will say that the assertion is perfectly justified: that Fellows of the Theosophical Society *do* interest themselves in "politics," not only as individuals, but "as such,"—namely, as Fellows of the Society. But in that case the assertion ceases to be an accusation and becomes an encomium, for it proves that Fellows of the Society endeavour to make Theosophy at least "a factor" in their lives, practically as well as theoretically. The encomium, however, is less than they really deserve. Fellows of the Theosophical Society are not satisfied with interesting themselves merely with the ethical regulation of any one nation, or the moral improvement of the citizens of the particular State to which they belong. It is the advancement of Morality, and Charity, and Justice, and Mercy, in themselves, and for themselves, in which Theosophists are interested and with which they claim to be legitimately occupied. This larger claim is gainsaid and opposed by no one; nor can it be, for it is an inherent

right in human beings to try to improve themselves, and to make their neighbours better and happier and holier than they are, and this higher claim includes the lesser one. *Theosophists have a right to study all questions from the ethical point of view*, and a right to express the opinions at which they may arrive. They have the right to declare, if they believe it to be true, that such or such an action is *wrong* and contrary to Morality or to Justice, whether committed by a public man or by a nation.

It matters very little whether they have the right to declare that such a statesman, or such a State, is wrong to uphold any institution or perform any action thus characterized as harmful or wrong. Those who stand at the bar of Theosophical opinion in such cases may very well be left to supply the minor premise of the syllogism for themselves,—the only danger is lest all governments, all religions, all rulers of men, should speak at once; for it is a simple fact that moral reprobation expressed in general terms is almost always applied by each guilty conscience to itself. Are there not a good many Western princes, each one of whom would secretly suppose he were meant, were the *Theosophist* to say: "A certain prince is a cross between a popinjay and a dunderhead"? How many Governments are there, each one of whom would feel itself attacked were we to write: "A certain government is imposing tyrannical burdens on the people"? How many Maharajahs and Rajahs are there in India, everyone of whom would feel himself aggrieved were we to say: "A certain Indian prince spent large sums of money to get a silly order or other bauble from the Empress, or lavishes lacs of rupees in his own selfish pleasures and in vain glorious ostentation, and yet, with all his asservations of patriotism, public spirit and benevolence, he has not helped by a single rupee the Theosophical Society, which all agree has done, and is doing, so grand a work in India"?

THE SPREAD OF THEOSOPHY.

WE have the most convincing proofs that the Theosophical idea is taking hold upon the Western mind, and winning the respect of advanced thinkers hitherto hostile. Among recent accessions, one of the most notable in every respect is Mrs. Annie Besant, who bears the same relation to Mr. Bradlaugh in the Secularist movement in England, as Madame Blavatsky does to myself in our own work. Besides being one of the most intellectual and best educated women, speakers, and writers of our epoch, she is conspicuous for courageous devotion to any cause with which she identifies herself, and the malignity of her bitterest foes has not been able to furnish her reputation for purity of life and unselfishness of motive. Her colleague, Mr. Bradlaugh, lacking her feminine insight which has made her see the profound verity of the Wisdom-Religion when once she calmly studied it, deplores Mrs. Besant's changed position towards Theosophy, and looks "to possible developments of her Theosophic opinions with the gravest misgivings."

Mr. Bradlaugh does not seem to understand the grand work of the Society in India. He has, apparently, only thought of Theosophy as a religious and philosophical system, and he is an atheist in the same sense in which Vedantins or Buddhists are called atheists by Christians, who cannot rise to the grandeur of their conception. Atheism is included in Theosophy, because the arguments upon which the atheist relies, though true enough in themselves, are not all there is to be said. Theosophy goes around atheism, and over it, and away beyond it, and shows that the so-called atheist is in his way very nearly as ignorant and prejudiced as the sectarian. The extraordinary thing about Theosophy is that it is more materialistic in its philosophy than the most confirmed Materialist of the schools, and yet it is at the same time more spiritual than the most spiritual of religions. When the so-called atheist enters it, he is met blandly by the admission "You are right, but there is another side to the question." When the Spiritualist comes in, he is told, "You are right, but there is something more." Instead of opposition each meets with sympathy, and the minds of both are opened to the part of the great whole to which they had previously been closed.

This is no mere theorizing; it is the experience of hundreds who have approached Theosophy from the opposite poles of Materialism and Spiritualism, and it will be the experience of thousands; for the prejudice with which we have hitherto been regarded is slowly melting away, and experience has shown that those who calmly and candidly listen to what we say end almost always in being converted to our doctrines and opinions; which will probably be the case also with Mr. Bradlaugh, who has always shown himself open to the reception of ideas new to him, and defender of what he believes to be the truth, as fearless as he is powerful.

I regret that this brave champion of Freethought has not as yet seen his way to accept the ancient philosophy, but hope he may be persuaded in time to do so, after having availed himself of the opportunities within his reach to discuss the moot points with Mrs. Besant and Madame Blavatsky.

Our next great hope is in a complete *rapprochement* with the Spiritualists, *for whom the Aryan Philosophy is an indispensable necessity*. If we and they had always put a proper restraint upon our tongues and pens, the mutual understanding between our two great families of spiritual reformers would undoubtedly have been an accomplished fact by this time. With the world's Free-thinkers, Spiritualists and Theosophists working together in full amity, no reactionary influence could long withstand the onward surge of Progress or baffle the scheme of Universal Brotherhood.

H. S. O.

SOME DARK CORNERS OF MODERN SCIENCE.

MANY years ago the late Arthur Schopenhauer predicted, with the intuition of genius, that the most important event chronicled in the 19th century, would be, in the judgment of posterity, the introduction of the Religious Philosophy of the East to the notice of the Western world.

A strange utterance, no doubt, to the ears of Europeans, then, as now, immersed in the strife of politics, or engaged in the ever-increasing conflict of modern philosophy with Western dogma; yet, to the observant eyes of the few, privileged to stand aside and play the part of spectators of the drama of life and of the tide of human thought surging around them, there are not wanting signs of the approaching fulfilment of this prophecy ere the century hastens to its close.

Not only has the number of distinguished Orientalists been notably on the increase of late years, but the comparative study of old-world religions, combined with archæological research, has been steadily and surely widening the thoughts and judgments of men, and doubtless preparing the way for the work of the Theosophical Society and for the reception of its priceless teachings, in the minds of many who, otherwise, might have rejected them contemptuously as an attempt to resuscitate old-world fables.

That Oriental religious philosophy is awakening a steady, ever-deepening interest in the West cannot be disputed; that a receptive few are even prepared to accept the statements of certain leading Theosophists as to the actual existence of a vast science known to hoary antiquity, but long since forgotten, or hid out of the sight of the world at large—though carefully guarded by custodians known only to a select minority. Strange to say too, (and yet not strange to those who believe that cyclic law governs human thoughts as well as mundane events) a set of independent thinkers has arisen, apparently ignorant of the wisdom of the East, whose writings, whether in grave essay, or through the medium of fiction, reproduce many phases of Aryan thought, more or less exactly, most of them manifesting an intuitive belief in super-sensual science. Such is the leaven already fermenting, which, if unchecked in its progress, may sooner or later permeate the mass of European literature—and in this case may prove an antidote to the spread of that sensuous materialism in which lies the germ of the decay of our civilization. But whilst our little Aryan sub-race is profiting so greatly by the teachings of its elder main stock, there are, alas! signs abroad that the reciprocal benefits which may possibly accrue to our "elder brethren"—social, political, or material, from intercourse with us, may be more than counterbalanced by the deteriorating effects of many of our modes of life,—above all, by the teachings of certain scientists whose methods of thought through a superficial resemblance to the Eastern doctrine of evolution, seem to exercise a special fascination over some of the Hindu students in the West. As, however, the radical difference of the Darwinian school of thought from the

true Esoteric Doctrine has been exhaustively dealt with in that wonderful book, "The Secret Doctrine," it is not necessary to add more on this subject in a periodical devoted to Theosophical literature. Indeed, my object in writing this article is a purely practical one, viz., to warn our Eastern brethren against the danger which seems more or less imminent of the introduction into India, sooner or later, of methods of physiological research practised by the adherents of this very school, involving the most atrocious and prolonged tortures ever inflicted on dumb animals, whilst, as yet, they remain absolutely or almost absolutely without beneficial results for Humanity. I allude to the modern practice of vivisection which has assumed gigantic proportions within the last few years, thus arousing the conscience of the public at last, and stimulating some of our best and noblest thinkers to a life-long struggle with a practice that entirely denies the claims of our "lower brethren" to our consideration, and at the same time demoralizes the human conscience to the utmost by putting supposed physical benefits to ourselves, above all considerations of Trust, Faith, Love; of all, in fact, that goes to build up our higher spiritual life.

I propose therefore to give *First*, a short sketch of the history of the anti-vivisection movement in Europe, from its very beginning, being anxious to bring our brethren of the Theosophical Society in India to a knowledge of the battle that has been fought in this cause with more or less success, although against fearful odds, owing to the public mind being blinded both as to the extent of the cruelty practised on the one hand, and on the other to the paucity of results, after an overwhelming proportion of suffering inflicted on the poor animals.

2ndly.—To dispose of the statements of the scientists as to the results obtained by themselves, as well as to show, as I hope successfully, that certain older discoveries, such as that of the circulation of the blood, the galvanic battery, &c., are not and never were really obtained by vivisection, as commonly stated.

