

LUCIFER

VOL. V. LONDON, OCTOBER 15TH, 1889. No. 26.

PHILOSOPHERS AND PHILOSOPHICULES.

“We shall in vain interpret their words by the notions of our philosophy and the doctrines in our schools.”

—LOCKE.

“Knowledge of the lowest kind is *un-unified* knowledge; Science is *partially unified* knowledge; Philosophy is *completely unified* knowledge.” — HERBERT SPENCER'S *First Principles*.

NEW accusations are brought by captious censors against our Society in general and Theosophy, especially. We will summarize them as we proceed along, and notice the “freshest” denunciation.

We are accused of being illogical in the “Constitution and Rules” of the Theosophical Society; and contradictory in the practical application thereof. The accusations are framed in this wise:—

In the published “Constitution and Rules” great stress is laid upon the absolutely non-sectarian character of the Society. It is constantly insisted upon that it has no creed, no philosophy, no religion, no dogmas, and even no special views of its own to advocate, still less to impose on its members. And yet—

“Why, bless us! is it not as undeniable a fact that certain very definite views of a philosophic and, strictly speaking, of a religious character are held by the Founders and most prominent members of the Society?”

“Verily so,” we answer. “But where is the alleged *contradiction* in this? Neither the Founders, nor the ‘most prominent members,’ nor yet the majority thereof, constitute *the* Society, but only a certain portion of it, which, moreover, having no creed as a body, yet allows its members to believe as and what they please.” In answer to this, we are told:—

“Very true; yet these doctrines are collectively called ‘Theosophy.’ What is your explanation of this?”

We reply:—“To call them so is a ‘collective’ mistake; one of those loose applications of terms to things that ought to be more carefully defined; and the neglect of members to do so is now bearing its fruits. In fact it is an oversight as harmful as that which followed the confusion of the two terms ‘buddhism’ and ‘bodhism,’ leading the Wisdom philosophy to be mistaken for the religion of Buddha.”

But it is still urged that when these doctrines are examined it becomes very clear that all the work which the Society as a body has done in the East and the West depended upon them. This is obviously true in the case of the doctrine of the underlying unity of all religions and the existence, as claimed by Theosophists, of a common source called the Wisdom-religion of the secret teaching, from which, according to the same claims, all existing forms of religion are directly or indirectly derived. Admitting this, we are pressed to explain, how can the T. S. as a body be said to have no special views or doctrines to inculcate, no creed and no dogmas, when these are “the back-bone of the Society, its very heart and soul”?

To this we can only answer that it is still another error. That these teachings are most undeniably the “back-bone” of the Theosophical Societies *in the West*, but not at all in the East, where such Branch Societies number almost five to one in the West. Were these special doctrines the “heart and soul” of the whole body, then Theosophy and its T. S. would have died out in India and Ceylon since 1885—and this is surely not the case. For, not only have they been virtually abandoned at Adyar since that year, as there was no one to teach them, but while some Brahmin Theosophists were very much opposed to that teaching being made public, others—the more orthodox—positively opposed them as being inimical to their exoteric systems.

These are self-evident facts. And yet if answered that it is not so; that the T. S. as a body teaches no special religion but tolerates and virtually accepts all religions by never interfering with, or even inquiring after the religious views of its members, our cavillers and even friendly opponents, do not feel satisfied. On the contrary: ten to one they will non-plus you with the following extraordinary objection:—

“How can this be, since belief in ‘Esoteric Buddhism’ is a *sine qua non* for acceptance as a Fellow of your Society?”

It is vain to protest any longer; useless, to assure our opponents that belief in *Buddhism*, whether esoteric or exoteric, is no more expected by, nor obligatory in, our Society than reverence for the monkey-god Hanuman, him of the singed tail, or belief in Mahomet and his canonized mare. It is unprofitable to try and explain that since there are in the T. S. as many Brahmins, Mussulmans, Parsis, Jews and Christians as there are Buddhists, and more, all cannot be expected to become

followers of Buddha, nor even of Buddhism, howsoever esoteric. Nor can they be made to realize that the Occult doctrines—a few fundamental teachings of which are broadly outlined in Mr. Sinnett's "Esoteric Buddhism"—are not the *whole* of Theosophy, nor even the whole of the secret doctrines of the East, but a very small portion of these: Occultism itself being but one of the Sciences of Theosophy, or the WISDOM-Religion, and by no means the whole of THEOSOPHY.

So firmly rooted seem these ideas, however, in the mind of the average Britisher, that it is like telling him that there are Russians who are neither Nihilists nor Panslavists, and that every Frenchman does not make his daily meal of frogs; he will simply refuse to believe you. Prejudice against Theosophy seems to have become part of the national feeling. For almost three years the writer of the present—helped in this by a host of Theosophists—has tried in vain to sweep away from the public brain some of the most fantastic cobwebs with which it is garnished; and now she is on the eve of giving up the attempt in despair! While half of the English people will persist in confusing Theosophy with "esoteric *bud-ism*," the remainder will keep on pronouncing the world-honoured title of Buddha as they do—*butter*.

It is they also who have started the proposition now generally adopted by the flippant press that "Theosophy is not a philosophy, but a religion," and "a new sect."

Theosophy is certainly not a philosophy, simply because it includes every philosophy as every science and religion. But before we prove it once more, it may be pertinent to ask how many of our critics are thoroughly posted about, say, even the true definition of the term coined by Pythagoras, that they should so flippantly deny it to a system of which they seem to know still less than they do about philosophy? Have they acquainted themselves with its best and latest definitions, or even with the views upon it, now regarded as antiquated, of Sir W. Hamilton? The answer would seem to be in the negative, since they fail to see that every such definition shows Theosophy to be the very synthesis of Philosophy in its widest abstract sense, as in its special qualifications. Let us try to give once more a clear and concise definition of Theosophy, and show it to be the very root and essence of all sciences and systems.

Theosophy is "divine" or "god-wisdom." Therefore, it must be the life-blood of that system (philosophy) which is defined as "the science of things divine and human and the causes in which they are contained" (*Sir W. Hamilton*), Theosophy alone possessing the keys to those "causes." Bearing in mind simply its most elementary division, we find that philosophy is the love of, and search after wisdom, "the knowledge of phenomena as explained by, and resolved into, causes and reasons, powers and laws." (*Encyclopaedia*.) When applied to god or gods, it became in every country *theology*; when to material nature, it was called *physics*

and *natural history*; concerned with man, it appeared as *anthropology* and *psychology*; and when raised to the higher regions it becomes known as *metaphysics*. Such is philosophy—"the science of effects by their causes"—the very spirit of the doctrine of *Karma*, the most important teaching under various names of every religious philosophy, and a theosophical tenet that belongs to no one religion but explains them all. Philosophy is also called "the science of things possible, inasmuch as they are possible." This applies directly to theosophical doctrines, inasmuch they reject *miracle*; but it can hardly apply to theology or any dogmatic religion, every one of which *enforces belief in things impossible*; nor to the modern philosophical systems of the materialists who reject even the "possible," whenever the latter contradicts their assertions.

Theosophy claims to explain and to reconcile religion with science. We find G. H. Lewes (*History of Philosophy*, vol I., Prolegomena, p. xviii.) stating that "Philosophy, detaching its widest conceptions from both (Theology and Science), furnishes a doctrine which contains an *explanation of the world and human destiny*." "The office of Philosophy is the systematisation of the conceptions furnished by Science. . . . Science furnishes the knowledge, and Philosophy the doctrine" (*loc. cit.*). The latter can become complete only on condition of having that "knowledge" and that "doctrine" passed through the sieve of Divine Wisdom, or Theosophy.

Ueberweg (*History of Philosophy*) defines Philosophy as "the Science of Principles," which, as all our members know, is the claim of Theosophy in its branch-sciences of Alchemy, Astrology, and the occult sciences generally.

Hegel regards it as "the contemplation of the self-development of the ABSOLUTE," or in other words as "the representation of the Idea" (*Darstellung der Idee*).

The whole of the Secret Doctrine—of which the work bearing that name is but an atom—is such a contemplation and record, as far as finite language and limited thought can record the processes of the infinite.

Thus it becomes evident that Theosophy cannot be a "religion," still less "a sect," but it is indeed the quintessence of the highest *philosophy* in all and every one of its aspects. Having shown that it falls under, and answers fully, every description of philosophy, we may add to the above a few more of Sir W. Hamilton's definitions, and prove our statement by showing the pursuit of the same in Theosophical literature. This is a task easy enough, indeed. For, does not "Theosophy" include "the science of things evidently deduced from first principles," as well as "the sciences of truths sensible and abstract"? Does it not preach "the applications of reason to its legitimate objects," and make it one of its "legitimate objects"—to inquire into "the science of the original form of the Ego; or mental self," as also to teach the secret of "the absolute indifference of the ideal and real"? All of

which proves that according to every definition—old or new—of philosophy, he who studies Theosophy, studies *the highest transcendental philosophy*.

We need not go out of our way to notice at any length such foolish statements about Theosophy and Theosophists as are found almost daily in the public press. Such definitions and epithets as “new fangled religion” and “ism,” “the system *invented* by the high priestess of Theosophy,” and other remarks as silly, may be left to their own fate. They have been and in most cases will be left unnoticed.

Our age is regarded as being pre-eminently critical: an age which analyses closely, and whose public refuses to accept anything offered for its consideration before it has fully scrutinized the subject. Such is the boast of our century; but such is not quite the opinion of the impartial observer. At all events it is an opinion highly exaggerated since this boasted analytical scrutiny is applied only to that which interferes in no way with national, social, or personal prejudices. On the other hand everything that is malevolent, destructive to reputation, wicked and slanderous, is received with open embrace, accepted joyfully, and made the subject of everlasting public gossip, without any scrutiny or the slightest hesitation, but verily on a blind faith of the most elastic kind. We challenge contradiction on this point. Neither unpopular characters nor their work are judged in our day on their intrinsic value, but merely on their author's personality and the prejudiced opinion thereon of the masses. In many journals no literary work of a Theosophist can ever hope to be reviewed on its own merits, apart from the gossip about its author. Such papers, oblivious of the rule first laid down by Aristotle, who says that criticism is “a standard of judging well,” refuse point blank to accept any Theosophical book apart from its writer. As a first result, the former is judged by the distorted reflection of the latter created by slander repeated in the daily papers. The personality of the writer hangs like a dark shadow between the opinion of the modern journalist and unvarnished truth; and as a final result there are few editors in all Europe and America who know anything of our Society's tenets.

How can then Theosophy or even the T.S. be correctly judged? It is nothing new to say that the true critic ought to know something at least of the subject he undertakes to analyze. Nor is it very risky to add that not one of our press Thersites knows in the remotest way what he is talking about—this, from the large fish to the smallest fry; * but whenever the word “Theosophy” is printed and catches the reader's eye, there it will be generally found preceded and followed by abusive

* From Jupiter Tonans of the *Saturday Review* down to the scurrilous editor of the *Mirror*. The first may be as claimed one of the greatest authorities living on *fencing*, and the other as great at “muscular” thought reading, yet both are equally ignorant of Theosophy and as blind to its real object and purposes as two owls are to day-light.

epithets and invective against the personalities of certain Theosophists. The modern editor of the Grundy pandering kind, is like Byron's hero, "*He knew not what to say, and so he swore*"—at that which passeth his comprehension. All such swearing is invariably based upon old gossip, and stale denunciations of those who stand in the moon-struck minds as the "inventors" of Theosophy. Had South Sea islanders a daily press of their own, they would be as sure to accuse the missionaries of having invented Christianity in order to bring to grief their native fetishism.

How long, O radiant gods of truth, how long shall this terrible mental cecity of the nineteenth century *Philosophists* last? How much longer are they to be told that Theosophy is no national property, no religion, but only the universal code of science and the most transcendental ethics that was ever known; that it lies at the root of every moral philosophy and religion; and that neither Theosophy *per se*, nor yet its humble unworthy vehicle, the Theosophical Society, has anything whatever to do with any personality or personalities! To identify it with these is to show oneself sadly defective in logic and even common sense. To reject the teaching and its philosophy under the pretext that its leaders, or rather one of its Founders, lies under various accusations (so far unproven) is silly, illogical and absurd. It is, in truth, as ridiculous as it would have been in the days of the Alexandrian school of Neo-Platonism, which was in its essence *Theosophy*, to reject its teachings, because it came to Plato from Socrates, and because the sage of Athens, besides his pug-nose and bald head, was accused of "blasphemy and of corrupting the youth."

Aye, kind and generous critics, who call yourselves Christians, and boast of the civilisation and progress of your age; you have only to be scratched skin deep to find in you the same cruel and prejudiced "barbarian" as of old. Were an opportunity offered you to sit in public and legal judgment on a Theosophist, who of you would rise in your nineteenth century of Christianity higher than one of the Athenian *dikastery* with its 500 jurors who condemned Socrates to death? Which of you would scorn to become a Meletus or an Anytus, and have Theosophy and all its adherents condemned on the evidence of false witness to a like ignominious death? The hatred manifested in your daily attacks upon the Theosophists is a warrant to us for this. Did Haywood have you in his mind's eye when he wrote of Society's censure:—

"O! that the too censorious world would learn
This wholesome rule, and with each other bear;
But man, as if a foe to his own species,
Takes pleasure to report his neighbour's faults,
Judging with rigour every small offence,
And prides himself in scandal."

Many optimistic writers would fain make of this mercantile century of

ours an age of philosophy and call it its *renaissance*. We fail to find outside of our Society any attempt at philosophical revival, unless the word "philosophy" is made to lose its original meaning. For wherever we turn we find a cold sneer at true philosophy. A sceptic can never aspire to that title. He who is capable of imagining the universe with its handmaiden Nature fortuitous, and hatched like the black hen of the fable, out of a self-created egg hanging in space, has neither the power of thinking nor the spiritual faculty of perceiving abstract truths; which power and faculty are the first requisites of a philosophical mind. We see the entire realm of modern Science honeycombed with such materialists, who yet claim to be regarded as philosophers. They either believe in naught as do the Secularists, or doubt according to the manner of the Agnostics. Remembering the two wise aphorisms by Bacon, the modern-day materialist is thus condemned out of the mouth of the Founder of his own inductive method, as contrasted with the deductive philosophy of Plato, accepted in Theosophy. For does not Bacon tell us that "Philosophy *when superficially studied* excites doubt; when thoroughly explored it dispels it;" and again, "a *little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism*; but depth of philosophy bringeth man's mind about to religion"?

The logical deduction of the above is, undeniably, that none of our present Darwinians and materialists and their admirers, our critics, could have studied philosophy otherwise than very "superficially." Hence while Theosophists have a legitimate right to the title of *philosophers*—true "lovers of Wisdom"—their critics and slanderers are at best PHILOSOPHICULES—the progeny of modern PHILOSOPHISM.



"FRATERNITAS."

DR. PLODA, F. T. S. of Locarno, Switzerland, the Secretary of the Society "Fraternitas" has asked us to mention that the shareholders will not be confined only to members of the Theosophical Society but that all in sympathy with the scheme are invited to join and subscribe.

The House is beautifully situated, with a fine view of the Lago Maggiore, and the valleys and mountains of Tessin; it will contain a valuable library; and will be open to shareholders the whole year; they having the right, in recognition of their share in the movement, to stay at the Retreat for as long as and whenever they choose. Their health and tastes will be studied in every possible way, vegetarian or mixed diets being given as required, and at the lowest possible terms.

HYPNOTISM.

FOR many years the scientific world in Germany and France has been stirred to its depths by the experiments in hypnotism made by some of the leading physicians in each country. Both from the philosophical and the practical sides it has been realised that the strange power which formed the subject of investigation was one of supreme importance in its bearing on the constitution and conduct of man. Many of the records of alleged feats by Middle Ages witches and wizards—regarded by the nineteenth century as the mere drivel of superstitious ignorance—paled their ineffectual fires before the wonders of the new experimenters, while the visions of the saints received startling pendants from the Salpêtrière. In Germany, the State, with characteristic promptitude, appears to have armed itself against the practical dangers which threaten to assail society, with a law which forbids unqualified persons to practice hypnotism. On the other hand, the Materialists, recognising by a true intuition the fatal character of the new departure for the Materialist philosophy, assailed the experimenters with quite theological virulence, scoffing at their experiments and decrying their motives. The famous Dr. Ludwig Büchner—whose services alike to medicine and to biology have been great—has vehemently attacked those of his compatriots who have entered the new path. In the last edition of his “Kraft und Stoff” he speaks of “the legerdemain and claptrap of magnetisers, clairvoyants, thaumaturgists, spiritualists, hypnotists, and other jugglers.”* Yet even he alludes to the hypnotic as a “highly interesting condition”† and suggests that “it is probable that hypnotism accounts for much that occurs at exhibitions of animal magnetism.” He remarks, indeed, that “the whole effect is brought about by strictly natural causes,” a statement with which Theosophists, at least, will not quarrel.

Hypnotism—derived from *ὑπνος* sleep—obtained its name from its resemblance to somnambulism; in most respects the hypnotic resembles the mesmeric or magnetic trance, but differs from it in this, that suggestions made to a person under hypnotism are carried out when the hypnotic state has apparently passed away, and not during the trance, as with ordinary mesmerism. Everyone has seen the mesmerised person obey the mesmeriser, accept his fictions as facts, and perform at his bidding acts of the most startling absurdity. But when the patient recovers his senses, the spell is broken. Not so with hypnotism. The patient opens his eyes, walks about, goes away, performs the ordinary duties of life, but obeys with undeviating regularity the impulse communicated by the hypnotiser, imagining all the time that he is acting as

* Force and Matter. English translation, p. 338.

† *Ibid* p. 346.

a free agent while he is the bond-slave of another's will. There can be little doubt, however, that all these phenomena are but phases of the same condition ; Hypnotism is a new name, not a new thing, its differentia being but extensions of the old "mesmerism."