3rdly.—To point out that of all forms of cruelty this is not only the most revolting, but also the most insidiously dangerous to public morality. Other and ordinary cruelties are mostly practised by men whose social status is low, in whom the brute nature predominates; nor is any attempt ever made publicly to justify such cruelties, whereas scientific cruelty is purposely veiled from public gaze, is practised by men whose brilliant intellectual gifts command popular admiration, and who take care to appeal to human selfishness by representing it as a necessary sacrifice for public good—the old, old fallacy! the end justifying the means!! that end being a most hypothetical physical benefit!—those means being cruelties which, in their very nature, must ultimately destroy the moral sense in those who practise them!

I.

But now to facts. The first organized agitation against vivisection began in 1868 at Florence, where Professor Schefft's atrocities had begun to excite public abhorrence. A memorial was

drawn up, headed by the signature of the celebrated Mrs. Somerville, and followed by those of most Italian and English notabilities then residing at Florence. The Professor treated this address (purposely worded with great moderation) with the greatest contempt and publicly in the pages of the *Nazione*, challenged one of the prime movers in the matter to prove the alleged cruelties. The challenge was accepted, the cruelties proven by the testimony of an eye-witness; but the same paper that inserted the challenge obstinately refused to insert the reply!! After this, perpetual agitation was kept up, till finally Professor Schefft was compelled to beat a retreat to Geneva in 1877. Up to the year 1873, whilst the atrocities of continental vivisectors were deplored in England, attention had not been drawn to matters nearer home until the publication of the Hand-book of the Physiological Laboratory excited the reprobation of all right-thinking people, and this was followed by the prosecution of some experimenters by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and the matter then began to be taken up warmly by many influential people. Above all, from the very beginning has one devoted woman been the foremost leader in the movement. I allude to Miss Frances Power Cobbe (whose name is known and loved, not only far and wide in England, but in India also). Her efforts from the first have been unremitting in the cause. Already commanding a high position as a writer on ethical and metaphysical subjects, and able at any time to make a large income by her pen, she has deliberately chosen to forsake more or less the pleasant paths of literature, and to devote all the energies of her large intellect and of her true heart to a cause which we, as Theosophists, must, above all others, hold sacred. Her exertions soon gathered round her a band of earnest workers, and besides the original Society to which she belongs, many others have been founded in London, in the Provinces, in Paris, in Italy, whilst the Scandinavian League against scientific cruelty is under the protection of H. R. H. Princess Eugenie of Sweden*, and the great German League under the admirable presidency of Baron Ernst Von Weber, a member of our Theosophical Society, whose most powerful pamphlet has done so much to hasten on the crusade against vivisection; and I am thankful to add, that our Trans-Atlantic cousins are more and more coming to the fore also in this sad cause. At the present moment the leading Society in London is under the presidency of the Lord Chief Justice of England, who has thrown the weight of his great name and influence into the scale of mercy and justice for the tortured brutes, and amongst its leading members are names of many of the highest standing in social, political and literary circles, yet the battle to be fought is a *hard* one, and will not be won yet; many causes contribute to this; above all, the appeal to the innate selfishness of the masses, so persistently made by the scientists, and that special phase of absolute subjection to scientific dogma, that possesses the minds of so many men at the present day. It is doubtless a good deal owing to this latter cause, as well as to decided double

* Deceased since the article was begun.

dealing on the part of the scientists themselves, that parliamentary legislation has in this matter proved more or less of a failure; nevertheless our confidence in the ultimate triumph of Right over Wrong remains unabated.

II.

Meantime the chorus of reciprocal admiration on the part of the scientists goes on as much as ever, as well as the exchange of congratulations as to some possible good in the near future—the result of vivisection. Let us, however, look a little more closely into these claims, and see whether the statement of our American advocate Dr. Laffington may not be true after all.

"Vivisection is at best prospecting in such barren regions, that if pain could be measured by money, no mining company in the world would sanction the outlay." To begin with the greatest of modern vivisectors, the late Claude Bernard; after a life passed in inflicting agonies on animals, which one would think even the mind of a vivisector could not conceive, actually acknowledged the extreme paucity of result of any sort by a few telling words that have again and again been repeated. "*Nos mains sont vides.*" I will now quote at some length from an admirable pamphlet recently published by Miss Cobbe, as it disposes in brief words of various other discoveries popularly ascribed to vivisection.

"I will not affirm that vivisectors have done nothing to improve the healing art. Many of our most able and competent authorities, nevertheless, assure us that such is the case. Sir William Fergusson told the Royal Commission on vivisection, 'I am not aware of any experiment on the lower animals having led to the mitigation of pain or to improvement as regards surgical details. I have thought over it again and again, and have not been able to come to the conclusion that there is any single operation which has been initiated by the performance of anything like it on the lower animals.' Sir Charles Bell has also said, 'Vivisection has never been the means of discovery, and the history of what has been attempted of late years will prove that the opening of living animals has done more to perpetuate error than to enforce the just views taken from anatomy and the natural sciences.' The discovery by Harvey of the circulation of the blood has been proved (in an able article by Dr. Bridges in the *Fortnightly Review*) to have been made *antecedent to his vivisections,* which only exhibited the fact to sceptical spectators. A great deal has been said of the supposed discovery by Hunter, by means of experiments on the arteries of dogs, with reference to the treatment of aneurism, and Professor Turner brought them forward before the Royal Commission as especially proving the use of vivisection. Nevertheless Sir James Paget in his Hunterian oration on the 13th February 1879 remarked, 'No one seems to have known better than he (Hunter) the danger of reasoning from physiology into practical surgery. Hunter's great achievement in surgery, the invention of the operation for the cure of aneurism, was no laborious result of physiological induction. It was a plain result of facts collected in the wards and in the dead house.' The greatest of French surgeons, M. Nélaton, denounced as false and delusive all systems based on experiments of the kind and not from observation of human patients. Sir James Simpson's great discovery of the use of chloroform was due to experiments not on animals but on himself and his assistants. As regards the supposed discoveries of Dr. Ferriar respecting the brain, Dr. Althaus tells us they are discredited by the greatest physiologists of Germany, and that all that is solid in modern science on the subject of localization of power in the brain, has been contributed 'not by vivisection but by clinical observation and pathological anatomy.' With regard to Pasteur's vaunted method of cure of hydrophobia, it is already becoming so much discredited that little need be said about it, as many unprejudiced persons agree that it is better to aid nature in curing disease than to turn all our attention to fighting the bacilli."

As to Galvani's discovery spoken of sometimes as obtained by torturing *live frogs,* the whole gist of the discovery lay in the possibility of stimulating the muscles of *dead* frogs, and the inscription that now hangs over his house in Bologna is "Dalla MORTE rane scoperse l'elletricita animale."

III.

And now there is a part of this subject which I feel compelled to enter on, great as is the pain which is caused to myself as I write, and which those who may read what is written will, I doubt not, experience also. But SOME of the ghastly details of the tortures inflicted on the poor victims must be told, for attempts are perpetually being made by the vivisectors themselves to prove that the cruelties of sport and of the shambles equal or exceed those of the laboratory. Now I do not think any very earnest person who regards intellectual and spiritual development as the true end of existence on this earth would, for a moment, affirm that the life of a man devoted to sport was compatible with that high ideal; nevertheless, from the mere point of view of the amount of cruelty inflicted, we must remember that many animals killed in the chase are dangerous to human life,—and that others have a fairer chance of life offered them in the open, than when trapped or otherwise destroyed. Even in the shambles, (the horrors of which are specially revolting to those of us who are vegetarians) the aim is to speedily destroy life, not to prolong it as much as possible in unutterable agonies,—the professed aim of many vivisections. Before mentioning a few of these hideous operations, it must be especially remembered that the use of chloroform or other *real* anæsthetics would nullify the ends to be obtained—evidence to this effect abounding in the pages of this revolting literature. *Mock* anæsthetics ARE however used—not for any benefit to the victims, but to enable the operator to shield himself from harm; morphia, for instance, during the application of which "sensibility persists," says Claude Bernard, "but at the same time morphia plunges the dog into a state of immobility which permits us to place it on an experimenting trough without tying or muzzling it." Curare *is* used too—these are its effects, described also by Claude Bernard—"In this motionless body,

behind that glazing eye, and with all the appearance of death, sensitiveness and intelligence persist in their entirety. The corpse before us hears and distinguishes all that is done around it." Again, the same writer tells us that it (curare) produces "*Les souffrances, les plus artroces que l'imagination de l'homme puisse concevoir.*"* Now it is with mock anæsthetics like these, with drugs that add to the victim's sufferings instead of diminishing them, that experiments like the following are performed—experiments which M. Cyon, a celebrated vivisector, tells us, "are to be approached *with joyful excitement*" for "he who shrinks from cutting into a living animal, he who approaches a vivisection as a disagreeable necessity, may be able to repeat one or two vivisections, but he will never be an artist in vivisection. The sensation of the physiologist, when, from a gruesome wound, full of blood and mangled tissue, he draws forth some delicate nerve cord, has *much in common with that of a sculptor.*"

Here are a few operations on (to begin with) our dear and faithful friend, the dog, a singular recompense to him truly, from us human beings, for whom *he* would so joyfully *die* to save *our* lives! "Sixteen dogs were baked to death in Claude Bernard's stove. These animals survived respectively eight minutes, ten minutes, twenty-four minutes, according to heat of stove, &c. It became impossible to count their pantings. At last they fall into convulsions and die, uttering a cry." Here is another performed by M. Bert (late *Minister of Education and Public Worship in France*). In this experiment a dog was first rendered helpless and incapable of any movement, even of breathing, which function was performed by a machine blowing through a hole in its windpipe. "All this time its intelligence, its sensitiveness and its will remained intact—a condition accompanied by the most atrocious sufferings that the imagination of man can conceive. In this condition the side of the face, the side of the neck, the side of the foreleg, were dissected out, in order to lay bare respectively the sciatic, the splanchaics, the median, the pneumogastric and sympathetic nerves, &c., &c. These were executed by electricity for ten consecutive hours, during which time the animal must have suffered unutterable torment, unrelieved even by a cry. The inquisitors then left for their homes, leaving the tortured victim alone with the clanking engine working upon it till death came in the silence of the night and set the sufferer free."

Pfluger speaks of "eighty dogs with their spinal nerves cut." "Fifty-one dogs had portions of their brains washed out of their heads." Most of these died of inflammation of the brain. Another experiment he mentions is one "on a delicately formed little bitch." "The left side of the brain was extracted, wire-pincers were applied to the hind feet. The creature whined, howled piteously, and foamed at the mouth. At last it became blind. The dissected brain resembled a lately hoed potato field." In Italy Professor Mantegazza (a member of the Senate) has devoted himself to solving the problem of the relative intensity of suffering. One

* "The most atrocious sufferings that the human imagination can conceive."

experiment was on a guinea pig, nursing its young, another on a dove enclosed in a horrible machine invented for the above-named purpose—tormented for two hours, then taken out, and after some respite put back for nearly two hours more with many nails in its feet and wings. Two white rats, after two hours in the machine, are larded with long thin nails in their feet. "They suffer horribly, and shut up in the machine for two hours more; they rush against each other, and not having the strength to bite, remain interlaced with mouths open screaming and groaning."

IV.

But I will not add more of these sickening details of the proceedings of this human fiend—would that I could give a better report of things in England: but, alas! the reports of experiments made under the present Parliamentary Act of restriction, show that English vivisectors are fast treading in the steps of their continental "confreres." Space, however, will not now allow me to do more than allude to Professor Ferrier's horrible experiments on monkeys, which were made the subject of a prosecution by the Victoria St. Society—anything more revolting it would be difficult to imagine.

As to the statistics of animal torture and death in this unhallowed quest after knowledge, it is calculated that in Vienna alone, the animals sacrificed in 1850-51-52 were 56,000;—dogs, 26,000; cats and rabbits, 25,000; horses and asses, 5,000. In England Dr. Rutherford sacrificed 62 dogs in three years; one year he himself confesses he used *forty*, and twenty-nine animals alone were sacrificed in one of Professor Ferrier's. There are at the present moment thirty-nine laboratories in France, thirty-two in England, twenty in Germany, thirty-two in Italy, and with those of other nations the sum total amounts to one hundred and forty-three laboratories in Europe, involving an amount of torture to sensitive, intelligent and, in many instances, most affectionate and faithful creatures, that any one with a heart at all would, one might suppose, hardly bear to contemplate.*

And now it will perhaps be asked, "What is the use of harrowing up our minds in India, by the recital of these horrors, since as yet no such cruelties are practised here or even likely to be?" Well, because, in the first place, "prevention is better than cure," and besides this, the fear of their introduction into India does not seem so very unreasonable after all. Only recently the Victoria St. Society presented a memorial to Lady Dufferin praying that vivisection should be prohibited by the original deeds of the Female Medical Colleges in India. The answer was that there was no reason at present to suppose that this practice would be allowed. I regret deeply to add, that Hindu students at (I think) the London University when asked to sign this memorial actually

* The truth of the above statements may be tested by the written avowals of the scientists. See "Hand-book of Physiological Laboratory." London, 1873. Béclard's "Traité Elementaire," Paris, 1880. Claude Bernard's "Physiologie Opérative." Cyon's "Methodic." Giessen. Mantegazza's "Del Dolore." Florence, 1880. Goltz's "Verrichtungen des Grosshirns," 1881; and many others.

refused to do so. But it depends very much on our brethren in India if this danger is to be averted or not. Some time ago in answer to a question from myself, I had an answer from a member of Parliament to the effect that the signatures of high class natives of India would have great weight in both Houses on this question. Restriction having failed, we are asking for *total abolition*. No Government could resist an overwhelming number of signatures. It is incalculable what good might be done in this way if, at each annual meeting of the branches of the Theosophical Society, the signatures of members were obtained to petition forms, which would be gladly forwarded from Head-quarters of the Victoria St. Society in London, and it would be a result deeply gratifying to the heart of many of us in England who believe that India is d estined to take the lead in the spiritual developments of the future, reviving the glories of ancient Aryavartha. Let her raise then her voice *now* against this unhallowed quest after knowledge purchased at the expense of all that is godlike in man! If we in the West realize this so acutely, what ought not the lawful inheritors of the wisdom of antiquity to feel in such a cause as this? They who penetrate into the mystery of re-birth, are cognizant of Karmic Law; and *know* "how material causes here are intensified as to their effects on other and higher planes." Nay—who perhaps, in this reckless glorification of the physical intellect at the expense of every higher consideration, even recognize some faint foreshadowing of that awful struggle between *its* promptings and man's higher self, which will have to be fought out at some far off period of the "History of the Race."

Brethren of the Great Aryan race! Shall this appeal be made in vain?—

ELIZABETH KNOWLES, F. T. S.

[Alienists recognize the love of inflicting pain as a distinct form of insanity. In almost all cases the patients, with the usual cunning of madness, invent some plausible excuse for the gratification of their abnormal craving for the spectacle of suffering. It is believed that many historical characters suffered from this form of insanity, and that the office of torturer, in countries where torture is inflicted, is generally filled by persons who volunteer for that position in order to thereby obtain legitimate gratification for their deplorable propensity. The malady is supposed to be contagious by means of what is now called "suggestion." There is no doubt but that most, if not all, of our modern vivisectionists suffer in a greater or less degree from this horrible form of insanity.—*Ed.*]

THE ADYAR LIBRARY.

THOUGH less than three years have passed since our Library was opened, it has acquired a collection of Oriental books of great value, both in the literary and the pecuniary sense. In the department of Buddhistic Literature it is richer than any Library in India, and probably equal to most in Western countries. From Mrs. Dias-Ilangakoon, F. T. S. of Matara, Ceylon, it has received the noble present of a complete set of the Pali version of the *Tripitikas*, engraved on palm-leaves and comprising 60 volumes with nearly 5,000 pages. Twelve stylus-writers were employed during two years in copying the volumes from the unique collection at Merissa. The wooden covers are painted in the Kandyan style of decoration, and to each top-cover are two large bosses in silver repoussée. The collection cost Mrs. Ilangakoon nearly Rs. 3,500. The Jodo sect of Japanese Buddhists presented Col. Olcott with a complete set of the Chinese version of the *Tripitikas*, in 418 volumes, on silk-paper, so that the means are here afforded for an exact comparison of the canons of the Southern and Northern Churches, or "Vehicles:" a comparison which Col. Olcott has perfected plans to have made in due time. Other Japanese and Chinese religious works, explanatory of the tenets of all the Japanese sects, were presented to him to the number of 1,057 volumes. And these are supplemented by 22 scroll paintings on silk and paper, illustrative of the same subjects. While his steamer was lying in Shang-Hai harbour, a splendid illustrated edition, in 4 vols. folio, of the *Lalita Vistara*, or Chinese Biography of Lord Buddha, was given him by a noted Chinese priest, who paid him a visit on board the vessel. Among the scroll pictures are two on silk that are said to be over 800 years old, and one a MS. said to be 350 years old, that is written in fine gold ink upon a scroll of some very smooth black paper, thirty-three feet in length, and mounted on a roller tipped with gold and crystal. There is also a large picture upon which, painted in vivid colors and drawn in the most careful detail, are 137 scenes in the life of the Founder of the Jodo sect. There is also an ancient biography of the Adept-Founder of the Yamabusi, or fraternity of phenomena-workers, and a scroll portrait of himself attended by some fire-elementals whom he seems to have subjugated to his trained will. Dr. Bigelow, of Tokio, kindly gives a photograph of a bronze group representing Kobo-dai-shi, the Adept-Founder of Shin-gon sect, attended by two little elementals who are serving him as messengers and domestics. In the Japanese collection there are small, beautifully carved images of Sakya Muni and Amitabha, a roll of gold brocade used for robes of ceremony, insignia of dignity for chief priests, views and plans of historic temples and gigantic images, pooja bells and incense-burners, and many other objects of interest. One of the noblest gifts of the latter class is a large brass lantern, of 4 ft. diameter and height, a replica of those which hang in the great Shin-Shu Temples at Kioto and Tokio. It now hangs in the centre of the main room of the Adyar Library. It is a present from the General Committee of all the sects which had charge of Col. Olcott's tour. From

the same donors came two 5-foot paper lanterns painted in the colors of the Buddhist flag. They also gave 700 small lanterns of the same pattern to our Ceylon Section for sale on behalf of the fund for local work.

The department of Sanskrit Literature and Ancient Philosophy in the Adyar Library is also very rich. From the Director's Report for the Quarter ending March 31st (see *Theosophist* for May 1889) it appears that the Library then contained of works in Sanskrit 1,245 volumes; in eight other Asiatic languages, 272; total, 1,517 volumes. Adding those of Ceylon (60) and Japan (1,469), there are now on the shelves of the Oriental Section 3,046 volumes—a very respectable beginning towards the great collection it is hoped to make it one of these days. If the members of our Society holding posts of influence under the Government of India felt a proper interest in the preservation of their ancestral literature, and a pride in having its intellectual treasures circulated throughout the world, the Adyar Library would be made before five years the most notable and best endowed and supported Oriental collection in the world. The ancient books are rotting by thousands in dead Brahmans' houses all over the country, and their gathering into the one model Aryan library of the world would cost but a little trouble and an insignificant expense. To give a slight idea of the value of the Sanskrit department already formed, I have made notes as to a few of the rarer works.