From the time of Mesmer onwards attention has from time to time been directed to the curious phenomena obtained by mesmeric passes, fixity of gaze, etc., but MM. Binet and Féré, in their work on "*Le Magnétisme Animal*,"* give to Dr. James Braid, a Manchester surgeon, the credit of being "the initiator of the scientific study of animal magnetism" (p. 67). "Magnetism and hypnotism," say these authors, "are fundamentally synonymous terms, but the first connotes a certain number of complex and extraordinary phenomena, which have always compromised the cause of these fruitful studies. The term hypnotism is exclusively applied to a definite nervous state, observable under certain conditions, subject to general rules, produced by human and in no sense mysterious processes, and based on modifications of the functions of the patient's nervous system. Thus it appears that hypnotism has arisen from animal magnetism, just as the physico-medical sciences arose from the occult sciences of the Middle Ages." Braid found that many persons could hypnotise themselves by gazing fixedly at an object placed a little above the head in such a position that the eyes, when fixed on it, squinted—or, to put the matter in more dignified fashion, in such a position as induced a convergent and superior strabismus. The fixation of the attention was also necessary, and Braid considers that the insensibility of idiots to hypnotism arises from their incapacity for fixed attention (pp. 69, 70). At the Salpêtrière, Dr. Charcot and his pupils, dealing with hysterical patients,† found that catalepsy could be produced by sudden sounds or vivid light, and that the patient could be made to pass from the cataleptic to the somnambulic or lucid hypnotic condition by friction on the scalp, pressure on the eyeballs, and other methods. Speaking generally, Dr. Richer states that stimulants "which produce a sudden shock to the nervous system and cause a sleep whose abrupt commencement is accompanied by marked hysterical symptoms, such as twitching of the limbs, movements of swallowing, a little foam on the lips, pharyngeal murmur, etc., give rise to the nervous condition termed lethargy ; while those which gently impress the nervous system and cause none of the hysterical symptoms to which I have alluded, produce a sleep which comes on progressively and without shock, the characteristics of which, differing from those of lethargy, belong to the special nervous state known under the name of somnambulic" (p. 519), or hypnotic. The ticking of a watch, the steady gaze of the doctor, magnetic passes, a verbal command, etc., will throw many subjects into a hypnotic trance.

* Issued in an English Translation, under the title of "*Animal Magnetism*." The references in the text are to the English edition, as it is more accessible to English readers.

† "*Etudes cliniques sur la grande Hystérie*." Par le docteur Paul Richer.

The condition of the hypnotised person may vary from insensibility to acute sensitiveness. The body may be rendered insensible to pain, so that critical operations can be performed without the use of a material anæsthetic, and a number of such cases are on record. On the other hand, hypnotisation often produces extreme hyperæsthesia. Binet and Féré say : "In somnambulism [hypnotism] the senses are not merely awake, but quickened to an extraordinary degree. Subjects feel the cold produced by breathing from the mouth at the distance of several yards (Braid). Weber's compasses, applied to the skin, produce a two-fold sensation with a deviation of 3° , in regions where, during the waking state, it would be necessary to give the instrument a deviation of 18° (Berger). The activity of the sense of sight is sometimes so great that the range of sight may be doubled, as well as sharpness of vision. The sense of smell may be developed so that the subject is able to discover by its aid the fragments of a visiting-card which had been given to him to smell before it was torn up (Taguet). The hearing is so acute that a conversation carried on in the floor below may be overheard (Azam). These are interesting but isolated facts. We are still without any collective work on the subject, of which it would be easy to make a regular study, with the methods of investigation we have at our disposal. More careful observations of the state of the memory have been made, but this state has only been studied as it is found during somnambulism, when it generally displays the same hyper-excitability as the other organs of the senses" (Binet and Féré, pp. 134, 135).

Memory may, indeed, be rendered extraordinarily vivid under hypnotism. A poem read to a hypnotised person was repeated by her correctly; awake, she had forgotten it, but on being again hypnotised she repeated it. A patient recalled the exact *menu* of her dinner a week ago, though awake she could only remember those of a day or two. Another gave correctly and without hesitation the name of a doctor whom she had seen in childhood, although in her waking condition she, after some doubt, only recalled the fact that he had been a physician in a children's hospital.

Many of the purely physical results obtained are interesting in themselves, but, to the Theosophist, less suggestive than those which pass into the psychological realm. Contractures can be caused, and transferred from one side to the other, by a magnet. A limb can be rendered rigid, or can be paralyzed, and so on. An extremely curious experiment is the tracing some words on the arms of a hypnotised subject with a blunt probe; the doctor then "issued the following order: 'This afternoon at four o'clock, you will go to sleep, and blood will then issue from your arms, on the lines which I have now traced.' The subject fell asleep at the hour named, the letters then appeared on his left arm, marked in relief, and of a bright red colour which contrasted with the general paleness of the skin, and there were even minute drops of blood in several places. There was absolutely

nothing to be seen on the right and paralysed side [the patient was affected with hemiplegia and hemi-anæsthesia]. Mabile sub-sequently heard the same patient, in a spontaneous attack of hysteria, command his arm to bleed, and soon afterwards the cutaneous hæmorrhage just described was displayed. These strange phenomena recall, and also explain, the bleeding stigmata which have been repeatedly observed in the subjects of religious ecstasy, who have pictured to themselves the passion of Christ. Charcot and his pupils at the Salpêtrière have often produced the effects of burns upon the skin of hypnotized subjects by means of suggestion. The idea of the burn does not take effect immediately, but after the lapse of some hours" (Binet and Féré, pp. 198, 199). The bearing of these experiments on the supposed miraculous impression of the sacred stigmata is obvious, and offers one more of the many illustrations which shew that the best way to eradicate superstition is not to deny the phenomena on which it rests, many of which are real, but to explain them, and to prove that they can be produced by natural means.

Muscular contractions of the limbs produce corresponding changes in the face, normally expressive of the feelings suggested by the artificially produced attitude. Richer states: "A tragic attitude impresses sternness on the face, and the brows contract. On the other hand, if the two open hands are carried to the mouth, as in the act of blowing a kiss, a smile immediately appears on the lips. In this case the reaction of gesture on physiognomy is very remarkable and is produced with great exactitude. . . . One can thus infinitely vary the attitudes. Ecstasy, prayer, humility, sadness, defiance, anger, fear, can be represented. It is indeed startling to see how invariably a simple change in the position of the hands reacts on the features. If the open hand is stretched outwards, the facial expression is calm and benevolent, and changes to a smile if the arm is raised and the tips of the fingers brought to the mouth. But without altering the attitude of the arms, it suffices to close the subject's hands to see benevolence give place to severity, which soon becomes anger if the clenching of the fist is increased. This phenomenon may be unilateral. If the fist is clenched on one side and carried forward as in menace, the corresponding brow only is contracted. So also if only one open hand is brought to the mouth, the smile will only appear on the same side of the face. The two different attitudes may be simultaneously impressed on the two sides of the body, and each half of the face will reflect the corresponding expression" (p. 669).

It is possible that these muscular contractions may give rise to no corresponding emotions, although it seems *prima facie* probable that where the emotions constantly find expression in gestures, the gestures should, in their turn, arouse the emotions. Yet it may be that the link is merely between muscle and muscle, and that the continual co-ordination results in a purely automatic muscular action. We will therefore

pass to phenomena in which the psyche is involved, and see what strange tricks can be played with it by the experimenter in hypnotism.

The lower senses of touch and taste and smell can be played with at will. A hypnotised patient, told that a bird had placed itself on her knee, stroked and caressed it (Richer, p. 645). "If a hallucinatory object, such as a lamp-shade, is put into the subject's hands, and he is told to press it, he experiences a sensation of resistance, and is unable to bring his hands together" (Binet and Féré, p. 213). Colocynth placed on the tongue is not tasted, odours are not smelt (Richer, p. 660). In the automatic stage contact with familiar objects brings up the action constantly associated with them; given soap and water a patient will steadfastly wash her hands; given a match, she will strike it, but is unconscious of pain if the flame touches her; given a probing pin, she will plunge it into her hand; given a book, she will begin to read it fluently, and when the book is turned upside down, continue to read it aloud in the reversed position (Richer, pp. 693—696). This automatic stage can be made to pass into the somnambolic, where the will is dominated, but where intelligence survives.

But it is when we come to the more intellectual sense of vision that we meet the most surprising phenomena. On a piece of white paper a white card was placed, and an imaginary line was drawn round this card, with a blunt pointer, without touching the paper, the patient being told that the line was being drawn. When she awaked she was given the blank paper, and she saw on it the rectangle which had *not* been traced; asked to fold the paper along the lines she saw, she folded it exactly, so that it was just covered by the card when the latter was placed on it (Richer, p. 723). A patient was told that she saw a black circle; on waking she looked about, rubbed her eyes, and on being questioned complained that she saw a black circle in whichever direction she turned her eyes, and that it was extremely annoying (*Ibid*). A portrait was said to exist on a piece of blank cardboard; when the card was reversed, the imaginary portrait was reversed with it, and it disappeared when the other side of the cardboard was shewn, although the changes of position were made out of sight of the patient (Binet and Féré, p. 224). Such a portrait is visible to the patient through an opera-glass, and is magnified or diminished like a real object. Again, a patient Bar— was told that Dr. Charcot was present, and although he was not there, she addressed him; told to listen to the music, she heard an imaginary concert; informed that a number of children were present, she made the gestures of taking them in her arms and kissing them, described the colour of their hair and eyes; while another patient complained that their play irritated her, and that the noise they made was intolerable.

More complex visions can be made to pass before the eyes; suggest to a subject that paradise lies open before her, and she will see angels and saints, the virgin, and so on, the details of the vision varying with the richness of imagination of the patient. Sometimes it is the devil whose

presence is suggested, and the most vivid fear and anger are expressed. Surely we have here the key to the visions of ecstatic nuns: the fixed gaze at the crucifix with upward-turned eyes is the very position for self-hypnotisation: the matter of the visions is suggested by the pressure of the dominant idea; while the certitude of the patient as to the reality of the visions would be complete.

Yet more curious are the phenomena connected with rendering an object or a person invisible by suggestion. Ten similar cards were shewn to a hypnotised subject, and she was told that she could not see one of them. When she was awaked, that card remained invisible; and similar results were obtained with keys, thermometers, and other objects (Richer, p. 725). To another was said, "You will not see M. X.," and on waking, M. X. was invisible to her. "We once suggested to a hypnotic subject that she would cease to see F—— but would continue to hear his voice. On awaking, the subject heard the voice of an invisible person, and looked about the room to discover the cause of this singular phenomenon, asking us about it with some uneasiness. We said jestingly, 'F—— is dead, and it is his ghost which speaks to you.' The subject is intelligent and in her normal state she would probably have taken the jest at its true value; but she was dominated by the suggestion of anæsthesia, and readily accepted the explanation. When F—— spoke again he said that he had died the night before, and that his body had been taken to the post-mortem room. The subject clasped her hands with a sad expression, and asked when he was to be buried, as she wished to be present at the religious service. 'Poor young man!' she said; 'he was not a bad man.' F——, wishing to see how far her credulity would go, uttered groans and complained of the autopsy of his body which was going on. The scene then became tragic, for the emotion of the subject caused her to fall backwards in an incipient attack of hysteria, which we promptly arrested" (Binet and Féré, pp. 312, 313). The most suggestive experiment was one in which F—— was rendered invisible; the subject was then awakened, and on enquiring for F—— was told that he had left the room. She was then told that she might retire, and went towards the door, against which F—— had placed himself. Unable to see him she came in contact with him, and, on a second experiment to reach the door, became alarmed at the incomprehensible resistance and refused to again go near it. A hat was placed on his head, and "words cannot express the subject's surprise, since it appeared to her that the hat was suspended in the air. Her surprise was at its height when F—— took off the hat and saluted her with it several times; she saw the hat without any support, describing curves in the air." F—— then put on a cloak, and she saw the cloak moving "and assuming the form of a person. 'It is,' she said, 'like a hollow puppet.'" A number of other experiments were tried with her, leaving no doubt that she was completely unconscious of F——'s presence (Binet and Féré, pp. 306—308).

In another class of experiments, the subject's personality was changed.

“On one occasion we told X— that she had become M. F—, and after some resistance she accepted the suggestion. On awaking she was unable to see M. F— who was present ; she imitated his manner, and made the gesture of putting both her hands in the pockets of an imaginary hospital apron. From time to time she put her hand to her lips, as if to smooth her moustache, and looked about her with assurance. But she said nothing. We asked her whether she was acquainted with X—. She hesitated for a moment, and then replied, with a contemptuous shrug of the shoulders: ‘Oh yes, a hysterical patient. What do you think of her? She is not too wise’” (*Ibid*, pp. 215, 216). Another patient personated, in succession, a peasant woman, an actress, a general, an archbishop, a nun, speaking appropriately in each character (Richer, pp. 729, 730).

There is another class of phenomena which opens up serious dangers of a practical nature. A suggestion made to a hypnotised subject may be carried out when the subject is awake, either immediately, or days or months afterwards, and this obedience is blind to consequences and to every consideration of right and wrong. We have here a personality not a machine, but a personality which is the puppet of another's will. Dr. Richer remarks: “In the latter state [cataleptic] the subject is an automaton, without conscience or spontaneity, only moving under the influence of sensorial stimuli, coming from without. The stimulus alone matters, and not the person who supplies it. The personality of the operator is indifferent. All the responses are of the nature of reflex actions, without any participation of the intellectual activity other than such as may be necessary to their production. The somnambulist, on the other hand, is no longer a simple machine. He is the slave of the will of another, the veritable *subject* of the operator. His automatism consists in servitude and obedience. But a certain consciousness exists other than that of the waking state. A new personality is created, which may give rise to those strange phenomena described under the name of duplication of consciousness or of personality. There is really a somnambulic Ego, while there is no cataleptic Ego” (p. 789).

It is in this somnambulic stage that occur the phenomena now to be considered. A hypnotised subject is desired to steal some object ; sometimes she resists, but insistance generally overcomes this resistance ; only in a few cases has it been found impossible to conquer it. On awaking, the patient watches her opportunity and performs the theft. And here comes in the curious fact that the subject shews cunning and intelligence in carrying out the suggestion. One patient, told to steal the handkerchief of a certain person, presently feigned dizziness, and staggering against the person stole the handkerchief. In another case, the subject abruptly asked the owner of the handkerchief what he had in his hand, and stole it as he, in surprise, looked at his hand. Another, told to poison X— with a glass of water, offered it with the remark that it was a hot day. “If Z— is armed with a paper-knife and ordered to

kill X— she says, ‘Why should I do it? He has done me no harm.’ But if the experimenter insists, this slight scruple may be overcome, and she soon says: ‘If it must be done, I will do it.’ On awaking, she regards X— with a perfidious smile, looks about her and suddenly strikes him with the supposed dagger.” The patient will find reasons to excuse her act; one who had struck a man with a pasteboard knife under suggestion was asked why she had killed him. “She looked at him fixedly for a moment, and then replied with an expression of ferocity, ‘He was an old villain, and wished to insult me’” (Binet and Féré, pp. 286—291).

Without further accumulating these phenomena, let us consider whether any, and, if any, what explanation of them is possible.

And first, from the standpoint of materialism. It is possible to explain on a materialist hypothesis the muscular contractions and coordinations, and the automatic actions succeeding contact with familiar articles. But even in the automatic stage, explanation is lacking of the fluent reading of a reversed book by an uneducated person. It is, however, in the phenomena of memory, of vision of the non-existent, of inhibited vision, that materialist explanation seems to me to be impossible.

Memory is the faculty which receives the impress of our experiences, and preserves them; many of these impressions fade away, and we say we have forgotten. Yet it is clear that these impressions may be revived. They are therefore not destroyed, but they are so faint that they sink below the threshold of consciousness, and so no longer form part of its normal content. If thought be but a “mode of motion,” memory must be similarly regarded: but it is not possible to conceive that each impression of our past life, recorded in consciousness, is still vibrating in some group of brain cells, only so feebly that it does not rise over the threshold. For these same cells are continually being thrown into new groupings for new vibrations, and these cannot all co-exist, and the fainter ones be each capable of receiving fresh impulse which may so intensify their motion as to raise them again into consciousness. Now if these vibrations=memory, if we have only matter in motion, we know the laws of dynamics sufficiently well to say that if a body be set vibrating, and new forces be successively brought to act upon it and set up new vibrations, there will not be in that body the co-existence of each separate set of vibrations successively impressed upon it, but it will vibrate in a way differing from each single set, and compounded of all. So that memory, as a mode of motion, would not give us the record of the past, but would present us with a new story, the resultant of all those past vibrations, and this would be ever changing, as new impressions, causing new vibrations, come in to modify the resultant of the old. On the other hand let us suppose a conscious Ego, retaining knowledge of all its past experiences, but only able to impress such of them on the organ of consciousness as the laws of the material organism permit, the threshold of consciousness dividing what it can thus impress from what it cannot;

that threshold would vary with the material conditions of the moment, rising and falling with the state of the organism, and what we call memory would be the content of the material consciousness, bounded by that threshold at any given instant. Now under hypnotisation an extraordinary revival of the past occurs, and impressions long since faded come out clear-cut on the tablet of memory. Is it not a possible hypothesis that the process of hypnotisation causes a shifting of the threshold of consciousness, and so brings into sight what is always there but what is normally concealed? The existence of the Ego is posited by Theosophy, and it seems to me that the phenomena of hypnotism require it.