I.—*Vedic Literature.*

No. $\frac{15}{AI}$ (Palm leaf MS.) Padaratna or Ravanabhait, by Ravanacharya, with Commentary. The author of this work is not Ravana of Lanka, but one Ravanacharya who lived in Chitrakuta, and who is also supposed to have been the author of a Commentary on Rig Veda (as stated by Drs. Max Müller and Haug). He lived about the 1st century after Christ, and before Bhartrihari. This MS. contains, besides this work, several other works (numbering 15) on the Siksha of the Black Yajur Veda, such as Avarani Lakshana, Vilanghya Lakshana, &c., which are very rare in India. The MS. itself is old, having been written about 3 centuries ago, as is found when palæographically examined.

No. $\frac{53}{A_1}$ (Palm leaf MS.) The Sarvanukramani of K atyayana with the Bhashya of Shadguru Sishya; we have also, in our Library, the Sarvanukramani of Sounaka with the Bhashya of Shadguru Sishya, as well as the Paribhasha of Sounaka with the Commentary of Nagadeva.

These works are very valuable and useful to Vedic students for studying the *history* of the Hymns of the Rig Veda.

No. $\frac{62}{AI}$ (Palm leaf MS.) Apastamba Srouta Sutras with the Commentary of Acharyakapardi and Dhurtaswami, written about the 1st century A. C. The work is a rare one, and the MSS., about 200 years old. These remarks apply also to Apastamba Srouta Sutras with the Commentary of Talavrinta Nivasi, No. $\frac{67}{AI}$ (Palm leaf MS.)

II.—*Philosophy.*

No. $\frac{52}{CI}$ (Palm leaf MS.) Nyaya Sutra Vivarana. This is a Vritti on the Nyaya Sutras of Gautama, and a very ancient work, as would appear by the style and from the fact that Vatsyayana or Pakshila Swami quotes the Vivarana in his Nyaya Sutra Bhashya. If the date of Vatsyayana be assigned to about the 4th century B. C. from the fact that he was a minister of Chundragupta, then the conclusion arrived at regarding the date of the author of Nyaya Sutra Vivarana is about the 5th century B. C. The MSS. itself is about 3 centuries old.

No. $\frac{20}{C_1}$ (Paper MSS.) Kasakristna Mimamsa or Sankarsha Kanda with Commentary. Allusion to Kasakristna appear in the Mimamsa Sutras of Jaimini, and the Vedanta Sutras of Bhadarayana. The work is only rarely found in India. The Commentary is by Khandadeva.

No. $\frac{33}{34}$ (Palm leaf MSS.) Tatwasarayana (2 thick volumes) on a study of the work, and from its language and style, it appears to be a very old one. It is in three parts—Karma Kanda, Upasana Kanda, Gnyana Kanda. The author's name does not appear anywhere in the work.

III.—*Grammar.*

(Palm leaf MS.) No. $\frac{36\text{-}8}{EI}$. Vivarana Commentary on Kayyata by Annambhatta.

(Palm leaf MS.) Nos. $\frac{39\text{-}41}{EI}$ Bhashyapradipaspurthy, a Commentary on Kayyata* (above) by Sarveswara Somayaji.

All these works are older than Nagojibhatta's work, the MSS. themselves are more than 300 years old.

General Remarks.—We have also in the Library several *rare* and *old* MSS. on Vaidik Literature, Philosophy, Grammar and Lexicon, Astronomy and the Tantras, and General Literature. Among the old MSS. we may chiefly mention Sayanacharya's Bhashya on Black Yajur Veda. (4 centuries old), Sabaraswami's Bhashya on Mimamsa Sastras, and Sri-Ramanujachariar's Bhashya on Brahma Sutras (nearly 5 centuries old when palæographically examined); in addition to which we have printed copies of several of them.

For the information of any foreign colleague under whose eye this brief account may fall, I wish to say that the Adyar Library, such as it is, has been got together under the great difficulties of total lack of pecuniary endowment and public patronage. It has received from no Government as yet so much as a single book or one rupee. Friends of the Society have, upon the urgent appeal of the President and by his personal exertions, given the money for its admirably-planned building and its artistic interior decorations, but the indispensable fund for its up-keep is still to be collected. How very useful the Library may be made is evident from the plan sketched out in the Address of the President on the occasion of the opening ceremony, as well as from the Catechisms of Buddhism, Dwaita, and Visishtadvaita which have actually been published. In the Address in question Col. Olcott said:

"Our Society is an agency of peace and enlightenment, and in founding this Library it is but carrying out its policy of universal good-will. Our last thought is to

(* Kayyata is a commentary on Patanjali's Mahabhashya).

make it a literary godown, a food-bin for the nourishment of white ants, a forcing-bed for the spores of mildew and mould. We want, not so much number of books, as books of a useful sort for our purposes. We wish to make it a monument of ancestral learning, but of the kind that is of most practical use to the world. We do not desire to crowd our shelves with tons of profitless casuistical speculations, but to gather together the best religious, moral and philosophical teachings of the ancient sages. We aim to collect, also, whatever can be found in the literature of yore upon the laws of nature, the principles of science, the rules and processes of useful arts.

With the combined labour of Eastern and Western scholars, we hope to bring to light and publish much valuable knowledge now stored away in the ancient languages, or, if rendered into Asiatic vernaculars, still beyond the reach of the thousands of earnest students who are only familiar with the Greek and Latin classics and their European derivative tongues. There is a widespread conviction that many excellent secrets of chemistry, metallurgy, medicine, industrial arts, meteorology, agriculture, animal breeding and training, architecture, engineering, botany, mineralogy, astrology, etc., known to former generations, have been forgotten, but may be recovered from their literary remains. Some go so far as to affirm that the old sages had a comprehensive knowledge of the law of human development, based upon experimental research. I confess that I am one of such, and that I am more and more persuaded that the outcome of modern biological research will be the verification of the Secret, or Esoteric Philosophy."

Since the utterance of these words—December 1886—certain discoveries in science and resultant hypotheses, for example, in chemistry, astronomy and practical psychology, have almost reflected back upon them a prophetic character. One thing at any rate is most certain, viz., that the advancement of modern science is watched by the educated Hindu with no feeling of dread for the stability of his ancestral philosophies, but with the very opposite conviction. For he knows that the sages and Rishis taught on the basis of fact, and under the inspiration of a full knowledge of natural phenomena.

PANDIT N. BHASHYACHARYA,
Director of the Oriental Section in A. L.

INDIAN JUGGLERY.

THERE are certainly more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy,—only it requires an observant eye to realize them. The moderns are just beginning to understand that India has always been in the front rank in utilizing the occult powers in man to produce phenomena, which the narrower scope of modern science as yet fails to account for, and therefore carelessly and unscientifically attributes to trickery.

If the product of trickery, it must indeed be trickery of a superior order to make us disbelieve our eyes. The following incident, witnessed by me about ten years, is of this nature.

There is a wandering race in Bengal called the Badaya—or gypsies—who with bag and baggage travel from place to place and perform their so-called jugglery before admiring groups. Their origin is to me unknown. There is a special kind of this jugglery or sorcery, called Bhanumatir Baji, and of which the instance I am about to describe is an example.

A company of male and female performers, with the various boxes, paraphernalia and musical instruments, assembled one afternoon in a village in the District of Hooghly, where my father then resided, to give an exhibition of their powers.

While I was looking on, in broad daylight, a man was shut up in a box, which was carefully nailed and then bound round with cords. The principal performer recited some *mantrams*, and in a few minutes went to the box, opened it, and to our amazement, showed us that the man had disappeared. He said that he had gone up to the heavens " to fight Indra."

In a few moments he expressed anxiety at the man's continued absence in the aërial regions,—and said that he would go up to see what was the matter. A boy was called, who held upright a long bamboo, up which the man climbed to the top, whereupon we suddenly lost sight of him, and the boy laid the bamboo on the ground.

There then fell on the ground before us the different members of a human body, all bloody;—first one hand, then another, a foot, and so on until complete. The boy then elevated the bamboo, and the principal performer appearing on the top as suddenly as he had disappeared, came down, and seeming quite disconsolate, said that Indra had killed his friend before he could get there to save him. He then placed the mangled remains in the same box, closed it and tied it as before.

Our wonder and astonishment reached their climax when, a few minutes later, on the box being again opened, the man jumped out perfectly hearty and unhurt!

SIDDESHER MITTER.

[Ibn Batuto, as quoted by Colonel Yule in " The Book of Ser Marco Polo," Vol. 1, p. 308, saw the same performance at the Court of the Viceroy of Khansa: only in that case a " ball of tape" was used instead of a bamboo pole. The Anglo-Dutch traveller Edward Melton, travelling in Batavia in 1670, saw the same thing done by a gang of conjurors.

The Kazi Afkharuddin is reported as saying after the performance " Wallah! 't is my opinion there has been neither marring nor mending, neither going up nor coming down; 't is all *hocus-pocus!*"

Undoubtedly it is, but such *hocus-pocus* is worthy the attention of the profoundest scientist, and reveals more of the psychological powers of the human mind than all the volumes now published of inane drivel that serve no other purpose than to keep away all practical investigation of the most important science open to man.

Any student totally ignorant of botany or geology, and who should go to the study of those sciences with a mind filled with absolutely incorrect pre-conceived opinions, which he would refuse to lay aside, would be hooted to scorn; and yet *precisely* this is done by the majority of smatterers who prate and dogmatize about a subject for the proper study of which an ordinary lifetime is all too short.

Time, however, is avenger as well as healer, and the absurd dogmatism of the nineteenth century sciolist will ere long be relegated to the limbo of obscurity from which a proper display of judgment would never have dragged it.]

WHAT IS "THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION?"