How can the materialist explain the vision of non-existent things? We know what are the mechanical conditions of vision in the animal body: the rays reflected from the object, the blows of the ethereal waves on the retina, the vibrating nerve-cells, the optic centre—the perception belongs to the world of mind. But in seeing the invisible we have the perception, with none of the steps that normally lead up to it; the suggestion of the hypnotiser awakens the perception, and the mind creates its own object of sense to respond to it. Again it must be the perceptive power, not the sense-channel, which is paralysed when objects and persons become invisible. Take the case of F—and his cloak; certain rays from the body of F— struck the retina of the patient, but no perception followed; for the cloak to be seen normally, a ray from it must traverse exactly the same line as those from his body, impinge on the same retinal cells, throw into vibration the same nervous cord, and so be perceived. If the inhibition were of the nerve-elements, the rays from the cloak would be stopped like those from the body round which it was wrapped. The inhibition was not of nerve but of mind; the operator had entered the subject-world of the patient and had laid his hand on the faculty, not on its instrument. If perception be only the result of the vibrating cells, how comes it that the cells may vibrate and the result be absent? That in two cases the vibration may be equally set up, the same cells be in motion, and yet that perception follows the one vibration and not the other? A still further complication arises when the cloak is seen though the body is interposed between it and the organ of vision. If perception result from cell-vibration, how can perception arise when no cell-vibration is set up?

But it seems that it is not only the perceptive faculty that the operator may bring under his control; he may lay hold of the will and compel the patient to acts, and so become the master of his personality. A terrible power, yet one that can no longer be regarded as doubtful, and which recalls the old-world stories of "possession," throwing on them a new and lurid light. How many of the tales of magical powers, which changed people's characters and drove them in obedience to the will of the "magician," are now explicable as hypnotic effects. How often may the "evil eye" have caused injury, by deliberate suggestion, as Charcot thus caused a burn. I have often thought that there must have

been some basis of fact underlying the widespread belief in witchcraft ; and the possession of hypnotising powers, aided by the exaggeration of fear and credulity, would amply suffice to account for it. The general belief in evil spirits would lead to the ascription of the results to their agency, and the very ignorance of the nature of their own power by the "magicians" would foster the notion of supernatural interference.

The study of hypnotism drives us, if we would remain within the realm of natural law, of causation, into the belief that the mind is not the mere outcome of physical motion, however closely the two may be here normally related. That while the brain is "the organ of mind" on this plane, it is literally the organ, and not the mind ; and that it is possible, so to speak, to get behind the organ and seize on the mind itself, dethroning the individuality and assuming a usurped control. On this hypothesis the results of the experiments become intelligible, and we can dimly trace the *modus operandi*.

Theosophists may well utilise this new departure in science to gain a hearing for their own luminous philosophy, for the Western World cannot turn a deaf ear to the testimony of its own experts, and the experiments of those very experts force on the mind the impossibility of thought and will being the mere result of molecular vibration. Once carry a thoughtful Materialist so far, and he will be bound to go farther, and thus the very triumph of Materialistic science shall lead to the downfall of its own philosophy.

ANNIE BESANT.



A KEY TO LIFE IN DEATH.

"Howbeit neither is the woman without the man nor the man without the woman, in the Lord," (i.e. in the Spirit). — *1. Corinth.* xi. 11.

TEN thousand years ago two forms
Had ever been ;
And yet but One existed then,
Fire-King unseen !

Ten thousand years ago two forms
Were born in earth
And Prince with Princess Royal were they—
E'en from their birth !

Ten thousand years ago the states,
Of mortal life,
Which Prince with Princess Royal upheld—
Were bloodshed, strife !

Ten thousand years ago two forms
In silence slept ;

A Bird of Paradise survived,
And mortals wept !

The knowledge of ten thousand years
Of earthly strife—
Was blest within one form in death—
One perfect life !

Ten thousand years have passed away,
And bloodshed, strife—
Will be destroyed in earth by One—
Fire-King of Life !

Ten thousand years will pass, two forms,
Within one soul,
A Prince with Princess Royal, will be
While ages roll !

W. C. ELDON SERGEANT.

THE WOMEN OF CEYLON

AS COMPARED WITH CHRISTIAN WOMEN.

IN the following eloquent strain speaks the report of the Wesleyan Mission in the Galle District for the year 1888 :

“ But the greatest force of Ceylonese Buddhism is not in the Bo-tree, the priesthood, the wealth of temple lands, or even in the sacred books. The dominant force for Buddhism in this island is WOMAN. Something to see, something to touch, something to worship ; these cravings of human kind are met in the Buddhistic worship of to-day ; the feminine instinct which brought that sprig of the sacred tree was unerring in its aim ; that appeal to the sight won the crowds for Songhamitto. Under the ban of the Brahmans, woman was again enslaved in India ; but in Lanka, the successors of the princess have never lost their liberty. Buddhist woman is not imprisoned in the zenana, or denied the right of free worship at the shrine. Unchecked she can climb to the peak where the footprint of BUDDHA is made out of holes in the rock, and fearlessly she can go on pilgrimages to the ancient temples of her faith. You see women in ‘ upasika ’ or devotee robes of white, on the *paya* or sacred days of Buddhism, leading trains of mothers and maidens to the *dumb idols* (?) * In the home she guards that altar where the image of the dead Teacher stands on its pedestal behind the veil. Woman, there, can take herself and give the family *mahasil*, the three great precepts : or *pansil*, the five binding vows : and *dasasil*, the ten embracing laws of Buddhism.”

Woman in Ceylon, like any other Buddhist woman, has always been free and even on a par with man, as above stated, in religious functions. It is then but fair to contrast her position with that of Christian woman during the early centuries and the Middle Ages. The Buddhist woman owes her position to Buddha’s noble and just law, and the Christian to her intolerant and despotic Church. Of this we are assured by Principal Donaldson, LL.D. in his article on the prevalent opinion that woman owes her present high position to Christianity, in the September *Contemporary Review*. As confessed by him, he “ used to believe in it,” but believes in it no longer however much he would like to, for the facts of history are against the claim ; and he proceeds to show that “ in the first three centuries I have not been able to see that Christianity had any favourable effect on the position of women, but, on the contrary, that it tended to lower their character and contract the range of their activity.”

Paul, he denounces as a “ woman hater.” Widows had very nearly as bad a position as the Hindu widows have now. In the Church women could be seen only in three capacities “ as martyrs, as widows and as deaconesses ”—but the office of the latter was simply nominal ! They had no spiritual functions, and while duly and legally ordained, they were precluded from performing any priestly office, such as we find entrusted to the Buddhist women. “ Let them be silent,” says Tertullian, “ and at home consult their own husbands.” †

* Does the adjective “ dumb ” mean to infer that as Christendom is in possession of several *speaking* “ idols ”—as we have seen in France and Italy—while Buddhisdom has none of this kind, therefore, is Christianity superior to Buddhism ? Pity the *Missionary Report* does not make it clear.—[ED.]

† Tertullian was only quoting Paul.—[ED.]

As to widows, who had as few spiritual functions as Deaconesses, they were forbidden to teach, and the Church said of them :

" Let the widow mind nothing but to pray for those that give and for the whole Church, and when she is asked anything by any one let her not easily answer, excepting questions concerning the faith and righteousness and hope in God. . . . But of the remaining doctrines let her not answer anything rashly, lest by saying anything unlearnedly she should make the word to be blasphemed." And the occupation of the widow is summed up in these words, " She is to sit at home, sing, pray, read, watch and fast, speak to God continually in songs and hymns."

A curious contrast is found, as pointed out to us by Dr. Donaldson and noticed by the reviewers, between the pagan Roman women of that day, and the Christian women. This is how he describes " the higher pagan ideal," the

" more remarkable because in Roman civilization, which Christianity sought to overthrow, women enjoyed great power and influence. Tradition was in favour of restriction, but by a concurrence of circumstances women had been liberated from the enslaving fetters of the old legal forms, and they enjoyed freedom of intercourse in society ; they walked and drove in the public thoroughfares with veils that did not conceal their faces, they dined in the company of men, they studied literature and philosophy, they took part in political movements, they were allowed to defend their own law cases if they liked, and they helped their husbands in the government of provinces and the writing of books. . . . The exclusion of women from every sacred function stands in striking contrast with heathen practice. In Rome the wife of the Pontifex Maximus took the lead in the worship of Bona Dea, and in the religious rites which specially concerned women. The most honoured priest attached to a particular God in Rome, the Flamen Dialis, must be married, and must resign his office when his wife died, for his wife was also a priestess, and his family were consecrated to the service of the God. And the vestal virgins received every mark of respect that could be bestowed on them, and the amplest liberty. The highest officials made way for them as they passed along the streets, they banqueted with the College of Pontifices, they viewed the games in the company of the Empress, and statues were erected in their honour."

" What the early Christians did," says Dr. Donaldson, " was to strike the male out of the definition of man and human being out of the definition of woman. Man was a human being made for the highest and noblest purposes ; woman was a female made to serve only one. She was on the earth to inflame the heart of man with every evil passion. She was a fire-ship continually striving to get alongside the male man-of-war to blow him into pieces. This is the way in which Tertullian addresses women : ' Do you not know that each one of you is an Eve ? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age : the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil's gateway ; you are the unsealer of that forbidden tree ; you are the first deserter of the divine law ; you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God's image, man. On account of your desert, that is, death, even the Son of God had to die.' And the gentle Clement of Alexandria hits her hard when he says : ' Nothing disgraceful is proper for man, who is endowed with reason ; much less for woman, to whom it brings shame even to reflect of what nature she is.' (It is curious to note that the doctrine of laying all the guilt on women, against which modern reformers protest, has thus Christian authority on its side.)

" Here, finally, put together from Dr. Donaldson's apostolic researches, is the whole duty of woman, according to the Fathers of the Church. Her first and great duty was to stay at home, and not let herself be seen anywhere. She is not to go to banquets. She is not to go to marriage feasts ; nor to frequent the theatre, nor public spectacles. Does she want exercise ? Clement of Alexandria prescribes for her : ' She is to exercise herself in spinning and weaving, and superintending the cooking, if necessary.' Any personal adornment is characteristic of ' women who have lost all shame.' The bearing of children was ' perilous to faith,' and it was a great spiritual gain to a man ' when he chanced to be deprived of his wife '—that is, by death. Meanwhile, during her life, her duty was plain. She was to stay at home and to be subservient to her husband in all things."—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

What a difference between this terrible and degrading position of the Christian wife, mother and daughter during the early days of Christianity and the Middle Ages, and the past and present position of the Buddhist woman at all times. Nor was the Brahminical, or Hindu woman, less free and honoured before the Mussulman invasion of India. For she was on a par with man in

Aryavarta before that calamity, even more free than the Ceylonese woman is now. But the position of the latter, and her great influence in her family are so well known to the Christian missionary and proselytizer that he seeks to turn this knowledge to advantage. Thus having described this enviable position, the *Report of the Wesleyan Mission* suddenly unveils its batteries by adding the following remarks :

“ Buddhism will never be vitally touched in Ceylon, until the female population is more universally Christianized and educated. Let a thousand girls' schools be opened in this land and efficiently maintained for one generation, and long before 1919 we should see our churches doubled, both in numbers and in strength. Have not the missionary bodies erred in this? It is the girl, the mother, and the wife, who cling to their religion, with all it can yield to elevate and transform: and when woman has done so much for the dead BUDDHA and the soulless creed, she could and would do more for the living Christ, the ever-present saviour, the real redeemer from death and sin.” (!)

This is a most sincere statement of their hopes and aspirations. No wonder it has provoked the wrath of the Colombo *Buddhist*, which we find, while quoting this testimonial to the devotion and piety of our Sinhalese sisters, giving voice to the sentiment of the whole Buddhist community of the Island, orthodox and theosophical. Saith our contemporary :—

Much of what is above stated by this missionary writer is most true, and the debt which Ceylon owes to her faithful Buddhist daughters cannot be overstated. Throughout a period when too many of her sons, bowed down by the succession of foreign yokes imposed upon them, had fallen away from their high calling and let the unequalled advantages which are their birthright slip through their fingers, the great majority of the women of Ceylon have shown their loyalty and devotion to our great Teacher by standing firmly round His banner, and holding the lamp of truth on high with unfaltering hand. That, in spite of the unscrupulous use made of its power and wealth by Christianity, they have been on the whole so successful in preventing the perversion of their sons to the degrading superstitions of our conquerors, shows how great is the power of woman, and how important the work undertaken by the Women's Educational Society. The object of this Society is to rescue the rising generation of the daughters of Ceylon from the wily snares of the cunning missionary, and to ensure that the mothers of the future shall be actuated not merely by traditional devotion, but by an intelligent faith in their religion, and when that object is fully achieved the honey-tongued deceivers, who try with such diabolical art to seduce the weak-minded into apostasy, may pack up their trunks and go back to try to Christianize and civilize their own land (which sadly needs their help by all accounts) for their occupation here will be gone for ever. Then when the shade of the upas-tree of Christianity with its terrible concomitants of slaughter and drunkenness, is removed from this fair island, we may hope for a brighter future of peace, happiness, and revived religion that shall rival the glories of our ancient history. May that day soon come !

The expressions of hostility towards the Protestant missionaries who are doing their work out there, while sounding bitter and intolerant to Western ears, may be excused on account of the long train of social calamities which have followed the successive evangelising labours of the Portuguese, Dutch and English conquerors of “Fair Lanka.” Not merely the disruption of families and the confiscation of property, but even bloodshed, rapine and persecution have entered into the long record of these efforts to extirpate the national religion and supplant it by exoteric Christianity. As the Waldenses and Albigenses had good reason to execrate the name of Roman Catholicism, so have the descendants of the sufferers from Christian persecution equal reason to couple mission work with what is most cruel and abhorrent.

As I am ending this interesting testimonial to women in general and those of Ceylon in particular, I find in our Colombo weekly *Supplement to the Sarasavisandaresa*—the *Buddhist*, the sad news of the death of one of the

best, noblest and kindest of all the ladies of Ceylon, a devoted Theosophist, and one who has been for almost half a century an ornament to her sex. I quote from the *BUDDHIST*, *verbatim*.

Just as we are going to press the news reaches us of the death of Mrs. Cecilia Dias Ilangakoon, F.T.S., after a long and severe illness. She will long be remembered as a generous and high-minded Buddhist, and most especially for two actions, the result of which will be seen not only in the present but in the future. We refer to her donation of the money to publish the first English and Sinhalese editions of Colonel Olcott's *Buddhist Catechism*, and to her magnificent present of a complete set of the sacred books of the Southern Church to the Adyar Oriental Library—this last a work which she has lived only just long enough to finish. May her rest be sweet, and her next birth a happy one!

AUM, so be it! is the heartfelt concurrence in this wish of a
EUROPEAN BUDDHIST.



KARMA.

Was there ever a past—is the present a present of dreams?
Will the Future become, like the past, but a something that seems?
Is Life but a Medley of things that are not—and yet are;
And the Near but the image Light casts from the infinite Far?

We drift on the main—we are flung on the surf-beaten shore;
To-day's sea is placid; to-morrow the breakers will roar.
Oh! vague and pathetic the wail of the living—the cry
Of the sorrowing ones who would fain turn their faces and die.

We dream and we do, and the wreck of our dreaming and doing
Points, ghastly and grim to our deeds of remorse and of rueing.
We dream and we do, and by doing and dreaming elated,
We reckon not the loss of the loser, the fate of the fated.

Yet half, in our night-time of woe, in our sunlight of bliss,
We fathom the fate that we tempt, and the fortune we miss.
When the curtain is drawn for a moment, the Truth to reveal,
And we stand face to face with the end that we thought to conceal.

Lo! the mask of our subterfuge hideth the face of a child;
The skin of the serpent is cast, and the trick that beguiled
Is discovered, and under the light of Truth's radiant Sun,
We know that the Past, and the Present, and Future are one.

FRANK H. NORTON.

The Case for Metempsychosis.

BY E. DOUGLAS FAWCETT.

Together with a survey of its bearing on the World-Problem.

RÉSUMÉ OF CONTENTS.

MODERN Science and modern thought—Mysticism redivivus, Comte notwithstanding—Inadequacy of Science to satisfy our spiritual needs, admitted by Lange and Büchner—H. Spencer's attempt to furnish the religion of the future—Defects of his system—E. von Hartmann and the "Philosophy of the Unconscious"—His advance on Spencer—Religion in the wider sense must deal with the problem of the human soul—The latter is the really important issue of to-day—Its treatment by theology and psychology—Evanescent character of Humanity in the mechanical systems of Büchner and Spencer—Causes of the influence of modern Pessimism—The dark side of Life—Schopenhauer on Life—Cui Bono?—The doctrine of Metempsychosis or re-Incarnation as the *deus ex machinâ* for modern thought—Our postulates—Our proofs:—

I. THE ARGUMENT FROM JUSTICE.—The inequalities and anomalies of Life—Kant, Mill, etc., thereon—the law of Karma as a solution—Illustrations—Mr. F. Peek on "Aeonian Metempsychosis" (Contemporary '78)—Primitive Christianity and the secret Mystery religion of the East—Harmony between the modern version of the "Free Will" doctrine and the law of Karma—Responsibility a "variable."

II. THE ARGUMENT FROM PRECOCITY.

III. THE ARGUMENT FROM HEREDITY AND VARIATION; Heredity and Metempsychosis; their reconciliation—Importance to Science of variations from normal laws—Case of discovery of Neptune—Evolutionists and the law of mental variation—Ribot and Galton on mental heredity—Mental variation in the Race—Why "History repeats itself"—W. E. Gladstone and Buckle on appearance of "right man at right time and place" in History.

IV. THE ARGUMENT FROM MEMORY. Why we cannot ordinarily recall memory of former lives—Cases, however, occur—A more gifted Humanity may in the future acquire the power—Suggestive lines of Tennyson.

V. THE ARGUMENT FROM THE CONSERVATION OF ENERGY. Application of the law to mental phenomena—We then have Karma.

VI. THE ARGUMENT FROM THE LIFE-CYCLE OF NATIONS AND SPECIES. The cyclic phases of national life—Romanes, Spencer—How explained—That the diversion of incarnating Egos from one stock to

another may cause a *Racial Sterility* proved by cases of Maories, Hawaiians, etc., etc.,—Animal species exhibit the same phenomenon—Evidence of Professors Owen and Page, and Dr. Mantell.

VII. ARGUMENT FROM MENTAL EVOLUTION. (*a*) in Man (*b*) in animals—The strata of Human Egos—Are Shakespeares and Mincopies on the same evolutionary level?—Mere cranial capacity no test of mental status; proof—Evidence shows that a large brain *per se* is relatively useless—Claim of the brutes to survive physical death discussed—Bishop Butler—Animal Egos evolute into human souls—Mr. N. Pearson in the *Nineteenth Century* on the origin of the animal Ego.

VIII. ARGUMENT OF DR. DU PREL. Summary of case presented in the well-known "Philosophy of Mysticism"—Plotinus, Ammonius Sakkas and Kant on the "Transcendental Subject"—The Higher Self and its relation to the normal "waking consciousness"—Enforced re-incarnation, Sexual love and Karma.

IX. The Argument from the "Dignity of Man." The answer to Kant. What is the goal of Evolution?—The harvest of the World-process—Systems of Renan and Hegel—The possible purpose of the Universe.

"Nature exists for the purposes of Soul."—PATANJALI.

THE conquest of old-world ideas by modern Science, momentous an achievement as it is justly held to be, has only served to throw the problem of the universe into yet deeper relief. The more fully the physical order of Nature has revealed itself to our gaze, the more vividly has the "Why and wherefore?" of conscious life forced itself upon our attention. We contemplate the stupendous drama of Evolution and the inevitable cry *Cui Bono?* rises unbidden to our lips. It is, indeed, only for a time amid the maelström of new physical discoveries that the thinker can lose sight of this great issue, compared with which all others sink into insignificance. Metaphysic is slain only to revive. Despite the assumption of Comte, the "metaphysical stage" not only thrives side by side with enfranchised empirical research, but has recently manifested unexpected activity in connection with that revival of Mysticism now colouring the best German thought. Man cannot live by bread alone. The greatest triumphs of Science—that is to say of the positive method—will never satisfy the ideal-seeking instinct. Prof. F. A. Lange in his monumental work, the "History of Materialism" fully conceded the point, and even the uncompromising author of "Force and Matter" has not hesitated to oppose the "moral feeling of the individual" to the cheerless outcome of his own physical researches.* Hence we find that advanced negationists are wont to relieve the bleakness of their systems by working up the veriest rags of religious philosophy. Witness Comte's *Vrai Grand Etre*. Witness the "Unknowable" which Mr. H. Spencer

* "Force and Matter," p. 320. 4th Eng. Ed. Asher & Co.

throws as a sop to the Cerberus of human emotion. Let us consider for a moment the alleged adequacy of the latter to satisfy our spiritual hunger.

Mr. Spencer yields to no one in his desire to keep alive the vestal fire of religion on the altar of the human heart. His aim has been to reconcile the negations of Science with the affirmations of Theology. Abjuring the narrower agnosticism of Stuart Mill and Dr. Huxley, he transcends phenomena so far as to posit an "Unknown and Unknowable Power" as the *fons et origo* of being. But the foundation is too frail to support the emotional superstructure. The vicegerent of this Unknown X is an iron mechanical causality which excludes all participation of mind—as an active factor—in the world-process. The Unknown X itself is an empty negation superadded to as rigidly materialistic an explanation of nature as that favoured by Dr. Büchner. Spencerianism therefore, is in the last degree unsatisfactory. Its Ultimate has no real point of contact with the soul, for the indeterminate consciousness of the Unknowable with which Mr. Spencer accredits us is only competent to testify to its "*Thatness*," never to its "*Whatness*." To enable any such Ultimate to serve as an object of religion as distinguished from one of mere speculative interest, the latter element must be at least symbolically specified.

The "Unconscious"—or as it ought properly to be termed Super-conscious Spirit—of E. von Hartmann does fulfil this condition. It represents the pure native essence of the same subjective reality which we experience as "self." This depersonalised concept of Deity constitutes the key to German and Oriental pantheism. It is, moreover, equally applicable to a system of Natural Dualism, and may thus be regarded as the apex of all religious thinking.

It would, however, be erroneous to suppose that the human mind could ever rest content with the contemplation of this Ideal, or even with the further consideration that in ultimate analysis all conscious units are but its manifestation. Granted that the soul is thus fundamentally rooted in Deity, the purpose of evolution, the travail of a universe in labour, the origin of evil, and many other kindred riddles of life, still remain over and clamour for some sort of solution. It is of scant interest to the individual what philosophers or theologians set up as the figurehead of a system or object of worship so long as the *crux* of his own place in the "eternal order of things" is shelved. Religion in the larger sense has a wider sphere than the investigation and recognition of "First Causes"—it has to deal with the problem of the human soul, and, if possible, to unravel the mystery environing its origin, evolution and destiny. Experience shows that it is the discussion of this subject alone which fires the interest of the modern indifferentist, weary alike of the reign of dogma and of the subtleties of the scientific taxinomial. Consequently it is this subject which deserves to evoke the concentrated effort of the

religious philosophy of the future. In the words of Dr. Carl du Prel, "It is not always the business of philosophy to split hairs and devise subtle problems. The weightiest problems are just those which are hidden by their everyday character." * Now in the category referred to the Soul question is indubitably comprised. Nevertheless, it is ignored to an extent which the cultured Oriental thinker would deem scandalous. It is true that Europe has its psychologists and its clerical authorities in plenty. But its psychology is either avowedly agnostic or confines itself to the analysis of familiar mental phenomena without seeking to raise the veil of Isis. The Church, questioned on the matter of pre-natal and post-mortem possibilities, answers a hundred inquiries in a hundred conflicting voices. Not only is it utterly ignorant in the matter, but its representatives have no longer any weight with the majority of men of letters.

Altogether the Western races appear to have speculated on these and kindred subjects to no more purpose than did the Palæolithic cave-men of 50,000 years ago. Notwithstanding this ominous fact, some further attempt must be made to penetrate the mystery, if our civilisation is to weather the rocks of Pessimism. Humanity, scourged with suffering and discontent is beginning to ask why it was called into being at all, and whether the drama of modern social evolution is a game that is really worth the candle. The prime *desideratum* of our time is a system of thought competent to read a meaning and a purpose into that struggle for existence, the intensity of which biology, sociology and the "testimony of the rocks" proclaim aloud to heaven. And this system must, at least in its general outlines, prove as comprehensible to the man of the market-place as to the man of the study. It must not, like Hegelianism, find a niche in the intellect of the thinker alone—it must stir the heart of the masses and furnish that great ideal in which Lange vaguely saw the means of inspiring society with the glow of a revived optimism. This ideal is, in the opinion of many distinguished thinkers in this country and in Germany, discoverable in the vista opened up by the doctrine of Metempsychosis or Re-incarnation. Speculations of this sort, so long tabooed by the empirical schools of psychology, have, since the publication of Carl du Prel's "Philosophy of Mysticism," acquired a wholly new importance. They have infused new life into the dry bones of metaphysic which is thus indirectly rendered attractive to the general reader, a gain of quite an unprecedented nature. It is to a survey of the case for Metempsychosis—the doctrine of the Soul-evolution through successive births—that I propose to devote the present paper.

Let me preface the argument by assuming with Kant the immortality of the soul as a "postulate of the practical reason," as an intuition superior to any determination of the intellect. Similarly I must take for granted a belief in what Mr. F. W. H. Myers has termed "the essential

* Preface "Philosophy of Mysticism," xxiii. Translated from the German by C. C. Massey.

spirituality of the universe" * ; the inquiry as to whether the attribute of personality is attachable to Deity need not, however, delay us. The agnostic will not, of course, concede even so much as is embraced in our second postulate. It may not, in view of this fact, be superfluous to refer thinkers of this school to the admirable defence of Spirit which characterises the works of Hartmann. That the root of things is spiritual is a thesis which he supports with overwhelming ability, impressing into his service the evidence of physiology and pathology as well as that of language, sociology, organic evolution and psychological science. The "Philosophy of the Unconscious" relies perhaps too exclusively on the argument from teleology. The strongest inferential proof of Deity appears rather to lie in the necessity of assuming a Spiritual Noumenon to account for the phenomenon "consciousness," † just as Mr. Spencer assumes an objective world to account for the phenomenon "matter." But to develop this line of thought would lead us too far astray.

The modern mechanical systems have no sympathy with the doctrine of a "future life." Why, then, this afterglow of Optimism which distinguishes the majority? For this spurious enthusiasm bears about the same relation to the enthusiasm of the true thinker as the phosphorescent gleam on a mouldering coffin does to the sunlight. The world is, indeed, a shambles, if the evils which buttress Evolution merely usher in consciousness at birth in order to blot it at death. Dr. Büchner's conception of Nature, as, in fact, that of Mr. Spencer, is only calculated to wrap the mind in a "horror of great darkness." Man is a cypher in the presence of this eternal mechanism, the Evolution phase of which hurries him into the martyrdom of being only to plunge him once again into nothingness.

" A moment's halt, a momentary taste
Of Being from the well within the Waste,
And then the ghostly caravan has reached
The Nothing it set out from."

Well may we ask : Of what avail is it to perpetuate, and labour for, a Humanity which possibly the next Glacial period, and at any rate a waning Sun, will sweep for ever into the eternal silence? Why store up knowledge for the mind—as raindrops for a pitcher only filled to be emptied—unless with Helvetius we cultivate intellect simply under the spur of *ennui*? Why hold to the "Ethics of Inwardness" instead of the "L'Art de Jouir" of Lamettrie? The Ego is, after all, only what

* This is, of course, the basic postulate of all attempts at framing a spiritual conception of the Universe. Space, however, precludes a present detailed examination of the intellectual foundations of the belief.

† In view of the novelty of this line of proof, I may, perhaps, be permitted to refer the reader to a series of articles recently contributed by me to the "National Reformer" on the "Illusion of Materialism." The excuse for this reference must be sought in the fact that the argument there developed may be termed a new discovery in philosophy.

M. Taine terms it, a rocket shooting up in the dark void and sputtering awhile before it goes out. It has no call to assist the work of a Nature which has treated it so scurvily. Rather will it incline out of intense sympathy for its fellow Egos to contribute its mite towards bringing conscious existence to a close.

We hear much of Pessimism just now. Nothing, however, is more inevitable than the prevalence of such a mode of thinking during transition periods such as the present. It is not merely that the error of regarding Life as an end in itself dominates the majority of men and women. This is, indeed, a *vera causa*. If we confine our purview to this narrow horizon, the world process certainly does appear to justify Hartmann's language when he dubs it—with certain reservations—an "unfathomable folly." So far, so good. But an additional factor serves to swell the effect thus produced. The Western nations are rapidly attaining that reflective stage of their sociological evolution, at which the misery of life becomes *continually present to thought* in addition to being the main constituent of emotional experience. Pleasures and pains are no longer experienced and then casually laid aside in the pigeon holes of Memory—they are coldly analysed and compared, greatly to the detriment of the former. It has been said that nothing is really evil; "Thinking makes it so." Even allowing for the marked indefiniteness of this statement, we must not fail to note the important fact which it throws into relief. It is the change from the "direct" to the "reflective" mode of thinking which is mainly responsible for the phenomenon of Socrates miserable, while the pig is happy. With the march of civilization and the disintegration of old faiths, an accentuation of the world problem is inevitable. Nature appears in her true light and subjects the most cherished illusions of optimism to revision. She is seen to furnish us, in Cardinal Newman's words, with "a vision to appal."

The average man of culture is becoming keenly alive to this riddle so mockingly propounded by the Sphynx of Life. He casts his eyes around him and usually finds Ahriman enthroned where Ormuzd ought to be. He discovers the hideous fact that:—

"the appetites, passions, and other propensities by which Nature works her human puppet are in keeping with the predatory scheme according to which she has constructed the animal kingdom. They make men predatory not only on other animals but on each other." *

He studies current sociology and derives from it the conviction that Evolution, the fruit of æons of agony and suffering, is conducting us into a *cul de sac*, that it is, in fact, a purposeless process with annihilation of conscious being as its final term. It accordingly appears to him that the preferable policy is to make the best of an unsatisfactory universe and live like the Positivist without care for the metaphysical morrow. Unfortunately to confine his attentions to concerns—im-

* *Westminster Review*, Feb. 1889. Article "We Fools of Nature."

mediate or remote—of “practical life” is only to court a sense of pessimistic *ennui*. It is assuredly not by renouncing the consolation of so-called “transcendentalism” that the millenium is to be inaugurated. There remain the grim demonstrations of Schopenhauer to be taken into account. The great German thinker faithfully echoed the teaching of the Buddha when he penned the following passage:—

“All willing arises from desire, that is from want, that is from suffering. Satisfaction makes an end of this but, nevertheless, for every wish that is gratified, there remain at least ten unfulfilled. . . . Lasting, unfading satisfaction no desired object of the will can afford; it is like the alms thrown to the beggar, which prolong his life for the day, only to postpone his suffering till the morrow . . . so long as we are the subject of will, lasting happiness or rest will never be our lot. Whether we pursue or flee, dread evil or strive after pleasure, it is essentially the same, the care for an ever onward urging will, it matters not what be its shape, ceaselessly moves and fills the consciousness. . . . Thus is the subject of the will bound eternally on the revolving wheel of Ixion, thus does it ceaselessly gather in the sieve of the Danaids, thus, like Tantalus is it ever languishing.” *

Schopenhauer even went so far as to regard pain alone as positive. In making this assertion he is unquestionably in error—a fact which his emendator and successor Hartmann has fully recognised. But his indictment as a whole is brilliant and incisive. It summarily disposes of the shallow optimism which reverences life as an enjoyable boon. Now this result the modernized doctrine of Metempsychosis accepts as final, though it claims at the same time to reconcile optimism and pessimism by merging them in a deeper synthesis. The nature of this reconciliation will subsequently be apparent.

Oriental philosophy is, of course, saturated with the idea of soul-evolution through successive rebirths. But of late years the Western world has begun to catch the infection of this hoary system. It will suffice to refer to the Theosophists, to M. Figuiet's popular “Day after Death,” to the *Secret Doctrine*, and the lucid exposition of “Esoteric Buddhism”; to the revival of Hermetism by the late Dr. Anna Kingsford and Mr. Maitland. Mr. Norman Pearson and Mr. Francis Peck have, also, defended the doctrine in the columns of the “Nineteenth Century” and “Contemporary Review” respectively. Last, but not least, one of the foremost thinkers in Germany, and the earnest disciple of Kant, Baron Carl du Prel, has, in his “Philosophy of Mysticism,” warmly espoused it. This important contribution to modern thought has created no small stir in the land of its birth, having received careful attention from von Hartmann, Dr. Schleiden and other distinguished writers. The gist of Dr. du Prel's contentions will be presented later on

* As translated by Mr. Belfort Bax in his “Handbook to the Hist. of Philosophy,” from the “World as Will and Idea.” (Vol. i. § 38.)

in the course of our inquiry. I now propose without further ado to furnish a general *précis* of the arguments tending to show that Metempsychosis, or as it usually termed "Re-incarnation," is a fact. The relation of this great truth to the world-problem will admit of subsequent treatment. It is proverbially unwise to build upon sand, and for this reason the actuality of the process itself must, if possible, be first proved up to the hilt. If Mystics prefer to rely on intuitions and occasional memories which, like the famous experience of Pythagoras, recall incidents of a former embodiment, the average sceptic most decidedly does not. In order to satisfy this individual, it will be necessary to shelve all subtle distinctions and envisage the main issue freed from the many accessories which cluster so thickly around it.

1. *The Argument from Justice.*

Having posited with Kant a World-Spirit, as a postulate of the moral intuition, we cannot refuse to regard this Ideal as the fountain head and archetype of those sublime moral qualities found in connection with a Buddha or Jesus. Among such attributes, if the postulate is in any sense valid, must be accounted that of absolute justice; a justice which allots to the individual Ego the most equitable treatment *consonant with the maintenance of the scheme of Evolution in its entirety*. Turning from this certitude of the inner consciousness to the world of everyday experience, we are confronted with a standing enigma.

Virtue in rags and vice in a palace is a familiar incident in the martyrdom of man. It puzzled Kant, it made Stuart Mill wonder at the decay of Manichæanism—a theory, however, which Mr. Samuel Laing has restated in a more scientific form in his "Modern Zoroastrian." Inequalities differentiate society in every direction—inequalities of rank, of wealth, of intellect, of health and of opportunity. Disease and mental distress appear to fasten arbitrarily upon their victims, like leeches on the first horse driven into the pond. Accidents occur in a seemingly haphazard fashion, so that the world-process at first sight suggests nothing more than the ruthless reign of a blind and indiscriminating Force. Nature distributes her billets of misery with the apparent indifference of a column of infantry firing into a crowd.

Is it possible to reconcile hard facts such as these with our original presupposition? Nothing is more simple when the hypothesis of Metempsychosis is introduced. When we recognize in the gradations of individual intellect, rank, opportunity, pleasure, pain, etc., the inevitable outcome of the "Karma" of a previous embodiment, the enigmas of Human Life soften their hard outlines. The hereditary cripple, the victim of agonizing disease, the passenger burnt to death in a wrecked train, are all, perhaps, reaping the harvest the seeds of which were sown in former lives. I say "perhaps," because the suffering of one incarnation does not necessarily imply a previous commission of corresponding "vices" in the dark mysterious past. Many cases must occur where

unmerited pain, *unavoidably bound up with the carrying out of the world-plan*, simply goes to evoke a compensatory Karma in the future. That the individual is systematically immolated for the time being on the altar of the species, the evidence of biology conclusively shows.