A PARAGRAPH in the letter of A BENGALEE, which appeared in our last issue, gives rise to reflection. After saying that he has made a study of comparative religion, and has found the same great truths at the bottom of them all, he adds; "I don't think that I could now advocate one religion to the exclusion of all others.....except, perhaps, as a matter of policy, thus sacrificing what I believe to be the truth to the weakness of others, less enlightened (as it seems to me) than I am;" the consequence being that our correspondent cannot now "find it in his heart to abuse the Christian religion,"—the immediate reason being that Christianity advances the idea of Universal Brotherhood more than other religions.

Now there is considerable truth in the view expressed by A BENGALEE, but, with all due deference to him, there is some error also,—and error of an insidious kind, for it is liable to get into the mind unchallenged, in the wake of the aforesaid truth.

In the table of "cross-questions and crooked answers" which passes in the world at present for religious discussion, every excuse must be made for any one who becomes a little confused between the different bearings of a religious subject. In the case before us, A BENGALEE can hardly be blamed for falling into an error which is common to born-and-bred Christians. That he does fall into such an error is evident, for he says that he could not find it in his heart to abuse Christianity "as most of his countrymen and co-religionists do;" and yet, although he does not define Christianity in set terms, he evidently understands by that name the underlying truths which are found in that religion as well as in all others; and Christianity in *that* sense of the term is precisely what his fellow countrymen do *not* abuse, for the simple reason that, with few exceptions, they know nothing about it, since it has never been presented to their notice.

It is extremely unlikely that A BENGALEE has made a study of the writings of "the Christian Fathers" or of modern ecclesiastics. It is not in their confused and fantastical tomes that "the truths common to all religions" are to be found. It is a study of the Biblical narrative itself, accompanied by that of the critical commentaries by modern writers on the life and teachings of Jesus, that leads to opinions and sentiments such as those expressed by A BENGALEE. The objectionable features of Christianity do not make themselves manifest to anyone who studies the religion of Jesus in that way, while the very points which the modern Christian Churches insist on the most do not come before such a student at all; or, if they do, they present themselves only as the deductions from certain passages, which he learns from the critics to regard as interpolations and forgeries.

A BENGALEE and those who are fighting the missionaries use the same word—"Christianity,"—but attribute to it totally different meanings. With the former it signifies the religion taught by Jesus, and which was in all probability the practical guide of his life; with the latter it means the religion built up by generations of priests out of all kinds of odds and ends from the lumber-room of worn-out faiths, and impudently fathered upon Jesus. Between these two—the religion of Jesus as critically deduced from the biblical account, and modern "Christianity"—there is a far wider difference than there exists between the pure and the popular forms of other religions; and for any one to say that one cannot find it in his heart to abuse the Christianity of the missionaries, because the religion of Jesus was based upon universal truths, is like declaring that one ought not to blame the degenerate descendant of a great or good man for his crimes and follies, because the history of the founder of the family show him to have been wise and virtuous.

If A BENGALEE were to present himself before a modern teacher of Christianity in India and ask for "instruction" in that faith, he would be told that there is "only one name under heaven by which men can be saved." If he asked how a "name" could save him; from what he would be saved; and so forth, he would be taught the basic doctrine of modern Christianity:—that those who did not believe in the "vicarious atonement" would go to everlasting hell. This damnable, mind-crushing doctrine is the life and soul of modern Christianity. Acceptance of it is incompatible with every idea of the justice and mercy of an Almighty power in the Universe; incompatible with the old-new idea of progressive development of the human ego; incompatible with self-respect, with self-control, and with self-guidance. It is a religious doctrine fit only for the trembling and the imbecile, and it reduces those who bring themselves to acknowledge and mentally realize it to the spiritual condition of slaves,—a condition in which tyrannical cruelty is the counterfoil to abject submissiveness. Of course the clergy teach much more than the dogmas that are distinctively "Christian." They have embroidered the golden rules of morality on the black ground of their materialistic conceptions of things spiritual, and would have the world believe not only that the device belongs thereto, but that it is only to be found thereon. It is this golden device that is common to all religions, but the difference between its display in Christianity and Brahminism or Buddhism is, that while it is woven into the latter as part of their very woof and web, it is artificially stitched into the black ground work of the former. There is a story told of a clergyman who was interrupted in a sermon by a stranger in the congregation who kept ejaculating: "That is from Porson;" "that is from Wilberforce," and so forth, mentioning at the end of each paragraph the classical preacher whose words the clergyman had appropriated. At last the occupant of the pulpit lost his patience, and pausing said, "I will have you put out, sir, if you interrupt me again;" whereon the stranger cried: "That's his own!!"—And so it is with Christianity. The part that is really good and valuable in it is common to all religions, because it springs from the religious element in human nature; the part that is arbitrary, irrational and offensive is its own.

After all A BENGALEE only anticipates public opinion by, perhaps, a quarter of a century when he takes the term "Christianity" to mean the valuable part of the religion that now goes by

that name; for that is the only part that can be attributed to its founder, and the idea is quickly spreading that those doctrines, such as vicarious atonement and everlasting hell, which have till lately been considered the very foundation of the Christian religion, are in reality no other than mere excrescences that have gradually formed upon it;—diseases of the tree of life caused by the *vermis ecclesiasticus*—which may be knocked off not only without danger to its health, but greatly to the benefit of its vitality and beauty.

Still a thing is what it is,—not what it will one day be; and Christianity, as it is understood in the world to-day, is not the harmless affair that, judging by his letter, A BENGALEE supposes it to be. The Christianity which is at present preached to the people of India is the outside husk of the most exoteric form of that religion. The cruel and bloody Jewish Jehova is only masked, not altered, by the illfitting robe of "loving mercy" in which Theologians have enveloped him;—that sheepskin is a fraud and a failure! The doctrines taught by Christian Clergymen concerning the nature of the Godhead, the destiny of the soul, and the purpose of existence, are incompatible alike with ancient philosophy and modern science, and imply, if they do not formally enunciate and advocate, an "arrest of development" in this world and the next. As to the Christianity of the Churches forming one of a fraternity of religions that might be expected to live together in unity, the idea is on the face of it an absurdity. *Voluntary* toleration of other faiths is impossible for Christianity as we know it to-day, for the simple reason that one of its fundamental doctrines is that *there is no salvation outside of its pale,* while of all the duties it inculcates, that most strongly insisted upon is the *saving of souls.* It is, then, clearly impossible that other religions should find any *modus vivandi* with Christianity, since the latter is pledged by its very constitution to undermine and destroy all others. It does not destroy them now by fire and sword, as in the "good old times" of the Church, but if the end be *death,* it is a mere matter of detail whether one gets his head cut off or is nailed up in a barrel of honey!

It therefore seems to us that there can be no valid comparison between the ideas of A BENGALEE, or the line of conduct recommended by him in regard to Christianity, and those respectively of Mr. R. Sivasankara Pandiya; for the former gentleman means by the term "Christianity" the religion of Jesus, and the latter understands the name as designating the theology of the Missionaries. The religion that is called Christian in the former sense may be treated by other religions as a friend and near relation; but Christianity in the latter sense is a deadly foe to every other faith, —a common enemy of them all. Therefore, in this instance, as is frequently the case, when we examine the real meaning of propositions that seem to be contradictory, both are found to be true in the sense they are intended. A BENGALEE is right in saying that he sees no reason to "advocate one religion more than another," or to abuse the "Christian religion," and Mr. R. Sivasankara Pandiya is right in attacking "Christianity." HERMAN.

PSYCHIC NOTES.

THE following is from "N. C." of the Aryan Miscellany Office, Elamanur:—

"Here is a truly wonderful case for the consideration of the medical fraternity. The daughter of a neighbour of mine, a Brahmin girl of 15, all on a sudden found a lock of her plaited hair drop to the ground about a week ago as if cut with a pair of scissors. The same thing has continued to occur these 6 or 7 days and in broad day-light, and at present there is little or no hair about the head of the unfortunate girl. This has caused no small amount of surprise in the neighbourhood. At night the girl is often heard to shriek out as if somebody pulls her by the hair or otherwise annoys her. The girl belongs to the Kanialar class of Brahmins,—a people noted in these parts for their knowledge and practice of sorcery. The witches are said to be mostly women—and especially widows. According to the popular account here the art is learned and practised with equal ease. The knowledge of a short mantra—a magical formula—at once makes a person both a master and a slave of some evil spirit—a master, as long as the person can point out victims to the spirit, and a slave, otherwise. The present case is supposed to be an instance of sorcery. I write from personal knowledge. Hair on the head being a natural ornament to a woman, and especially to a girl, the parents of the girl must be supposed to have been carefully watching over her, day and night, these six days, lest the loss should be occasioned by malice.

"Belief in sorcery appears to have existed in all ages and countries, and we read that it 'still lingers even in civilized Britain.' People have ceased to believe in the mystery of a number of phenomena since they were traced to physical laws, and as long as medical men cannot give a rational explanation of events of a mysterious character, so long the public should be excused if they, in their ignorance, attribute such events to sorcery; and the natural result is that many innocent persons are suspected of sorcery by their ignorant neighbours and killed or otherwise cruelly treated, and the latter, again, are brought under the clutches of the law and punished for what they do in their ignorance, often much against their own inclinations. The guilt of all such human suffering must be laid at the door of medical men who will not enlighten their ignorant fellow men on the subject. Here is an instance of the kind.

"In the wild tract, in the extreme south-west of Udaipur, in 1871, the headman of a Bhil village was taken ill, and one Lemba Bhaguri, a bhopa or witch finder, was employed to discover the witch who had caused his sickness, and he declared a woman named Deeta as the witch. What happened then may best be told in Deeta's own words in her evidence before the Political Assistant at Kotra.