For this necessary sacrifice only a blissful Devachan followed by a fair environment in a future incarnation can atone. Allowance has, also, to be made for the "failures of Nature" and torture incidental to organic evolution—matters for redress and nothing more. The important aspects of Pain as an educative factor and as Nature's device to ensure the integrity of the organism must not be lost sight of.

The anomalies characteristic of the dogma of Monogenesis entirely disappear when the hypothesis of rebirth is adopted. Men, for instance, have some cause to envy the intellectual or moral grandeur of a favoured few when Nature is supposed to bestow her gifts at random. But it is otherwise when the mental "make-up" of the present is regarded as the heritage of the past! The victorious intellect of to-day may have walked with Plato in the groves of Academe, while in the chattering idiot at Earlswood may be seen the erst abandoned associate of Lais or Phryne. What we honour as *genius* in the prowess of the poet, politician or philosopher may but represent compound Karmic interest supervening on the plodding perseverance of an obscure scholar in ancient Rome. What we respect as the moral beauty of a friend may date from a painful war against the passions waged by him in forgotten days among the Pharaohs. All we now envisage is—Result. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap."

EDWARD DOUGLAS FAWCETT.

(To be continued.)



ALL THINGS MUST FADE, ALL THINGS MUST DIE.

ALL things must fade, all things must die, All things are doomed to pass away ; The life that greets the morning sky May perish ere the close of day !	Our friendships : those we love to twine Around the heart, and ever hold ; May leave us lonely to repine,— For Death to Sympathy is cold !
The hopes that held the heart for years, If e'en they be fulfill'd at last ; Or wreck'd in agony and tears, Shall surely sink within the Past !	The wealth that gives the spirit pride And holds man humbly in its sway ; Must lose its pow'r, when Death's beside To sternly beckon us away !
The love that seems to give the heart Its only joy in life at all ; May suddenly be swept apart At Death's relentless, callous call !	The deeds that fill the Book of Life With all their records, good or ill ; Shall sleep in silence from their strife And in the grave be ever still !

The memories that haunt the brain
 And still defy Time's furrow'd mask ;
 That Youth in Age revives again—
 Shall vanish with the vital spark !

The beauty that enchants the eye,
 The sounds that thrill the ravish'd ear ;
 Shall fade, and softly lingering, die—
 For nothing is abiding *Here !*

Wealth, hopes, deeds, mem'ries, friend-
 ships, love,
 Must all a common chaos find ;
 Till sad experiences prove
 That Life is but a passing wind !

Unstable are the things of earth,
 As fleeting as an infant's breath ;
 And looking back on time, their birth
 Seem'd waking only to their death !

All things must fade, all things must die,
 All things are doom'd to pass away :
 The very sun that lights the sky
 Shall glimmer, dwindle and decay !

The countless orbs that swing in space,
 Those stars, that pierce the vault of night ;
 Shall pale, and shrink, without a trace
 To mark their glory or their might !

The hills shall crumble into dust,
 The sea shall mingle with the air ;
 The World shall bear a frozen crust
 With Ruin's Silence ev'rywhere !

And yet it seems *the Soul* shall live
 From all this awful wreck of things ;
The Soul of Man shall still survive
 And flourish on immortal wings !

Or why do we discern the light
 Beyond this gloomy work of Time ;
 That Death seems but a passing night
 Before a dawn that is sublime ?

Or whence proceeds this inborn sense,
 That tells us God had never will'd ;
 That *here*—where all is hidden, dense,
 Our Destiny should be fulfill'd ?

Or how is it, though all the rack
 That rends our restless, wond'ring brain :
 And sins and snares that hold us back—
 We feel our yearnings are not vain ?

That thro' the whirl of doubt and woe
 And all the devious paths we tread ;
 The soul forgets its cares below
 And knows that God is overhead.

Yes ! how unfinished seems the plan
 Of Fate if hope be buried here ;
 If all the nobleness of man
 Is worthless as a wasted tear.

Shall all this breathless turmoil die,
 And cease for ever, in the grave ?
 Shall victory be seen so nigh,
 And triumph be denied the brave ?

Shall love and honour meet their doom,
 Shall friendships sever ev'ry bond
 Within the darkness of the tomb—
 When all our dreamings lie *beyond ?*

No ! conscience tells us we shall see,
 More clearly thro' "the darkened
 glass" ;
 And read the Book of Destiny,
 When Death shall like a shadow pass !

The soul shall *live !* it shall not die
 With this imperfect life, so brief ;
 But shall survive Eternity,—
 Such is our fond, if false, belief.

The soul shall live ! and live again,
 Thro' change and change ; and be refined
 At each transition, till its gain
 Shall be a peaceful, perfect mind.

The soul shall live ! then what is pain,
 Misfortune, poverty, or grief ;
 When Death but rends our woes in twain
 And ministers a sweet relief.

Then Justice shall be dealt at last,
 Then Right shall rule Oppression's rod ;
 Then Wisdom shall be true and fast
 Before the presence of our God !

JOSIAH R. MALLETT.

Numbers, their Occult Power and Mystic Virtues.

PART II.—(Continued.)

THE Kabbalah became a means of handing down from one generation to another hidden truths, religious notions, secrets of nature, ideas of Cosmogony, and facts of history, in a form which was unintelligible to the uninitiated; and the revealing of the secrets and the methods of interpretation was veiled in mystery, and only to be approached through Religion.

The more practical part of the system was involved in the three processes of:—

GEMATRIA, NOTARICON, and TEMURA.

Gematria, a method depending on the fact that each Hebrew letter had a numerical value. When the sum of the numbers of the letters composing a word was the same as the sum of the letters of another word however different, they perceived an analogy between them, and considered them to have a necessary connection. Thus certain numbers got to be well known as meaning certain things; and not words only, but sentences were treated in this manner: thus, as an example, referring to Genesis xviii, v. 2, we find the words "and lo, three men," Vehennah shalisha, VHNH SHLSHH, this set down in numbers becomes 6, 5, 50 5, 300, 30, 300, 5, which amount to 701: now the words "these are Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael," "Alu Mikhael Gabriel ve Raphael," ALV MIKAL GBRIAL V RPAL converted are 1, 30, 6, 40, 10, 20, 1, 30, 3, 2, 200, 10, 1, 30, 6, 200, 80, 1, 30, also amounting to 701, and the Rabbis argued that these two sets of three beings were identical. Some Christian Kabbalists point out that in Genesis xlix., v. 10 we find "Yebah Shiloh," YBA SHILH, "Shiloh shall come," which amount to 358; and that the word "Messiah," MSHYCH is 40, 300, 10, 8, or 358; but so is also Nachash the Serpent of Moses, NCHSH, 50, 8, 300; and I must remark that the claim to translate SHILH, or, as some ancient Hebrew MSS. write it, SHLH, by "Shiloh," in the sense of Jesus Christ, is far-fetched. The word is simply "rest," or "peace," in its simplest meaning: but also is the Scorpio of the Chaldean zodiac (related to Nachash, serpent); and "Judah" of whom Jacob is talking in the prophecy is the sign of the zodiac, Leo, for "Judah is a lion's whelp" (the Chaldean zodiac has a lion couchant), "he crouches as a lion." In this sense, then, "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah," *i.e.*, power shall not leave Leo, until Shelah, Shiloh, or Scorpio shall come up or rise. Astronomy teaches that as Leo passes away from the meridian, Scorpio rises. The title "Comforter," "Menachem," MNCHM, 40, 50, 8, 40, amounting to 138, and the title

“The Branch,” applied to the Messiah in Zechariah iii., v. 8, namely, TZMCH, 90, 40, 8, also 138, are of the same number. Metatron, the great angel MTHRTHN, and Shaddai SHDI, translated “Almighty,” are both 314. The letter Shin, SH, = 300, is used as a glyph of “the spirit of the living gods,” Ruach Elohim RUCH ALHIM, which transmutes into 200, 6, 8, 1, 30, 5, 10, 40, or 300.

Notaricon, a word derived from the Latin *notarius*, a shorthand writer, means the construction of a word from the initial or final letters of the several words of a sentence; or *vice-versa* the construction of a sentence of which each word in order begins with the several letters composing a given word: processes of contraction and expansion, therefore.

Refer to Deuteronomy xxx., v. 12, and find that Moses asks, “Who shall go up for us to heaven?” the initials of the words of the sentence, MY YOLH LNU HSHMYMH, read “My yeolah lenu hashemimha,” form the word MYLH or “Mylah,” which means “Circumcision,” and the final letters form the word Jehovah, YHUH or IHVH, suggesting that Jehovah pointed out the way, by circumcision, to heaven. Again the first six letters of the book of Genesis, BRASHIT, Berasit, translated “In the beginning,” but more properly “In wisdom,” are the initials of the words BRASHIT RAH ALHIM SHYQBLU ISHRAL TURH, read “Berasit rauah Elohim shyquebelu Israel torah,” which mean “In the beginning, God saw that Israel would accept the Law.”

The famous Rabbinic name of power, “AGLA,” is formed of the initials of the sentence, “Tu potens in sæculum Domine,” ATH GBUR LOULM ADNI, Ateh gibur loulam Adonai. The word “Amen” is from AMN, the initials of “Adonai melekh namen,” ADNI MLK NAMN, meaning “The Lord and faithful King.”

Temura means Permutation; sometimes the letters of a word are transposed according to certain rules, and with certain limitations; at others each letter of a word is replaced by another according to a definite scheme, forming a new word, of which permutation there are many recognised forms. For example, the alphabet of 22 letters is halved and the two sets placed one over the other in reverse order thus:—

A	B	G	D	H	V	Z	CH	TH	Y	K
T	SH	R	Q	Tz	P	O	S	N	M	L

then A is changed to T, and V to P, and so on; so Babel=BBL becomes Sheshak *i.e.*, SHSHK used by Jeremiah xxv., v. 26. This form is called Atbash or AT-BSH; it will be seen that there must be 21 other possible forms, and these were named in order, thus, Albat, Agdat, etc.; the complete set was called “the combinations Tziruph.” Other Permutations were named Rational, Right, Averse and Irregular; these are produced by forming a square and subdividing it by 21 lines in each direction into 484 smaller squares, and then writing in each square a letter in order successively from right to left, or from above down, or

the reverse. The most popular mode of permutation has however been the form called "Kabbalah of the Nine Chambers," produced by the intersection of two horizontal and two vertical lines, forming nine spaces, a central square, and 4 three-sided figures, and 4 two-sided figures, to each are allotted certain letters; there are several modes even of this arrangement.

This method is used in a superficial manner in Mark Master Masonry and is completely explained in the teaching of the "Hermetic students of the G. D."

A further development of the Numerical Kabbalah consists of arithmetical processes of Extension and Contraction; thus Tetragrammaton is considered as Y 10, H 5, V 6, H 5, or 26, but also may be spelled in full YVD 20, HA 6, VV 12, HA 6, or 44

Again the Kabbalists extended a number by series. Zain Z or 7 becomes 1 and 2 and 3 and 4 and 5 and 6 and 7 or 28. After another manner they contracted, as 28 was equal to 2 and 8 or 10: again Tetragrammaton 26 became 2 and 6, or 8, so every number was reducible to a primary numeral. In this manner, within certain restrictive laws, every word had analogies with certain others, thus, AB father 1 and 2 are 3, IHV Jehu 10 and 5 and 6 are 21, 2 and 1 are 3. AL SHDI, Al Shaddai, God Almighty, 1, 30, 300, 4, 10 or 345 becomes 12 and then 2 and 1 are 3; HVA or Hoa 5, 6, 1, are 12, and then 3; and GDVLH Gedulah 3, 4, 6, 30, 5, are 48, and are 12 and 3.

Another method of substitution leading to results of an opposite character is the substitution in any word of similar letters of another group, hard for soft, or sibilant for dental, thus in TM=perfect, exchange TH for T, and obtain THM meaning defiled; SHAN secure, tranquil, becomes SAN battle; SHKL wisdom, becomes SKL foolish. In the word Shaddai SHDI Almighty, with soft sibilant and soft dental or Shiddah, a wife; if we replace with a hard dental, a partial change of meaning is effected STHH Sittah, an adulterous wife; both letters hardened completely change the sense STH Seth, a fallen man, a backslider, STHN Satan, adversary.

I cannot, without Hebrew letters, explain well the change of sound in the Shin SH, from SH to S, but it is marked by a dot over the right or left tooth of the three teeth of the letter.

A deep mystery is concealed in the Genetic account of the conversion of the names of Abram ABRM into Abraham ABRHM and that of his wife Sarai SHRI into Sarah SHRH, see Genesis xvii., v. 5-15, on the occasion of the conception of Isaac YTzCHQ or YSHCHQ from the root SHCHQ or TzCHQ "laugh," when Sarah was 90 and Abraham 100 years old, this was on the occasion of the covenant made by Jehovah with Abram, and the institution of circumcision of males in token thereof. Now here we have the addition of an H or 5, the essentially Female Letter to the name of Abraham, and a conversion of a

Yod into He, Y into H, in the case of Sarah, and then their sterility is destroyed.

Some learned men consider Abraham to be a conversion of Brahma the Hindoo Deity. The name splits up curiously. AB is father, BR is son, AM is like OM or AUM a deific name of Power; RM meant "he is lifted up." Blavatsky remarks that Abraham and Saturn were identical in Astro-symbology, the Father of the Pharisees was Jehovah, and they were of the seed of Abraham.

The number of ABRM is 1, 2, 200, 40 or 243, the number of the man figure Seir Anpin, representing Microprosopus.

Read Pistorius, *Ars Cabalistica*, for the effect of adding H 5 to men's names, see page 969; also Inman, *Ancient Faiths*, article Abraham; *Secret Doctrine* i. 578, ii. 77; also C. W. King, *The Gnostics*.

The name Sarah also has a curious set of similars in Hebrew, SRH, princess; SAR, flesh; SOR, gate; SCHR, black; SOR, hairy seir; SRT, incision; SR and SRR, navel; and note the Sacti of Brahma is Sara-swati, watery; Sara refers to SRI, Lakshmi, Aphrodite, and all are related to Water and Luna, Vach Sophia of the Gnostics, and the ideal Holy Ghost, all feminine.

S. L. MacGregor Mathers says 243 of Abram becomes 248 by adding H, and Sarai 510 becomes 505 by taking 5 off, putting H for Y, and the total of the two names is unaltered, being 753; 248 is the number of the members of Microprosopus and of RCHM, rechem or Mercy.

Before leaving this subject, a reference must be made to the Magic Squares, of the Planets etc.; to each planet belongs a special unit, and secondarily other numbers.

Thus the Square of Saturn has three compartments each way, and in each subdivision is a unit, 1 to 9, so arranged that the columns add up to 15 every way, and the total being 45. The Square of Jupiter has a side of four divisions, total 16, each line adds up to 34, and the total is 136.

The Square of Mars is given here as an example, each side five, total squares 25, each side counting 65, and total 325.

11	24	7	20	3
4	12	25	8	16
17	5	13	21	9
10	18	1	14	22
23	6	19	2	15

Similarly the four several numbers of Sol are 6, 36, 111, 666. Of Venus 7, 49, 175, 1225. Of Mercury, 8, 64, 260, 2080.

Of Luna 9, 81, 369, 3321. Each number then becomes a name; take the case of Mercury; 64 is alike DIN and DNI, Din and Doni; 260 is Tiriël, TIRIAL, and 2080 is Taphthartharath, TPTRTRT.

The Chaldeans associated mystic numbers with their Deities, thus to Anu 60, Bel 50, Hoa 40, Sin 30, Shamash 20, Nergal (Mars) 12, and Beltis 15.

It will be noticed that the great number of Sol is 666, called Sorath, SURT, the number of the Beast, about which so much folly has been written. One famous square of five times five divisions, amounting in most directions to 666 is formed of the mystic words *sator, arepo, tenet, opera, rotas*. Of these the first, third, and last number 666, but *opera* and its reverse number only 356. The number 608 is notable, being in Coptic, PHRE, the Sun 500, 100, 8 and in Greek we find VHS, 400, 8,200, which becomes IHS in Latin, for the Greek Upsilon changes to Y and I in Latin, and so we obtain the anagram of "Iesus hominum Salvator."

Kircher points out a Greek example of magic squares; the names Jesus and Mary, IESOUS and MARIA have a curious relation. Iesus is 10, 8, 200, 70, 400, 200=888. Now take Maria, 40, 1, 100, 10, 1=152. Set 152 in a Magic Square of Three, *i.e.*, nine compartments, thus, 1—5—2, 5—2—1, 2—1—5, then the totals are all 888. The letters of Iesus also make a magic square of 36 divisions, adding every way to 888. Consult the "Arithmologia" of Kircher.

Remember "*illius meminuit Sybilla de nomina ejus vaticinando,*" "*ouoma sou monades, dekades, ekaton tades okto,*" or "*nomen tuum 8 unitates, 8 denarii, 8 centenarii.*"—See St. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*.

Note the mystic word Abraxas is 1, 2, 100, 1, 60, 1, 200=365 in Greek letters.

As a curiosity note that the Roman X for 10 is two V's which are each five; C, or, squarely drawn, L, for 100 consists of two L's which are each 50. Priscian says I for one was taken from i in the middle of the Greek *mia* female of *eis*, one, and V for five because it was the fifth vowel. To remember Hebrew numerals note AIQ=1, 10, 100; and in Greek AIRA=1, 10, 100, 1,000.

PART III.

THE INDIVIDUAL NUMERALS.

CHAPTER I.—THE MONAD.

THE number One or the Monad has been defined by the Mathematician Theon of Smyrna as "the principle and element of numbers, which while multitude can be lessened by subtraction, is itself deprived of every number and remains stable and firm"; hence as number it is indivisible, it remains immutable, and even multiplied into itself remains itself only, since once one is still one, and the monad multiplied by the monad remains the immutable monad to infinity. It remains by itself among

numbers, for no number can be taken from it, or separated from its unity. Proclus observed : " the first monad is the world itself, the second is the inerratic sphere, then thirdly succeed the spheres of the planets, each a unity, then lastly are the spheres of the elements which are also Monads " ; and these as they have a perpetual subsistence are called wholenesses—*holotetes* in Greek.