"'Seven Bhils of Jhanjur came to my house and told me I was a witch. They seized me saying, 'Come and undergo an ordeal.' I agreed and went with them. They put me to the test of taking

out a rupee from heated oil. I twice took out the rupee from the burning oil without injury to myself, and was innocent. They allowed me to go home. A month after this, they came to my house, seized me and said they would put me to the water test. I refused. They took me to a tamarind tree, applied a bandage of red chillies over my eyes, tied me to a rope head downwards from the tree, and began to swing me backwards and forwards, for four hours. Then, thinking me dead, they undid the ropes and left me there. Budda Paigee, who belongs to my father's village, took me to his house and attended to my wounds. I recovered.' The Political Assistant sentenced Lemba to 5 years' imprisonment in Ajmir Jail. The punishment of the villagers who had swung the woman had been committed by the Durbar to a neighbouring chieftain, and he executed it in such a barbarous manner as to call for severe animadversion on the part of the British political officers.

I wish to know whether there is such a thing as sorcery, and whether you can give a theosophical explanation, or your medical readers a physiological explanation of the present affair."

With regard to this young lady's hair; and supposing that N. C. is right in saying that there is no trick or deceit in the matter, the phenomenon belongs to a class of which there are many examples on record. That the inhabitants of Kama Loka, or some of them, have the power of doing ill natured things of this kind, has long been acknowledged in the East, and is not now seriously denied in the West, at least by believers in the phenomena of modern Spiritualism. Who this mischievous spirit is, whether he is some one still in the flesh, or is a true "bhoot" it is impossible to say, as equally is his motive. It is precisely to find all that out that recourse is generally had to persons who profess to be able to summon spirits and make them talk. One thing, however, is pretty certain, namely, that medical men could give no information or assistance in the matter, at least not those who have been educated in Western medical wisdom. The medical fraternity present in psychical matters the same characteristics that the clergy present in the region of the spiritual,—almost total ignorance and overweening pretensions to be able to lay down the law. It is very probable that a jury of coach builders, or bankers, or a jury composed of the first set of men one met in the street, would give a more rational and less prejudiced opinion concerning such matters as this mysterious hair-cutting than a jury of doctors. All that the *Theosophist*, however, can say about it is that in the West the girl would be termed a *medium*, and be said to be subject to the pranks of an "undeveloped spirit." Here it would probably be called a case of sorcery, or of persecution by bhoots.

The Secretary of the Berhampore Branch, Mr. K. P. Mukherji, writes as follows:—

The following was related to me by Pundit K. Bhuttucharya of Nuddea, a gentleman well versed in horary astrology:—

"I was, a few years back, travelling in a certain district in Bengal, and had formed the acquaintance of a Babu, the Deputy Magistrate of the place. One day we were sitting together, and

the conversation turned upon ghosts; when he said that he had hitherto been a disbeliever in such things, but was lately forced to believe, being an eye-witness. I thought he was in jest, and answered in the same strain; he replied that he would show me some phenomena on a certain day.

"The day was fixed, and an Ajah living in the neighbouring village was sent for; he sent word that he would be unable to attend, but would send a ghost on that particular day.

"There was a beautiful tree in the compound of the Deputy Magistrate; it stood alone and was kept clear of undergrowth. On that particular day the tree began to move suddenly from one side to the other, the upper branches touching the ground every time either way. There was no wind, and as we were sitting just in front of the tree in broad day-light, any trick could easily be detected. Seeing the tree move in this way, the Deputy Magistrate exclaimed: 'Are you come Babaji?' 'Yes,' replied a deep, sonorous voice. 'Why am I called, Sir?' 'My friend wishes to converse with you,' was the reply. I then asked the ghost how he felt; he said he felt a burning sensation all over his body, the pain of which was constant. I then asked who he was before his death, and how he became a Bhoot, thereupon he told me the following story:

"'I was a poor Brahmin who had collected some money by begging. One day in the district of Darjeeling I was attacked with cholera and was lying by the roadside in a lonely place. The Ajah, my keeper, was passing by, he observed my condition; he asked me what I would like to have most. I mentioned certain edibles; he procured them, and showing them to me, buried them at a certain distance in front of me, reciting some mantras. I longed for those things, but could not get at them; after a short time I died. I cannot say how long afterwards I found myself a Bhoot, a slave to the commands of the Ajah, whom I am forced to obey by the powers of his mantras. Gentlemen, take pity on my condition and free me.'"

The movement of the tree in broad day-light is very curious. Phenomena of somewhat similar character are said to occur in the presence of some mediums—with the late D. D. Hume, for instance. The voice from the tree, however, and the strange story it related, would not be easily paralleled in Western experiences. The placing of food near dying persons or animals in order to *fix* their "Spirit" to the earth is one of the old practices of black magic. It is done to animals, who, when starved to death in that manner, are supposed to haunt their own skulls; and it is related that when the English once captured a Chinese town, from which the inhabitants had fled on their approach, a man was found buried up to the neck in the ground, with a number of dishes of food and vessels of water placed all round him out of his reach. He was nearly dead of starvation; but recovered, and the reason assigned for this treatment was the desire to turn him into a serviceable bhoot.

A. K.

Reviews.

AMONG THE ADEPTS.*

MADAME BLAVATSKY ON THE "SECRET DOCTRINE."

(*From the Pall Mall Gazette.*)

It would be difficult to find a book presenting more difficulties to the "reviewer with a conscience" than these handsome volumes bearing the name of Mdme. Blavatsky as author—or, perhaps, it would be more accurate to say, as compiler and annotator. The subject-matter is so far away from the beaten paths of literature, science, and art; the point of view so removed from our Occidental fashion of envisaging the universe; the lore gathered and expounded so different from the science or the metaphysics of the West, that to ninety-nine out of every hundred readers—perhaps to nine hundred and ninety-nine among every thousand—the study of the book will begin in bewilderment and end in despair.†

Let it be said at once that the great majority of average easy-going folk will do well not to begin "The Secret Doctrine" at all. A certain mental position must be acquired ere any reading thereof can be aught save weariness and futility. The would-be reader must have an intense desire *to know*, and to know not merely the relations between phenomena but the causes of phenomena; he must be eagerly searching for that bridge between matter and thought, between the vibrating nerve-cell and percipiency, which the late Professor Clifford declared had never yet been thrown across the gulf that sunders them; he must be free from the preposterous conceit (that exists now as really for the psychical universe as it did in the days of Copernicus for the physical) that this world and its inhabitants are the only inhabited world and the only intelligent beings in the universe; he must recognize that there may be, and most probably are, myriads of existences invisible, inaudible, to us, because we have no senses capable of responding to the vibrations that they set up, and which are therefore non-existent to us, although in full activity, just as there are rays at either end of the solar spectrum quite as real at the visible rays although invisible to us. If only the nerve ends of our eyes and ears could respond to higher and lower rates of vibration, who can tell what new worlds, more and less "material" than our own, might not flash into our consciousness, what sights and sounds might not reach us from spheres interblended with our own? A deep-sea fish, aware that his comrades explode if they are dragged to the surface, and knowing nought of life-conditions other than his own, might, if he were a rash deep-sea fish, deny the possibility of other intelligent beings inhabiting the upper regions of the sea or the land invisible to him. And so we may, if we are rash, deny all lives save those led on our globe at the bottom of our air-ocean, and human deep-sea fishes had better leave Mdme. Blavatsky's volumes alone.

None the less is her book at once remarkable and interesting—remarkable for its wide range of curious and ancient lore, interesting for the light it throws on the religions of the world. For as she unrolls the "Secret Doctrine" we catch sight of familiar faces in the imagery that passes under our eyes, now Egyptian and now Jewish, now Persian and now Chinese, now Indian and now Babylonish, until slowly the feeling grows up that she is showing us the rock whence all these faiths were hewn, the complete cosmogony whereof these have presented disjointed fragments. Inevitably the question arises: "Have we here, from the Aryans who rocked the cradle of the world's civilization, the source of all the master-religions as well as of the master-races of the earth?"

* "The Secret Doctrine." By Madame Blavatsky, 2 vols. (Published by the Theosophical Publishing Company.)

† Yet, the Oriental mind trained through an hundred generations to grapple with these loftiest metaphysical problems, will find consolation and intellectual refreshment, where the mind of the new-begotten mind of the Occident falls into "bewilderment and despair." If it were a question of spinning jennys or steam-boilers the tables would be turned.—*Ed.*

The first volume of the "Secret Doctrine" is divided into three parts—an exposition of Cosmic Evolution, of the Evolution of Symbolism, and of the contrast between Science and the Secret Doctrine. Of these the first will most repel and the third will most attract. For the first is a metaphysical treatise wherein the Hindu brain, subtlest and most mystic of all mental organisms, expounds Being and the beginning of beings in a fashion that no Western intellect can rival. The causeless Cause, the rootless Root, whence spirit and matter alike differentiate, is the One Existence—hidden, absolute, eternal indistinguishable by us from non-existence in that it has no form that can enable us to cognise it. From this all that exists proceeds: in itself Be-ness—why not Existence?—then Becoming, and the Becoming alone can be intelligible to us. From this one primal element, whereof all phenomena are transmutations, and then a hierarchy of existences in linked order, the gradual evolution of a universe. In reading this "origin of things," as in reading all others, there is the constant feeling of unsatisfied desire for evidence, despite the sweep of conception and the coherency of the whole. Of course the claim set up is that this "Secret Doctrine" comes from those who know, know with scientific certainty, not with mere guess and groping, from the Arhats, the Wise Ones of the East, whose disciple Mdme. Blavatsky claims to be. But then we crave for some proof of the revealers. As regards the metaphysics, here again once more there is the feeling of the breakdown of language, the contradictions in which the mind is involved when it strives to grasp the ever elusive ultimates of being. However flexible and subtle in its shades of meaning Sanskrit may be, our Occidental tongues, at least, stumble into maddening confusion amid the shadowy forms and no forms of the Thing in itself, and when it comes to symbolizing existence as a boundless circle, using a word that implies limitation, and is empty of meaning without it, in connection with the absence of limitation, what can one do save admit that we have passed out of the region in which language is useful as conveying concepts, and that before the mystery of existence silence is more reverent than self-contradictory speech?