The Monad, Unity, or the number One received very numerous meanings. Photius tells us that the Pythagoreans gave it the following names :—

1. God, the First of all things, the maker of all things.
2. Intellect, the source of all ideas.
3. Male and Female—both together produce all things ; from the odd proceed both odd and even.
4. Matter, the last development of universality.
5. Chaos, which resembles the infinite, indifferentiation.
6. Confusion. 7. Commixion. 8. Obscurity, because in the Ineffable principle of things, of which it is the image, all is confused, vague and in darkness.
9. A Chasm, as a void.
10. Tartarus, from its being at the lowest extremity, is dissimilarly similar to God, at the highest end of the series.
11. The Styx, from its immutable nature.
12. Horror, the ineffable is perfectly unknown and is therefore terrible.
13. Void of Mixture, from the simplicity of the nature of the ineffable.
14. Lethe, oblivion, ignorance,
15. A Virgin, from the purity of its nature.
16. Atlas, it connects, supports, and separates all things.
17. The Sun. 18. Apollo. 19. Pyralios, dweller in fire. 20. Morpho.
21. The Axis. 22. Vesta, or the fire in the centre of the earth. 23. Spermatic Reason. 24. " The point within a circle," " the Central Fire Deity."
25. The Lingam, upright pillar, figure I.

The Monad being esteemed the Father of number is the reason for the universal prejudice in favour of Odd Numbers over Even ones which are but copies of the first even number the Duad, or universal Mother ; the father being more esteemed than the mother, for " Might."

Odd numbers were given to the greater Gods, and even ones to the inferior and terrestrial deities.

The number one is represented in the Roman and Arabic systems, by an upright simple line, but in many old systems whose numerals were their letters we find that almost universally the letter A, from being chosen to commence the set of letters, had the task of representing the Monad.

In Numeration note that the Romans began with lines I, II, III, IIII, and then followed the Acute Angle V for 5, then for ten this was doubled

X, for fifty the angle was laid down and became L, for a hundred, two fifties, one inverted became C, for five hundred C and L became D D.

Hermias, the Christian philosopher, author of "Ridicule of the Gentile Philosophers," quotes from the Pythagoreans. "The Monad is the Beginning of all things"—"*arche ton panton he monas.*"

The figure of one signifies, identity, equality, existence, and preservation, it signifies "living man" alone among animals "erect"; on adding a head we make of it P, the sign of creative Power, (paternity, Phallus, Pan, Priapus, all commencing with the Vocabule P).

Another dash added, and we have man walking, advancing, with foot set forward, in the letter R which signifies "iens," "iturus" or "advancing."

Compare Unity, *solus*, alone, the unique principle of good; with *sol*, Sun God, the emblem of supreme power; and they are identical.

CHAPTER II.—THE DUAD.

THIS also was said to represent a large number of different objects and ideas; things indeed so dissimilar that a modern is at his wits' end to understand how such multiplicity arose.

And first it is the general opposite to the monad, the cause of dissimilitude, the interval between multitude and the monad. Of figures, those which are characterised by equality and sameness, have relation to the Monad; but those in which inequality and difference predominate are allied to the Duad. Monad and Duad are also called Bound and Infinity.

1. It was called "Audacity" from its being the earliest number to separate itself from the Divine One; from the "Adytum of God-nourished Silence," as the Chaldean oracles say.

2. It was called "Matter" as being definite and the cause of Bulk and division.

3. It is called "the interval, between Multitude and the Monad," because it is not yet perfect multitude, but is parturient with it. Of this we see an image in the duad of Arithmetic, for as Proclus observes: "The duad is the medium between unity and number, for unity by addition produces more than by multiplication, but number by addition produces less than by multiplication; whilst the Duad whether added to itself, or multiplied by itself produces the same.

4 "Fountain of Symphony," and "Harmony."

5. Erato, because it attracts the Monad, like Love, and another number is formed.

6. Patience, because it is the first number that endures separation from the Monad.

7. Phanes, or Intelligible Intellect.

8. It is the fountain of all Female divinities, and hence Nature, Rhea and Isis.

9. Cupid, just as Erato, from desiring its opposite for a partner.

In Astronomy, we speak of 2 nodes, Caput and Cauda Draconis; and in Astrology of 2 aspects of the planets, Benefic and Malefic. In Masonry we especially note 2 Pillars, and 2 parallel lines.

The Chinese speak of Blue, as the colour of Heaven, because made up of Red, Male, and Black, Female; of the active and the passive; the brilliant and the obscure.

The followers of Pythagoras, spoke of two kinds of enjoyment. First, lasciviousness and indulgence of the Belly, like the murderous songs of Sirens; Second, honest and just indulgences, which bring on no repentance.

Hierocles, says 2 things are necessary to life, the aid of kindred, and benevolent sympathy.

A notable ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic was formed of two serpents in connection with a globe or egg, representing the world. Another celebrated pair, in connection with worship, is the association of a tree and a serpent, referring as some say to the Mosaic account of the Tree of Knowledge, and the Tempter Serpent. Some have supposed that it is only since the condemnation "on thy Belly shalt thou go" that the Serpent has been limbless, and obliged to crawl.

Note, it has been argued and by a great churchman too, that the whole tale rests on error, and that for serpent, we should read "Ape" (Adam Clarke). This is substituting one error for another.

In the orgies of Bacchus Mænades, the worshippers had snakes twined in their hair and danced, singing "Eve, Eve, by whom came the sin," see Clemens Alexandrinus, Protrept. 9.

Duality introduces us to the fatal alternative to Unity or Good, namely EVIL; and to many other human and natural contrasts—night and day, light and darkness, wet and dry, hot and cold, health and disease, truth and error, male and female, which man having fallen from his high estate, from spirit to matter, cannot avoid associating himself with. Two is a number of Mourning and Death, misfortunes are apt to follow; turn to our History of England, see the unhappiness of Kings numbered the second of each name, William II., Edward II., and Richard II. of England were all murdered. The Romans dedicated the 2nd month to Pluto, God of Hades, and on the 2nd day of it they offered sacrifices to the Manes. Pope John XIX. instituted the Fête des Trépassés (All Souls Day) on November 2nd, the second month of Autumn.

W. WYNN WESTCOTT, M.D.

(To be continued.)

MEMORY IN THE DYING.

WE find in a very old letter from a MASTER, written years ago to a member of the Theosophical Society, the following suggestive lines on the mental state of a dying man :—

“ At the last moment, the whole life is reflected in our memory and emerges from all the forgotten nooks and corners, picture after picture, one event after the other. The dying brain dislodges memory with a strong, supreme impulse ; and memory restores faithfully every impression that has been entrusted to it during the period of the brain’s activity. That impression and thought which was the strongest, naturally becomes the most vivid, and survives, so to say, all the rest, which now vanish and disappear for ever, but to reappear in Devachan. No man dies insane or unconscious, as some physiologists assert. Even a madman or one in a fit of *delirium tremens* will have his instant of perfect lucidity at the moment of death, though unable to say so to those present. The man may often appear dead. Yet from the last pulsation, and between the last throbbing of his heart and the moment when the last spark of animal heat leaves the body, *the brain thinks* and the EGO lives, in these few brief seconds, his whole life over again. Speak in whispers, ye who assist at a death-bed and find yourselves in the solemn presence of Death. Especially have ye to keep quiet just after Death has laid her clammy hand upon the body. Speak in whispers I say, lest you disturb the quiet ripple of thought and hinder the busy work of the Past casting its reflection upon the veil of the Future.”

The above statement has been more than once strenuously opposed by materialists ; Biology and (Scientific) Psychology, it was urged were both against the idea, and while the latter had no well demonstrated data to go upon in such a *hypothesis*, the former dismissed the idea as an empty “ superstition.” Meanwhile, even biology is bound to progress, and this is what we learn of its latest achievements. Dr. Ferré has communicated quite recently to the Biological Society of Paris a very curious note on the mental state of the dying, which corroborates marvellously the above lines. For, it is to the special phenomenon of life-reminiscences, and that sudden re-emerging on the blank walls of memory, from all its long neglected and forgotten “ nooks and corners,” of “ picture after picture ” that Dr. Ferré draws the special attention of biologists.

We need notice but two among the numerous instances given by this Scientist in his *Rapport*, to show how scientifically correct are the teachings we receive from our Eastern Masters.

The first instance is that of a moribund consumptive whose disease was developed in consequence of a spinal affection. Already consciousness had left the man, when, recalled to life by two successive injections of a gramme of ether, the patient slightly lifted his head and began talking rapidly in Flemish, a language no one around him, nor yet himself, understood. Offered a pencil and a piece of white cardboard, he wrote with great rapidity several lines in that language—very correctly, as was ascertained later on—fell back, and died. When translated—the writing was found to refer to a very prosaic affair. He had suddenly recollected, he wrote, that he owed a certain man a sum of fifteen francs since 1868—hence more than twenty years—and desired it to be paid.

But why write his last wish in Flemish? The defunct was a native of Antwerp, but had left his country in childhood, without ever knowing the language, and having passed all his life in Paris, could speak and write only in French. Evidently his returning consciousness, that last flash of memory that displayed before him, as in a retrospective panorama, all his life, even to the trifling fact of his having borrowed twenty years back a few francs from a friend, did not emanate from his *physical* brain alone, but rather from his spiritual memory, that of the *Higher Ego* (Manas or the re-incarnating individuality). The fact of his speaking and writing Flemish, a language that he had heard at a time of life when he could not yet speak himself, is an additional proof. *The EGO is almost omniscient in its immortal nature.* For indeed matter is nothing more than “the last degree and as the shadow of existence,” as Ravaisson, member of the French Institute, tells us.

But to our second case.

Another patient, dying of pulmonary consumption and likewise re-animating by an injection of ether, turned his head towards his wife and rapidly said to her: “You cannot find that pin now; all the floor has been renewed since then.” This was in reference to the loss of a scarf pin eighteen years before, a fact so trifling that it had almost been forgotten, but which had not failed to be revived in the last thought of the dying man, who having expressed what he saw in words, suddenly stopped and breathed his last. Thus any one of the thousand little daily events, and accidents of a long life would seem capable of being recalled to the flickering consciousness, at the supreme moment of dissolution. A long life, perhaps, lived over again in the space of one short second!

A third case may be noticed, which corroborates still more strongly that assertion of Occultism which traces all such remembrances to the thought-power of the *individual*, instead of to that of the personal (lower) Ego. A young girl, who had been a sleep-walker up to her twenty-second year, performed during her hours of somnambulant sleep the most varied functions of domestic life, of which she had no remembrance upon awakening.

Among other psychic impulses that manifested themselves only

What can it
be from Earth?

during her sleep, was a secretive tendency quite alien to her waking state. During the latter she was open and frank to a degree, and very careless of her personal property; but in the somnambulant state she would take articles belonging to herself or within her reach and hide them away with ingenious cunning. This habit being known to her friends and relatives, and two nurses, having been in attendance to watch her actions during her night rambles for years, nothing disappeared but what could be easily restored to its usual place. But on one sultry night, the nurse falling asleep, the young girl got up and went to her father's study. The latter, a notary of fame, had been working till a late hour that night. It was during a momentary absence from his room that the somnambulant entered, and deliberately possessed herself of a will left open upon the desk, as also of a sum of several thousand pounds in bonds and notes. These she proceeded to hide in the hollow of two dummy pillars set up in the library to match the solid ones, and stealing from the room before her father's return, she regained her chamber and bed without awakening the nurse who was still asleep in the armchair.

The result was, that, as the nurse stoutly denied that her young mistress had left the room, suspicion was diverted from the real culprit and the money could not be recovered. The loss of the will involved a law-suit which almost beggared her father and entirely ruined his reputation, and the family were reduced to great straits. About nine years later the young girl who, during the previous seven years had not been somnambulant, fell into a consumption of which she ultimately died. Upon her death-bed, the veil which had hung before her physical memory was raised; her divine insight awakened; the pictures of her life came streaming back before her inner eye; and among others she saw the scene of her somnambulant robbery. Suddenly arousing herself from the lethargy in which she had lain for several hours, her face showed signs of some terrible emotion working within, and she cried out "Ah! what have I done? . . . It was I who took the will and the money. . . Go search the dummy pillars in the library, I have . . ." She never finished her sentence for her very emotion killed her. But the search was made and the will and money found within the oaken pillars as she had said. What makes the case more strange is, that these pillars were so high, that even by standing upon a chair and with plenty of time at her disposal instead of only a few moments, the somnambulant could not have reached up and dropped the objects into the hollow columns. It is to be noted, however, that ecstasies and convulsionists (*Vide the Convulsionnaires de St. Médard et de Morzine*) seem to possess an abnormal facility for climbing blank walls and leaping even to the tops of trees.

Taking the facts as stated, would they not induce one to believe that the somnambulant personage possesses an intelligence and memory of its

own apart from the physical memory of the waking lower Self; and that it is the former which remembers *in articulo mortis*, the body and physical senses in the latter case ceasing to function, and the intelligence gradually making its final escape through the avenue of psychic, and last of all of spiritual consciousness? And why not? Even materialistic science begins now to concede to psychology more than one fact that would have vainly begged of it recognition twenty years ago. "The real existence" Ravaisson tells us, "the life of which every other life is but an imperfect outline, a faint sketch, is that of the Soul." That which the public in general calls "soul," we speak of as the "reincarnating Ego." "To be, is to live, and to live is to will and think," says the French Scientist.* But, if indeed the physical brain is of only a limited area, the field for the containment of rapid flashes of unlimited and infinite thought, neither will nor thought can be said to be generated *within* it, even according to materialistic Science, the impassable chasm between matter and mind having been confessed both by Tyndall and many others. The fact is that the human brain is simply the canal between two planes—the psycho-spiritual and the material—through which every abstract and metaphysical idea filters from the Manasic down to the lower human consciousness. Therefore, the ideas about the infinite and the absolute are not, nor can they be, within *our* brain capacities. They can be faithfully mirrored only by our Spiritual consciousness, thence to be more or less faintly projected on to the tables of our perceptions on this plane. Thus while the records of even important events are often obliterated from our memory, not the most trifling action of our lives can disappear from the "Soul's" memory, because it is no MEMORY for it, but an ever present reality on the plane which lies outside our conceptions of space and time. "Man is the measure of all things," said Aristotle; and surely he did not mean by man, the form of flesh, bones and muscles!

Of all the deep thinkers Edgard Quinet, the author of "Creation," expressed this idea the best. Speaking of man, full of feelings and thoughts of which he has either no consciousness at all, or which he feels only as dim and hazy impressions, he shows that man realizes quite a small portion only of his moral being. "The thoughts we think, but are unable to define and formulate, once repelled, seek refuge in the very root of our being." . . . When chased by the persistent efforts of our will "they retreat before it, still further, still deeper into—who knows what—fibres, but wherein they remain to reign and impress us unbidden and unknown to ourselves. . . ."

Yes; they become as imperceptible and as unreachable as the vibrations of sound and colour when these surpass the normal range. Unseen and eluding grasp, they yet work, and thus lay the foundations of our future actions and thoughts, and obtain mastery over us, though we may

* *Rapport sur la Philosophie en France au XIXme. Siècle.*

never think of them and are often ignorant of their very being and presence. Nowhere does Quinet, the great student of Nature, seem more right in his observations than when speaking of the mysteries with which we are all surrounded: "The mysteries of neither earth nor heaven but those present in the marrow of our bones, in our brain cells, our nerves and fibres. No need," he adds, "in order to search for the unknown, to lose ourselves in the realm of the stars, when here, near us and *in us*, rests the unreachable. As our world is mostly formed of imperceptible beings which are the real constructors of its continents, so likewise is man."

Verily so; since man is a bundle of obscure, and to himself unconscious perceptions, of indefinite feelings and misunderstood emotions, of ever-forgotten memories and knowledge that becomes on the surface of his plane—*ignorance*. Yet, while physical memory in a healthy living man is often obscured, one fact crowding out another weaker one, at the moment of the great change that man calls death—that which we call "memory" seems to return to us in all its vigour and freshness.

May this not be due as just said, simply to the fact that, for a few seconds at least, our two memories (or rather the two states, the highest and the lowest state, of consciousness) blend together, thus forming one, and that the dying being finds himself on a plane wherein there is neither past nor future, but all is one present? Memory, as we all know, is strongest with regard to its early associations, then when the future man is only a child, and more of a soul than of a body; and if memory is a part of our Soul, then, as Thackeray has somewhere said, it must be of necessity eternal. Scientists deny this; we, Theosophists, affirm that it is so. They have for what they hold but negative proofs; we have, to support us, innumerable facts of the kind just instanced, in the three cases described by us. The links of the chain of cause and effect with relation to mind are, and must ever remain a *terra-incognita* to the materialist. For if they have already acquired a deep conviction that as Pope says—

"Lulled in the countless chambers of the brain

Our thoughts are link'd by many a *hidden* chain. . . ."

—and that they are still unable to discover these chains, how can they hope to unravel the mysteries of the higher, Spiritual, Mind!

"H. P. B."



PSYCHIC FIRE.

THE mind is a laboratory which, receiving ideas, proceeds to manipulate them according to the dictates of its own Will. In doing so it develops subtle essences of power which give a delicacy of perception to itself almost impossible to communicate to others by the method of writing. As we may not hope to fix in words these ethereal radiances, we will confine ourselves to a concise and simple statement of the reasons which have led us to certain fundamental conclusions concerning the nature of earthly fire and the unseen universe.

Statement.

What is the scientific definition of an atom?

It is matter subdivided to its ultimate limits.