Very briefly and roughly put, the idea is that Be-ness evolves spirit and matter, spirit descending further and further into matter in search of experience not otherwise attainable, evolving all forms; it reaches the lowest point, commences its re-ascent, evolves through mineral, vegetable, animal, until it attains self-consciousness in man: then in man, with his sevenfold nature, it climbs upward, spiritualizing him as he evolves, until the grosser body and the animal passions are purged away, and, his higher principles united to Atma, the spark of the divine spirit within him, reach their goal, the absolute existence whence they originally came, carrying with them all the gains of their long pilgrimage. This process implies, of course, manifold re-incarnations for each human spirit as it climbs the many steps at whose summit alone is Rest. Only when a certain height is touched comes memory of the past, and then the purified spirit can gaze backwards over the stages of its ascent.

Passing over Part II. on Symbolism, we find Mdme. Blavatsky, in Part III., in full tilt against modern science, not as against its facts, but as against its more recondite theories. It is an easy task for her to show that great scientific thinkers are at issue with each other as to the constitution of the ether, the essence of "matter" and of "force," and she claims that the Occultist has the knowledge after which the scientist is only groping, and that at least, among the warring theories, Occultism may demand a hearing. Some of the theories now put forward, indeed, come very near to occult views, and make scientifically possible some of the startling manifestations of occult power. Newton's view, for instance, that "gravity must be caused by an agent acting constantly according to certain laws," is in unison with the Occultist's assertion that all the "forces" in nature are actions of Intelligences, working ceaselessly, though invisibly to us, in the universe; while much of the speculation of Butlerof and Crookes almost touches Occult teaching. The Akasa of the Occultist is, as it were, the "matter-force" after which Science is groping, the parent of all phenomena. Within our terrestrial sphere, on the plane of the universe accessible to our physical senses, Science is accurate as to vibrations and so on; where it fails, says the Occultist, is in supposing that these

are all, that on these lines of investigation can ever be discovered the nature, say, of light or colour; there are planes above ours on which matter exists in other modifications, in other conditions; on those must be sought the causes whereof science studies the effects, the true nature of our physical phenomena. The Atom, that strange conception of the physicist, elastic yet indivisible, is to the Occultist a soul, "a centre of potential activity," differentiated from the One Soul of the universe, "the first born of the ever-concealed Cause of all causes," building up the visible universe. Instead of matter "inert" and "inanimate," clashing through eternities, flinging up here a sun and there a world, and finally evolving thought, the Occultist sees Intelligence robing itself in matter, energizing, guiding, controlling, animating, all that is. The antithesis could not be sharper, and one or other solution of the problem of problems must be accepted by the philosopher. Which?

The second volume of Mdme. Blavatsky's work deals with man, the first part being occupied with his genesis, the second with the symbolism of his religions, the third with the contrast between the Occult and the scientific views of his evolution. Of these the first will be met with the most furious and contemptuous resistance, for briefly this is the theory; Man as he is now, with his sevenfold nature—physical body, vital principle, "astral body," animal soul, human or rational soul, human spirit, divine spirit—was not created off hand complete. The First Race was created, breathed out of their own substance, by the beings who built our world, and was spiritual, ethereal, sexless, and of slight intelligence; the Second Race was produced by gemmation from the First, more material than its progenitor and asexual; the Third Race was produced oviparously, and among these separation of the sexes appeared gradually, the earlier being androgynous, the later distinctly male and female; the intellectual development was still very low, for spirit had not yet become sufficiently clothed with matter for self-conscious thought. Of this race in its later stages were the dwellers in Atlantis and the Lemurians, among them the birth of religions, astronomical and sexual, and of these was born the Fourth Race, the giants, the "men of renown," in whom we touch the "purely human period." (A curious excursus on the "third eye," which occurs here, receives remarkable confirmation from some of the latest scientific speculations on the pineal gland.) Now begins civilization, and the building of great rock cities, and the physical and intellectual nature of man develops "at the cost of the psychic and the spiritual;" the huge statues and remains found in Easter Island, Bamian, and other spots, bear witness to the great size of their makers, as do the vast dwellings and the "enormous human bones" of Misorte. With the Fifth Race we pass into the domain of history, and to this the present races of men belong. Far away as, at first sight, all this seems from Occidental science, yet the careful reader will mark the curious analogies between this occult view of human evolution and the scientific view of the evolution of living things on our globe, an evolution still shown in broad outline in the individual development of each human being from ovum to man. Mdme. Blavatsky's views may not meet with acceptance, but they are supported by sufficient learning, acuteness and ability to enforce a respectful hearing. It is indeed the East which, through her, challenges the West, and the Orient need not be ashamed of its champion. We have here but given a few fragments of her lore, and injustice is necessarily done by such treatment to a coherent whole. The book deserves to be read: it deserves to be thought over; and none who believes in the progress of humanity has the right to turn away over-hastily from any contribution to knowledge, however new in its form, from any theory, however strange in its aspect. The wild dreams of one generation become the common places of a later one, and all who keep an open door to Truth will give scrutiny to any visitant, be the garb of Asia or of Europe, be the tongue of Paris or of Ind. If this counsel be of folly or of falsehood, it shall come to naught, but if of Truth ye cannot overthrow it. Passing strange is it. Of the truth in it our superficial examination is insufficient to decide.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

HERTHA, *or the Spiritual Side of the Woman Question.* By ELIZABETH HUGHES. Published by E. HUGHES. Salisbury Block, 247, South Spring Street. Los Angeles, Cal. 1889. 8vo. pp. 81.

Hertha is the ideal woman, and also the earth as symbolical of the female element in nature. The motto of this little book reveals its scope and purpose: "The ever-womanly leads us on." The writer is evidently a Theosophist, and writes eloquently of the great change for the better which will take place in the world when woman's place is recognized as side by side with man, in perfect equality.

A GUIDE TO ASTROLOGY. By T. S. NARAYANASWAMI IYER (Author of *Jyotisha Pragyanadipika.* Printed by ADDISON & Co., Mount Road, Madras, 1889. 8vo. pp. 150.

Those who are interested in this "science" will find a large amount of information in the book, the last 25 pages of which are taken up by a "Defence of Hindu Astrology." The author says that "the horoscope drawn up and offered you by the astrologer must be regarded by you as good advice for the guidance of your future conduct, for, as above affirmed, astrology is a science of tendencies, and unfavourable tendencies may be modified, if not entirely averted, by careful and cautious conduct." This is a more moderate view to take of Astrology than that generally prevalent in the world, where people take their notions of real *bonâ fide* astrology from the Arabian Nights and other works which go upon the fatalistic hypothesis, and in which the prominent feature of an Astrologer's prophecies is that these are absolutely certain to turn out true, no matter what pains are taken to avoid their fulfilment. The author tells us that "the great Gautama Sakya Muni was a profound astrologer; after him, among the Jains, the great Yavanar, Sakanar, and the sage Sainya Muni, are conspicuous names in the annals of Hindu Astrology. The great eighteen sages, commencing with Bramha, Surya, Vyasa, Vasishta, Parasara, &c., have, in a series of 1,450,000 Volumes, almost exhausted this science." If these sages had not written a British Museum Library full of books about the science, it would probably not be so "exhausted" as it is to-day. The eighteen sages must have been pretty well exhausted too, one would think, for allowing each sage 100 working years, every one of them must have composed a volume on astrology every 12 hours during the whole of that period, without stopping on Sundays either. In relating this miraculous production of treatises, the author evidently is merely repeating the legend, whose improbability in no way detracts from the merits of his work itself.

THE LIGHT OF EGYPT or *The Science of the Soul and the Stars.* By [here follows a sign that looks like a dilapidated Swastika]. Religio-Philosophical Publishing House. Chicago, 1889. 8vo., pp. 292.

This book professes to be an occult treatise, and occult it certainly is, for its meaning is exceedingly hidden. From the preface we learn that "for nearly twenty years the writer has been deeply engaged investigating the hidden realms of occult force," which investigations seem to have been excursions into "Kama Loka" of much the same order as those of Andrew Jackson Davis. "The chief reason urging to this step (the publication of the book) was the strenuous efforts now being systematically put forth to poison the budding spirituality of the Western mind, and to fasten upon its mediumistic mentality, the subtle, delusive dogmas of Karma and Reincarnation, as taught by the sacer-

dotalisms of the decaying Orient,"—so says the author. Here is a specimen of how the subject is handled. "A mediumistic nature will respond to error, because of the more potent thoughts of the writer, or, if we are over sensitive, we may be superficial enough to respond to an erroneous idea through pure sentiment. These means have been seized upon by the Inversive Brethren, to enable them to fasten this re-awakening of the karma and re-incarnation delusion upon the sensitive minds and mediumistic natures of the Western race. The most finely spun ideals of 'the higher life,' of 'Devachan,' 'the Masters,' and 'blissful Nirvana,' have been and are continuing to be presented by a host of sentimental, spiritually-sick, mystical writers to explain 'the glorious mysteries' of nature and 'the secret doctrine' of all religious philosophies, of which they themselves in real truth know very little, apart from the mediumistic ideas which are projected towards them by the Inversive Magic. The whole craze is merely a metaphysical delusion cast over their mentalities by means of a magnetic glamour." It would take a very large ocean of this kind of stuff to wash away the doctrines of Reincarnation and Karma! The work makes a very good counterfoil to Theosophic publications. It is decidedly amusing in parts, whereas in others it reads like the confused recollection of last night's dreams. Why it is called "The Light of Egypt" is a mystery which the author does not reveal. "The Light of Chicago" would seem to be a more appropriate title. Southern Illinois is nicknamed "Egypt"; or perhaps, there is a place called "Egypt" near Chicago, which is not marked on the map. Every American knows that Cairo at least is in the United States.

A GREAT BOOK.

THE "KUSHARON;" *a Japanese Treatise on the Doctrines of the Sapatta Sect.* By BASOHAN-DSU; *circa* 900 years after the Nirvana of Sakya Muni Buddha. New Edition, in 30 Vols., with Commentary, by Fujii-genju, Incumbent of Butsu-goje Temple (Shinshu Sect), at Hiroshima, Japan. Preface by H. S. OLCOTT, President of the Theosophical Society.

During his stay in Japan, Colonel Olcott was asked to write a preface for the new edition of this very important classical work. This preface gives an excellent idea of the scope and value of the book, which has never been translated into any European language. It runs as follows:—

PREFACE.

I gladly accept the invitation to say a few prefatory words in my private capacity of a Buddhist layman, to accompany this new edition of the highly important work which is said by the compiler to be the basis of Japanese Buddhism, or at least one of the foundation-stones. Whatever its merits, I am obliged to take the statement upon trust until some Sinalogue shall lay Western scholarship under obligations by rendering the work into some European language. The learned modern Editor tells me that the original Sutra was brought out, with a Commentary, "by the Brother of Asoka;" but since we know that Asoka reigned about two or three centuries after Buddha's Nirvana, and the period of this book is alleged to be six or seven centuries later, this is a mistake. Nor have I any means here at hand of identifying the "Sapatta" Sect, being far away from Ceylon, its learned monks, and their Pali manuscripts. It matters not, however: the important point is that the "Kusharon" is asserted to be an ancient Sutra of the Southern Buddhistic Canon, with a critical refutation of its claims to

be the primitive doctrine of the Founder of our religion; which refutation, or Commentary, is partly or wholly the basis of Japanese Buddhism. Such a work possesses inestimable value at this very time, when a keen interest begins to show itself throughout Christendom in the subject of the Buddhist religion, and when thousands of educated persons of Europe and America are hoping that it may take the place of Christianity. The learned world knows but very little as yet about the early history of Buddhism and of the development of its Canon. It is impossible to say how much that is in the possession of either the Northern or Southern Churches may be called orthodox, and how much forgery or inflations. The schism which splits the Order of Bhikkus into two hostile parties occurred in the second Council at Vaisali about a century or so after Buddha's Nirvana (Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 216), and it is possible that each placed peculiar value upon some parts of the Canon, and so preserved them with special care. By collecting the extant Scriptures of Tibet, China and Japan on the one side, and Ceylon, Burma and Siam on the other, the wealth and value of Buddhistic literature can only be discovered. Such comparison could best be made by convening a General Council of delegated bhikkus from the Buddhistic countries named, selected for their learning, their tolerance of mind, and their amiability of temper. Such a work as the present one is very valuable as a forerunner and preparative of that desirable event. Our century has seen so many remarkable international conventions and congresses, that I have strong hopes that the Council of Buddhistic monks I have in mind will be convened, either at Buddha Gaya or in Ceylon, the two Holy Lands of our religion. And I also hope that it may be attended by eminent Western Orientalists. Since I began, ten years ago, in connection with the Buddhist Section of the Theosophical Society to do some practical work for the revival and extension of pure, primitive Buddhism, I have been impressed with the paramount importance of bringing the several Buddhistic nations into close fraternal relations. Whether this will be practicable or not, time will show: at any rate, I invoke the help of all good Buddhists to bring it about. A first step in that direction is my present, first, visit to Japan, bearing brotherly overtures from the Sinhalese Buddhists through Hikkaduwe Sumangala, Principal of the Pali College, in Colombo, and High Priest of Sripada and Galle. My enthusiastically hospitable reception, and the unprecedentedly close union of all Japanese sects to further the object of my mission, give ground for hope that the past estrangement, for more than two thousand years, of the followers of Mahayana and Hinayana will cease, and the whole Buddhist Church put forth its strength to spread the religion of Sakya Buddha throughout the Western world. That this is what He would *insist* upon, were He here to speak, is most clear from reading the Sutras He has left for our guidance. We, laymen, have the power and the right to force the bhikkus to cease their petty quarrels and tell us which books of the two Canons are, and which are not, authentic. For my own part, I do not believe that either the Northern or Southern party have the complete Canon; and think the sooner the question is settled the better for the world. In the words of Hiouen Thsang, the learned Chinese pilgrim:—

"The schools of philosophy are always in conflict, and the noise of their passionate discussions rises like the waves of the sea."

We have had enough of this: let us now have peace and tolerance.

HIROSHIMA, JAPAN, 17*th May* 1889. } H. S. OLCOTT.

NOTES FROM THE ADYAR LIBRARY.

*Andra Saririka.**

A copy of the above work, a Telugu commentary on the Brahma Sutras of Badarayana, has been received in the Adyar Oriental Library. On carefully studying it, it appears that the subject is well treated, and the Sutras well explained according to the interpretation of Sri Sankaracharya; the material translation (Telugu) of the Sutras forming an important feature of the work. Sri Sankaracharya's interpretation of Upanishad vakyas (extracts from the Upanishads to explain the text of the Sutras) are very accurately translated. In this respect it can be said that it is superior to the English translation of the Brahma Sutras by the Rev. Dr. Bannerji. The author acknowledges having secured the assistance of a good Pandit, and the work itself shows that such was the case. The great want felt by the Theosophists and non-Theosophists in the Telugu districts, of really good Vedantic works in the Telugu language, is, in a great measure, supplied by the one under Review.

ORIENTAL LIBRARY, ADYAR, 17*th July* 1889. } PANDIT N. BHASHYA CHARYA.

SIDDANTHA-SARA.

It is very much to be desired that Babu Manilal Nabhubhai Dvivedi would translate into English and publish his new work entitled "Siddantha Sâra."†

The work, which is written in Guzerati, is "an outline of the history of thought in India, terminating with an attempt to point out the basis of universal religion."

The book treats of the Vedic period, the Brâhmavas, Aranyakas and Upanishads; Sutras and Smritis; the Darsanas, the Puranas, Tantras, and Idol-worship; the Samprodayas and Panthas; Karma, etc., and ends with chapters on Western science and thought.

A synopsis in English precedes the text, and the English preface explains the scope of the work. In it we read: "Ancient India is generally acknowledged, on all hands, to be the cradle of civilization and religion. The religion of ancient India has, however, nothing so peculiar in it as to render it special property. Moreover science and religion, so far as the ancient teaching is concerned, are convertible terms. The religion of ancient India is, therefore, the common property of mankind. The conclusions of modern science checked by the wisdom of antiquity appear untenable, and most disastrous in their ethical results. The stir of the present century, while it is the knell of all religions is, at the same time, the travail preceding a magnificent birth. The age of "idol"—atry is at an end. The Great Iconoclast is up with his hammer: It is time for the theologian to break open the shells of their belief; it is time for antiquarians to step over the boundary of myths, words and forms; it is time for scientists to break the charmed circle "this much and no more." A universal religion of truth, if it can be demonstrated, is the most craving necessity of the day.

We recommend the work to the attention of those who can read Guzerati.

---

*ANDHRA SARIRAKA: *written in accordance with the Brahma Sutras of Badarayana, the commentary of Sri Sankaracharya and that of Ramananda.* By RAI BAHADUR V. JAGANNATHA ROW PANTULU, assisted by BRAHMASRI MAHABHASHYAM VENKATRAMANA SASTRI GARU. Empress of India Press, Madras, 1889. Part I containing the 1st para. of the 1st Adhyaya.

† SIDDANTHA SARA, by MANILAL NABHUBHAI DVIVEDI, Nirnaya-Sagara Press, Bombay, 1889.

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. X. No. 120.—SEPTEMBER 1889.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[*Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.*]

CENTRES OF THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT.

MY old friend and colleague and a co-Founder of the Society, Mr. William Q. Judge, has sent me a long article taking exception to certain ideas embodied in two articles which appeared in the June *Theosophist*. They are respectively entitled "Applied Theosophy," and "The Situation." The criticism of Mr. Judge is marked by his usual force and directness, but at the same time contains passages of a far too personal character for me to admit them. To do so would be to depart from the policy of editorial dignity, which I have promised myself to follow out so long as I am the responsible Editor of this Magazine. I have taken no part, nor shall I, in the various unseemly quarrels, public and private, which the friction of 'strong personalities' among us has and probably always will engender. They are mostly unimportant, involving no great principle or vital issue, and therefore beneath the interest of those who have the high purposes and aims of the Society at heart. The "great healer"—Time—always sets things right. For none of my colleagues have I a stronger regard and friendship than for Mr. Judge, for no one of them has worked by my side during these past fourteen years with more singleness of purpose or loyalty to our ideal. Officially, I have ever supported him when he was in the right, and in the present instance prove my personal regard by omitting parts of his article which are irrelevant to the issue and injurious to his reputation for calmness and impartiality.

He quotes approvingly from the first of the two articles under notice the following passage:

"But it is only as a united whole that the Theosophical Society can ever be a power in the world for good, or a vehicle for the altruistic efforts of its

creative commons

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.

This is a human-readable summary of the Legal Code (the full license). Disclaimer