Therefore it has no dimensions, because, if it had, it could be still further subdivided.

It is, therefore, a point.

Therefore, matter is made up of points having no dimensions. But matter is inseparable from motion, and motion is ever obedient to law.

What is true of matter is true of points, and therefore points are inseparable from motion. This gives us the following definition of an atom of matter. It is a point of energy, without dimensions, active in obedience to law. But since its activity is undimensional, it and the law which it exhibits are the same thing. Therefore an atom of matter is both the manifestation of a law and the law itself in action.

Each elementary atom differs in its innate activity. Therefore each represents a different law.

Atoms being pure energy the first result of multiplication is to increase, not the number of points, but the activity of the law which that point *is* and represents.

Atoms combining are in reality laws of motion combining to form centres of activity as molecules. A molecule has a resultant action as a unit of energy. This obeys a law. This law is the synthesis of laws composing it. It represents a resultant of forces. If this is a simple vibratory power it will have no direction, and the molecule as a unit represents a balance of power. Thus an atom becomes polarised energy as a molecule.

But polarisation is a development of equal and opposing forces.

Therefore the molecule is a unit of latent power compounded of minor units and representing the form of action of a law which hides in itself the potencies and forms of minor laws. From this we find that an atom is active energy. A molecule is latent energy active as a compound

whole. The addition of atoms increases the vitality of the point. The addition of molecules increases the tension of pure energy.

Both additions are required to produce visible and tangible substance.

We define substance as pure energy existing in a state of enormous tension. We say that the amount and tension of the energy thus visible represent the form of a definite law, and that the quality of this tension is due to its being made up of minor laws whose intensified activity is for the time being paralysed by the action of the containing law.

A body is therefore simply compounded of law, and the forms of motion which as minor laws the containing law confines in place.

Therefore material bodies are only composed of that which to us is immaterial, namely, the unsubstantial activity of law.

So that from the above statement we must admit the unreality of all that seems so solid and so sure. Yet we cannot forget that the feeling of power which massiveness gives us, and the feeling of life which the tempestuous ocean tosses abroad from wave to wave, are far more real than the substantial guise in which they masquerade. For tension is the word which best describes life in its material form, it being the result of an ethereal Power raised to an intense activity and then condensed by the opposition of equalising laws into a visible mass, as polarised points one on the other, forming up equitable strength. Forms are the silent witnesses of laws whose real life is constant vibration. These, as electric currents of vitality in potential, make a magnet of every planetary body, and are due to the churning of the astral wave by the revolving spheres. The ethereal cause of formal life becomes substantial. We may partially illustrate this by referring to the effects of Sound. A single note strikes the attentive mind as a perception intangible and unscen. We hear but do not feel it. Add note to note and we have a volume of sound ; and its effects are not only heard but felt. We can conceive of volume being condensed into visible shape. This is the third act of the drama of evolution which begins by showing us an unsubstantial ideal and ends by presenting us with solid, substantial facts.

Thus we have a general conception of an atom. It is as unsubstantial as the Will of Man, which it in some sort resembles. It gathers volume like the Will, when the latter, concentrated by a powerful mesmeriser, grows the power to touch and seize the human body, stiffens its muscles and binds it as with iron bands. But in Nature, psychic Force attains a third condition, for the energy which we throw out from our mind over other things and which is to a certain extent purely ethereal, concentrates itself, when acting under the guidance of ruling powers of macrocosmic Law, into visible matter. In this state it is the product of volume by itself, and bursts into the plane of physical perception like a flower, the crown and glory of the subjective cause which

is its law as an active entity living within the precincts of the unseen universe.

Every object which we see and touch is pure Energy caught up and woven together into solidity by different Laws. Yet these are themselves the objects which they have made; for they and their activity are two and yet in the ultimate are only one. Complex forms are many minor laws stricken into shape by higher and more comprehensive ones; while simple elements consist of single laws. All is Power held in bondage by the meaning of a law, and, should these bonds be loosened by mechanical means, a sudden rush of vitality must ensue, as the liberated energy returns to its unconfined activity on the astral plane. This mighty burst of pent-up Tension shows itself as Fire. All that exists, whether as the entombing rock which holds with an iron grip the all-pervading essences of Fire, or in its antithesis the human form loosening around it, as a shroud, a living flame of many colours, we see one element at work, one earthly power, one substance which in its visible completeness we call Fire and in its invisible activity is Psychic Force. Both of these, the one as generator, the other as guardian of Shape and Size we hold to be united in a Law of which indeed they are but two different aspects.

The character of fire being the same no matter what produces it, we say that Energy is similar in kind but variable in quantity in each individual law. So that it has one common origin and burns with the strength of countless potentials of vitality which previously existed as substantial particles. All around us seems naturally cool and solid, yet we stand surrounded by the devouring element ready to burst into flame and rush back into the unseen world, we cannot touch; a thing which does not throb with the congested agony of its fiery breath.

Life is said to belong only to organic matter, yet both it and organic matter may be resolved back into a fiery state; both therefore possess vitality. For Fire is but the visible manifestation of Psychic Force and Psychic Force is Law in action, which is Life. The difference which lies between them is that the first is a body of many laws synthesised by others, and forming in this way centres of force productive of free energy in the form of an ultimate synthetic law. Inorganic matter is the presentation of formal life in single laws, unconnected by comprehensive and therefore superior ones; here vitality is latent because all the strength of the law is required to keep the form upon the physical plane, leaving none available for other purposes. Thus one strain of vitality runs through all things; and man, believing in the finality of appearances, wanders blindly amongst the shadows, cast by another world, which appeal to him as tangible realities. Yet they are the actions of the invisible rulers of the Astral Plane, and though not all that they seem to be as, such are very real. For, while we on Earth first think

and then act, there the two are One, and Thought *is* its action and registers itself as matter, or our physical Universe.

Nature then is Psychic Force polarised and equilibrated as substance. Therefore Fire is psychic activity visible to us in this, its only earthly reality, as the flash of light or unit of heat which manifests the change from the objective and material to the subjective and ethereal state. This is pure mental power in transition from the passive presentation of itself on the physical plane back to its previous condition of formative life. If we are correct in our interpretation of the inner nature of fire, we can well understand the sanctity in which it was held by the Rosicrucians. The Magi, worshipping the sacred flame, held it to be typical of the Creative mind and doubtless the mystery which they attached to Fire partook of all the meaning we attach to psychic force. The active Cause of All, it becomes a flash of real life, darting back into the inner realms of Space and carrying with it the Soul or synthetic law of the thing it was when existing as a material body. Life, chained to earth, bursts into fire and obtains its freedom, passing away into the subjective world. Thus we see a profound philosophy lying in the conception of Purification by Fire. Here the body, erstwhile the tabernacle of the Soul, is bathed in Psychic Force. Hence the *raison d'être* of the funeral pyre where the empty shell is impregnated with the purest essences of Life, which, with tongues of living fire, flash into the paralysed vitality of the fleshly atoms, setting them free and passing with them into the unseen world. Being thus changed into active vitality or free laws, they cease at once to be attracted to the scene of their forced labours, and throw off allegiance to the Desires and Passions with which the Will of the inhabiting Ego associated them.

The modern crematorium has quite a different origin. Sanitation has forced on our notice the necessity of destroying by fire our dead. Yet, though we care not to inquire what reason there was for the profound veneration in which this form of disposing of the body was held in bygone ages, yet the superficial cause which has resulted in our reverting to the practices of our Aryan forefathers in this respect, does not in any way affect the sublime results which they knew were obtained by such a deed; and a corresponding purification of the psychic atmosphere of our world will not be one of the least advantages which must follow from the adoption of cremation.

If heat demonstrates the presence of psychic force, then it becomes evident that every thought promulgated through the brain must be accompanied by the evolution of an equivalent amount, this being due to the destruction of atoms and their release from confining laws through the disturbance of their balanced state, and their consequent activity as free mental energy. The passage of a thought is visibly typified by the flash of matter into flame and thence into the unseen world. Thought is the atom acting freely as its equivalent energy and is, in its act of

freedom from its atomic shape, present to the mind as an intelligible idea. It then passes naturally away into an oblivion which is only real to this world. Thus the brain matter is thought itself in potential. But, while here we are in seeming harmony with the modern materialist, we differ from him in that the act of thinking is not originated in the brain. It is an entirely objective process and depends on yet higher planes and subtler causes than those we have attempted to describe. Science, which occupies itself only with externals, discovered the relation between heat and thought, but, because of its limitation to the study of the phenomenal world, it failed to grasp the objective nature of this coincidence and make it subjective. We hold that man's thoughts are the meanings of Fire, and that he is able to appreciate in his mind each potential which, as an atom, existed on the physical world ; but that he does not cognise it in its concentrated or physical form because this is not purely psychic but only a state of becoming. Thought as fire is only energy. The laws which are the life and soul of this energy only become individually active when fire has ceased to *Be* on this plane ; has in fact become extinguished into its subjective state. The heat which is developed by the evolution of a thought affects the senses as an involution of simple energy, and hence belongs partially to this world and in part to the other, so that the senses which are entirely objective are too coarse to perceive it. We have, instead of a perception, a conception due to involution, which is nevertheless sensitive as a mathematical quantity of force to evolution through sense perceptions. Thus we may define a conception as the understanding by the mind of the inner meaning of the law whose activity is perceived in the physical world as fire, and whose immobility under the influence of other laws produces the formal Universe. A Thought is the effect produced on the mind by the energy of that heat which accompanies the activity of the brain ; and is in fact an atom or atoms disintegrating as single thoughts, more or less powerful according to the number of points in liberation. Molecules co-ordinated present us with trains of ideas.

THOS. WILLIAMS, F.T.S.

(To be continued.)



The Talking Image of Urur.

CHAPTER XIV.—*continued.*

WHEN Pancho read this account, he smiled at the ludicrous idea of being accused of carrying away a statue of the weight of the Talking Image.

"Nevertheless," he said to himself, "it will be best not to mention my real name to anybody, as it might cause me annoyance."

An invisible power seemed to attract Pancho to Venice. Was it the recollection of pictures which he had seen of the City of the Lagoon with its moonlit quays, of gondolas, its historical palaces and prisons that attracted him there; or was it some invisible hand that guided his steps? Pancho went to Venice and took rooms in a hotel. When the inn-keeper came with the register and asked him to enter his name, he wrote down the first name that entered his mind.

"Ah!" said the landlord, reading it. "Mr. Krashibashi! I see you are a Hungarian. There is another Hungarian gentleman at the hotel. Perhaps you would like to be introduced to him."

"I wish to remain incognito," answered Pancho, "and I have been away from Hungary so long that I have forgotten the language."

He made up his mind to remain at Venice. He visited all the remarkable places of the city and among others the Church of San Marco. It was a quiet place, fit for meditation, and what he admired there most was "the tomb," with the dying lion, sculptured by Canova. "Verily!" he thought, "here is a Talking Image, accessible to everyone and speaking to everybody who understands its unuttered language. Its silence expresses more than can be expressed in words."

His frequent visits to the church of San Marco attracted the attention of a Catholic priest. This priest was a man of venerable aspect and unusual intelligence and of far greater tolerance than is usually found among the clergy. He approached Pancho and made his acquaintance.

"This tomb," said the priest, "is a wonderful piece of art and very suggestive of the immortality of the soul."

"It is suggestive," answered Pancho, "but it gives no positive proof of it."

"Such a proof," said the monk, "is unnecessary to those who believe."

"But there are thousands of well-meaning people who are unable to believe on faith," said Pancho. "To believe in a thing does not create it. A man may believe in his immortality all his life and nevertheless find himself swallowed up by death. What I want is proof positive of the soul's immortality, such intellectual proof that nobody can dispute. Let such proof be given and there will be a universal revival of religion."

"Does not the Bible give numerous historical evidences that there is a life after death?" asked the priest. "Was not Christ resurrected from his tomb?"

"Excuse me," said Pancho; "but what guarantee can you give that the Bible stories are true, that the marvellous things of which they speak have happened, that the Bible is divinely inspired, or that these tales are not to be taken in an allegorical sense? Please do not answer me in the usual phrases; that it is our duty to believe if we do not understand, and so forth. I have myself studied theology and I know the customary answers. Tell me something new."

"My dear sir," answered the priest, "to confess to you the truth, the church has no positive proof of the soul's immortality; because religion is not a science. The church takes that immortality for granted and as a matter of course, as it is taught in the Bible. To learn the mysteries of the Deity would make it necessary that one should be in possession of the Holy Ghost and be able to write a new Bible."

"But what proof have you that there is such a thing as a Holy Ghost?" asked Pancho.

"None other," answered the priest, "but the doctrines of the authorities in which we believe. We live in accordance with the directions given by our books. If their statements are true, we will go to heaven; if they are wrong, so much the worse for us."

"It often seems to me," said Pancho, "that for everything that exists, there must be a sense by which that thing can be perceived. Is it not thinkable that there is an undeveloped sense in man, which might be developed so that he could perceive the presence of the Holy Ghost?"

"I have heard of such cases in the lives of the saints," said the monk. "It is said that some of them saw the heavens opened and that the Holy Ghost descended upon them in the form of a dove; but alas! the time for miracles is over; the heavens are now closed, and though there are lots of pigeons, there is no Holy Ghost among them."

Pancho's acquaintance with this priest led him to be introduced to one of the dignitaries of the church, Cardinal Carlo. This cardinal was universally known on account of his boldness and eloquence. He made several attempts to convert Pancho.

"Your lack of faith," he said, "is caused by a lack of love. Do you not know that the apostle said: "If I were in possession of all the treasures of the earth and of all knowledge, what would it benefit me, if I were deficient in love?"

"But what object am I to love?" asked Pancho.

"Why! Christ, of course," answered the Cardinal.

"Unfortunately," said Pancho, "I am not acquainted with him. How can I love a man who lived so many hundred years ago?"

"If you remember," answered the Cardinal, "that this man is God and that he has come down from heaven to die a cruel death for the purpose of reconciling his father with mankind, a feeling of extreme gratitude must overcome you, which will surely kindle the fire of love in your heart. Read the Bible and see how much he has suffered, how he has been ill-treated and spat upon and how he was ultimately crucified, and all that for your own sake as well as for all mankind, and then tell me that you do not love him for it."

"Alas!" said Pancho, "I have no historical proof that the story is true, and if it has actually happened, I can only feel pity for him. Moreover, there are

numerous other people who have died an even more cruel death. Some of them have been tortured and afterwards burned alive, and they have submitted to it with a hope of thereby benefitting humanity. Why should I not love Giordano Bruno as much as the man called Christ? To tell you the truth I am disgusted with his father, for having used such abominable means to effect his own reconciliation. I cannot understand why he could not reconcile himself with mankind without sacrificing his son!"

"There are many things in religion," answered the Cardinal, "which no man can grasp within his reason. On such occasions the best thing to do is to shut one's reason up as in a prison, and believe in the doctrines. *Credo quia absurdum* is a very good maxim. The more absurd a doctrine appears to reason, the more is there a necessity for belief."

Pancho answered that such an unreasonable belief seemed to him to be merely a superstition and degrading to the higher nature of man. The cardinal, seeing that Pancho could not be converted, discontinued his attempts and dismissed him, not without showing signs of his displeasure.

Once more Pancho passed a great deal of his time in reading the Bible; but he could find therein no proof of the immortality of the soul. The stories he found there seemed to him so improbable, that he felt inclined at last to regard them as allegories, representing some mysterious and unknown spiritual process, instead of historical events, alleged to have happened in external life. But neither the priest nor the cardinal could give him any other explanation except that they were historical facts. This seemed unreasonable to Pancho, and therefore he could find no external proof about a life hereafter except the fact that he had seen his wife's ghost.

The knowledge of having seen and communicated with her afforded him great consolation and happiness. It is true that her spirit had appeared to him no more since he had left Africa; but this could easily be due to the fact that he had never been since then in the necessary state of tranquillity to perceive her, or that Conchita's spirit, being of a very refined nature, had not sufficient power to communicate. But he was satisfied with the knowledge that she was alive and near him, and did not care for any more proofs.

One evening, as Pancho was standing before the tomb of Canova, he was interrupted in his meditations by the approach of a woman. She was past middle age, and dressed in the Italian style. When she saw Pancho, she seemed surprised.

"Excuse me, sir," she said, "I have been sent to you by a sick lady. She is waiting to see you. Will you come with me?"

"My good woman," answered Pancho, "you must be mistaken. I am a stranger in Venice."

"I am not mistaken," replied the woman. "The lady described you to me exactly, and said that you were a stranger. She can see everything when she is asleep. She then sees things which nobody else can see, and she foretells things which are going to happen. I never saw the like of it in my life."

"Ah, a somnambule!" exclaimed Pancho. "This will be an interesting adventure. Perhaps I may find out through her the whereabouts of the Image. Let us go."

They went, and while on the way, Marietta—for that was the name of the

woman—told Pancho that the lady was a stranger and that she was ill-treated by her husband.

“He is very cruel to her,” she said, “and is as jealous as a Turk. It would not have been possible to take you to see her, if the *poltrone* had not gone away to Verona and left her alone.”

They arrived at a poor-looking house in the Via Albanese. Entering though an arched doorway which led into a stone-paved court-yard, they ascended a dark and narrow staircase, and the woman opened a door which led into a scantily furnished room. Pancho entered, and before him stood a woman dressed in white with long black hair hanging loosely around her shoulders. Motionless, and with her eyes closed, she looked more like a statue of stone than a living woman. In an instant Pancho recognized the form before him. It was that of his beloved Conchita!

CHAPTER XV.

A DOUBLE PERSONALITY.

FOR one moment Pancho stood speechless with surprise. She whom he had believed to be dead and with whose spirit he had communicated face to face was before him—not a spirit but a human being with flesh and blood. There could be no doubt. She was visible not only to him but to Marietta. She had not yet passed through the portals of death.

But what a change had taken place in her! What a difference there was between the beautiful angelic being that had floated before Pancho's vision, and the emaciated form that stood here before him. True, there were still traces of beauty left upon her face; but that face was cadaverous, the eyes were now seated deep within their sockets; the lips had shrunk, her form was no longer rounded. Red spots upon her pale cheeks indicated consumption and the charms of the woman before him could not be compared with those of the ethereal being, the true Conchita, the spirit, nor with those of the woman with whom he had stood upon the balcony of the Cliff house. He almost regretted to find Conchita still alive and appearing to him in such an emaciated form.

Then it was that Pancho felt horrified at his own thoughts. It showed to him clearly that his love for her had been caused merely by her beauty and was therefore selfish.

“What,” he asked himself, “is a love whose existence is dependent on the qualities of a form? Can there, perchance, be a higher kind of love, one that is self-existent and divine and which does not need any objective shape to call it into existence?”

As if in answer to his thoughts, Conchita said:

“The sun exists independent of the objects in which his light becomes manifest, and likewise the sun of divine love is an eternal spiritual power, self-existent and independent of the objects which it illuminates. Forms cannot exist without love; but that which produces love is not created by love.”

This was indeed Conchita's voice. Doubt was no longer possible. Pancho stepped forward toward the somnambule, preparing to touch her, when she lifted her hand and made a motion, as if she would not have him approach her.

"Do not touch her," she said, "for now you are cold as ice, and your touch would revive the powers of darkness that have happily fallen asleep. Free born is the spirit, but heavy the chains that bind it to the material clay. The soul loves light, but must return to its dungeon when it awakens."

"Alas!" exclaimed Pancho. "How strangely you speak! Do you not know me; and are you not Conchita? Have you become a medium, and has some strange spirit taken possession of you?"

"No, Hasmaline!" answered Conchita. "It is her own self that speaks to you, now that the lower elements of her body permit its voice to be heard. When these elements are awake her body does not represent her true self, for the powers of evil have taken possession of the house which ought to be a temple of the Divine Spirit. When she is awake, she sleeps; but when she sleeps she is truly awake. Do not mistake the instrument for the power. Do not mistake the light of the sun that illuminates a diamond for a production of the diamond. All human bodies are mediums through which natural forces act; all souls are instruments through which the Spirit of Wisdom may become manifest."

"Why do you call me Hasmaline?" asked Pancho, to which the somnambule answered:

"Is man, while in that spiritual sleep which he calls wakefulness, so entirely forgetful of his true nature and of the tribe to which he belongs, that he cannot remember his home? Our personalities, O, Hasmaline, belong to this inferior planet earth; but you and I are not bound to this single speck of dust in the universe. For millions of ages we have known each other. I have revolved within the orbit of the planet to which I am bound and where I find happiness; but you love to roam through space and will continue to do so until your cometary existence will come to an end at last, and you become engulfed in the glory of the sun that attracts you by the power of his divine love."

A struggle for the recognition of something which had no existence for him took place in Pancho's mind. For a moment he felt himself in a new world of light, surrounded by the most beautiful and radiant forms, but to see which he could not open his eyes.

One short moment, and his arguing intellect regained mastery over his mind and persuaded him that these things were delusions, unsupported by well established facts.

"Alas," he said, "I see that you have gone completely mad, and it is all my own fault!"

"Do not think, O mortal," continued the entranced form, "that the spirit which gives you life is a nonentity and the belief in it a delusion. Your consciousness is at present limited to your terrestrial state of existence; but there are other states, far superior to the one of which you are now aware. Your personality is ephemeral like that of the insect which is born to-day and dies to-morrow; but the Spirit of man, O Hasmaline, has existed for millions of ages. Always the same in its divine essence, it is for ever changing its manifestations in bodies, working its way into form, and through forms, until it awakens to find itself a god."

"Gone!" sighed Pancho. "Entirely gone. O, how I wish you would say something reasonable!"

"How insignificant," went on the entranced woman, "is all the knowledge of terrestrial things when compared with the divine self-knowledge of the spirit. Can you not feel, O mortal, celestial love pervading all space? Can you not see the substantial light that surrounds you and which your spirit breathes? Can you not know yourself one with the universal Mind whose harmonies vibrate throughout the universe? You know only one little world; but there are worlds within worlds and systems within systems whose limits even thought cannot reach, and still all that unlimited infinitude exists within one's own self-consciousness. It is 'I.'"

"Oh!" said Pancho. "What a pity your reason should be so entirely gone! Can it ever be restored?"

Without paying attention to this remark, the Somnambulist assumed an attitude of prayer, and spoke the following words:

"Within myself shines the sun, the changing moon and the glittering stars. Oceans are stored in my breast, my breath pervades the world, and my heart is a living fire in which all created things are for ever consumed. Within myself resides the glory and splendour of the universe and my dominion is the kingdom of joy. Wherever I am, there is peace and happiness and divine harmony; wheresoever I do not manifest, there is disorder and suffering. Open, O mortals, your hearts to the sunshine of eternal truth, and let divine thoughts descend upon you like rain-drops from heaven! Fill yourselves with the wine of love and feed upon the feast of the celestial manna prepared for you. Open the gates to that place where the lamb and the lion lie together, and behold the king in whose hands is the restoration of all peace."

"Oh, what nonsense!" groaned Pancho. "Oh, that your reason could be called back!"

"A veil has been thrown over her external understanding," answered Conchita. "Her imagination is beclouded by the power of Sorcery. Still the light of the spirit clings with its roots to the centre of her being, and there is hope that the elements of darkness will be destroyed by the omnipotent power of love."

"Where is Juana?" asked Pancho.

"Birds love their nests, and wolves their dens. The child of the forest has returned to her parent."

"Now you speak sensibly," said Pancho; "but how unfortunate it is that you have lost your mind and speak of yourself as if you were not yourself and of me as if I were another!"

"Know, O mortal," she replied, "that to the truly enlightened the world of those illusions, which you call corporeal forms, does not exist."

"How!" exclaimed Pancho. "Do you mean to say that my body which I can see and feel has no individuality? Do you mean to insinuate that my living and sentient form, and not only mine, but all others, have no substantiality or reality in them, that all our personalities are merely as shadows dancing upon a wall? Did God create a world of illusions for the purpose of misleading mankind?"

"No!" answered the speaker. "Existence is real, and forms are made to represent truths. It is man himself who makes himself illusions, and deludes himself by mistaking the forms for that which they only represent. Thus he mistakes the form for the spirit and the house for him that inhabits it."

"The soul, O mortal, is far too grand to be imbedded and swallowed up in material clay. It resembles the boundless sky in whose infinitude floats a little cloud of visible matter, reflecting the light of the sun. This ever-changing cloud represents the terrestrial personality, reflecting a part of the light of the spirit. The Light itself is the *real* Being. Forms are merely instruments for its manifestation, and it manifests its activity according to the qualities and capacities of the form. The personality with its ever-changing states of consciousness, its variable thoughts and emotions, is continually born, continually dies, and is reproduced again from day to day; and when at last the form is dissolved the Light gathers to itself once more the rays which it lent to the form."

"Is there, then, no real or permanent form?" asked Pancho.

"Not until it has imbibed the *Elixir of Life*," answered the speaker.

"And where can that Elixir be found?"

"It is with us wherever we go, and we can find it nowhere except within ourselves. It was even before the day of creation began and it still is, and will be. It is 'the Life and the Light of men, that light that shineth eternally in darkness, and darkness comprehendeth it not.' Men are not themselves the light, they can only 'bear witness' to it, by becoming instruments for its manifestation."

"But," put in Pancho, "the light shines also in a diamond, and renders it bright, and when the light disappears the diamond gradually loses its luminosity."

"Thus also," she replied, "the wind blows within the trees, and blows out again, carrying out with it the dead leaves to drop them on the ground. Likewise the breath of the spirit passes in and out of the soul. To fasten it there by the power of faith, and to render it firm as a rock: this is the secret of the *Philosopher's Stone*."

"What do you mean by 'Faith'?" asked Pancho. "Surely to believe oneself to be in possession of a thing is not sufficient to obtain it?"

And the woman answered:

"Mere belief is not faith. True faith is a magic power that overcomes all obstacles and which no one knows, except he who is in possession of it."

"Why then," he asked again, "is this great mystery not taught to mankind? Why do our clergymen not preach it from every pulpit, so that all men may find Light in themselves, and by clinging to it become immortal?"

"It has been taught and is still taught by thousands of tongues; but those who teach it do not recognise it themselves. They speak of it as if it were a dream or fable, and therefore their words have no power. It is the true Light which shineth within every man that cometh into the world, but the world knoweth it not, and will not receive it. From the unavailing efforts of the material intellect to perceive the light of the Spirit arise all your struggles. Intellect would seek in vain for truth within the realm of Imagination, and does not penetrate into the heart where the Light can be found. Those who thirst after truth must go to the fountain. There are many who imagine that they love truth; but their love is adulterous. It only seeks for the gratification of self and not for the attainment of Wisdom."

Meanwhile, night was fast advancing. There was no lamp or candle in the

room, but the moonlight shone through the window, and its beams fell upon the white-draped form of Conchita, as she still stood motionless, and thus resembling the Talking Image of Urur, as Pancho had seen it on that memorable day when he had seen the rosy light entering the cold stony Image. He remembered how he had wished that this light could enter himself, likewise, and fill him with knowledge. Then the entranced woman, as if divining his thought, uttered the following words :

“There is nothing to prevent the Holy Spirit of Wisdom from manifesting within the human consciousness, except that the minds of many are obsessed by erroneous doctrines, misconceptions, and unholy desires, the products of their own imagination. Ignorance darkens the mirror of the soul, and thus prevents the truth from reflecting itself therein in all its purity.”

And now a tremor seemed to pass through Conchita's frame, who said : “Go now, my friend. Her body is about to awaken to consciousness, and she must not see you. Go !”

Pancho reluctantly left, and, giving his address to Marietta, made arrangements with her to be informed every day about the condition of the patient.

We will not stop to discuss on what pathological grounds Conchita's abnormal condition could be explained, especially as the medical authorities, whom Pancho consulted, did not agree in their opinions about it. Some said it was merely Hysteria, others assured him that it was nothing but Hypnotism connected with unconscious cerebration. One authority swore that it was a case of spinal meningitis, and a professor of “psychiatry” declared it to be a pathological condition of the vasomotoric ganglia. Some advised bleeding, others large doses of morphia with bromide of potassium, and still another, cauterization by means of a white-hot iron. None of these remedies were, however, accepted.

But whether the utterances of the patient were the ravings of a maniac, or inspired by a superior spirit, at all events, they caused Pancho to reflect very deeply. He made up his mind to seek within himself for that interior Light, by whose knowledge it was said one could learn more important truths than from any information coming from outside sources, be they what they may. He tried to practise concentration of thought, that is to say, to collect his thoughts and to keep them upon one single idea instead of permitting them to disperse in various directions ; and, after a comparatively short time, he found a great deal of internal tranquillity within himself, although he did not find the Light. Then it was that the meaning of an allegory which he had read in the Bible became clear to him. It was that passage which describes how the disciples went in a ship, and the sea arose by reason of a great wind. They had great fear, but they saw somebody walking upon the troubled waters and he spoke to them : “It is I ; be not afraid. Then they willingly received him and *immediately the ship was at the land whither they went.*” This he supposed meant that the peace comes to those who do not reject it, and that with the recognition of truth, doubt and discontent disappear.

Let us now return to the *Via Albanese* and see what took place in Conchita's room after she awakened from her trance.

We find her resting upon a lounge, her eyes wide open and her hands folded over her head. Gazing at the ceiling she seems to be thinking as if trying to

remember a dream. After a while she calls Marietta, and the latter enters the room.

"Marietta," says Conchita, "give me some strong brandy. I feel very bad."

Marietta disappears and soon enters with the desired liquid. "How is your head?" she asks.

"It is all right now," answered Conchita; "but I had such a silly dream. It seemed to me as if snakes and reptiles were crawling into my brain. I combed my hair and out came little scorpions that had just been hatched and they fell upon the floor. There was a curious insect with four heads among them and they looked like the heads of birds. I put my foot upon it and killed it."

"You ought not to imagine such things, Mrs. Smith," remarked Marietta; "and it would be better for you to pray."

"Pray to whom? to the devil? Know, that I do not imagine such things. I see them; they are perfectly real to me, and you must be blind if you cannot see them. And mind! do not call me 'Mrs. Smith,' because I dislike that name. Call me simply Juana."

Marietta was horrified at Conchita's profane language. She was a very pious woman who not only grieved sincerely about the sufferings which Jesus had incurred at the hands of the Pharisees, but used to cry for hours because Nebuchadnezzar had to eat grass for seven years, and wept very bitterly over the story of Joseph sold into captivity by his own brothers. She was a devout Christian, in the habit of saying her prayers regularly, although she did not know that praying required abstraction of thought.

"It is very wicked of you to talk in that way," she answered, "especially as you spoke so nicely when that doctor was here."

"Was there any doctor here?" asked Conchita. "Did I not tell you to let no one enter my room when I have one of my fits?"

"It was yourself who sent me for him," answered Marietta.

"If he comes again," said Conchita, "get some boiling water and throw it over him. I do not want to have any doctors around me when I am in one of my fits. They know nothing and can do me no good."

"One never knows how to please *you*," grumbled Marietta. "Your parents must have had great trouble with you when you were a child."

"I never was a child and I never had any parents," replied Conchita. "At least I do not remember anything about such sorts of things. I have been Mrs. Smith all my life."

"How can that be?" exclaimed Marietta.

"All that I remember," went on Conchita, "is that I once had a fit, or fever, or some sort of disease, and when I recovered I was Mrs. Juana Smith. But of what happened before that time I have no recollection whatever, and my husband says that it is none of my business to know it. Nor do I care for it. I would rather enjoy the present than worry about what happened in the past. Will it not soon be time for the Carnival?"

"Yes, it begins in two weeks."

"Ah, well! Then you and I will go to the masquerade and have some fun."

Thus it was evident that Conchita was leading a double existence. When in her higher state of consciousness, or a "trance," her mind was at perfect rest and her own imagination inactive, she served as an instrument through which some

superior spirit, perhaps her own, could manifest its wisdom and use her organs of speech. But when the functions of her own physical brain again began their work by the awakening of her external consciousness, she exhibited all the traits of Juana. In fact, it seemed that she had come so much under the influence of that Indian girl that it was as if a part of Juana's very self had been implanted into her soul. Her sickness was apparently caused by the influence of that foreign element. At the time when she had come under the full control of her "magnetizers," they had commanded her to forget her whole past life and to believe that she was Mrs. Smith. All this is neither very wonderful, nor very incredible, for similar experiments have since then been performed by means of what is called "hypnotism," or to express it in plain language by a transmission of will.

Two days after the events described above, Pancho was again called to Conchita, whom he found entranced as before, and his visit was frequently repeated. And now we might write a whole volume of the teachings which Pancho received from her. But we cannot attempt to give in these pages even a tittle of them. A few extracts from some of the more comprehensible, only, must be given as characteristic specimens.

F. HARTMANN, M.D.

(To be continued.)



AN OPEN LETTER

TO THE READERS OF "LUCIFER" AND ALL TRUE THEOSOPHISTS.

AS LUCIFER was started as an organ of the T. S. and a means of communication between the senior editor and the numerous Fellows of our Society for their instruction; and as we find that the *great* majority of Subscribers are not members of the T. S., while our own Brothers have apparently little interest in, or sympathy with the efforts of the few real workers of the T. S. in this country—such a state of affairs can no longer be passed over in silence. The following lines are therefore addressed *personally* to every F. T. S., as to every reader interested in Theosophy—for their consideration.

I ask, is LUCIFER worthy of support or not? If it is not—then let us put an end to its existence. If it is, then how can it live when it is so feebly supported? Again, can nothing be devised to make it more popular or theosophically instructive? It is the earnest desire of the undersigned to come into closer relation of thought with her Theosophist readers. Any suggestion to further this end, therefore, will be carefully considered by me; and as it is impossible to please all readers, the best suggestions for the general good will be followed out. Will then, every reader try and realize that his help is now personally solicited for this effort of solidarity and Brotherhood? The monthly deficits of LUCIFER are considerable, but they would cheerfully be borne—as they have been for the last year by only two devoted Fellows—if it were felt that the magazine and the arduous efforts and work of its staff were appreciated and properly supported by Theosophists, which is not the case. To do real good and be enabled to disseminate theosophical ideas broadcast, the magazine has to reach ten times the numbers of readers that it does now. Every Subscriber F. T. S. has it in his power to help in this work: the rich subscribing for the poor, the latter trying to get subscriptions, and every other member making it his duty to notify every Brother

Theosophist of the present deplorable state of affairs, concerning the publication of our magazine. It needs a fund, which it has never had ; and it is absolutely necessary that a subscription list should be opened in its pages for donations towards such a publication fund of the magazine. Names of donators, or their initials and even pseudonyms—if they so desire it—will be published each month. It is but a few hundred pounds which are needed, but without these—LUCIFER will have to cease.

It is the *first* and last time that I personally make such an appeal, as any call for help, even for the cause so dear to us, has always been unutterably repugnant to me. But in the present case I am forced to sacrifice my personal feelings. Moreover what do we see around us? No appeal for any cause or movement that is considered good by its respective sympathisers, is ever left without response. The Englishman and the American are proverbially generous. Let "General" Booth clamour in his "War-Cry" for funds to support the Salvation Army, and thousands of pounds pour in from sympathetic Christians. Let any paper open a subscription list for any mortal thing, from the erection of an Institute for the inoculation of a virus, with its poisonous effects on future generations, the building of a church or statue, down to a presentation cup—and the hand of some portion of the public is immediately in its pocket. Even an appeal for funds for a "Home" for poor stray dogs, is sure to fill the subscription lists with names, and those who love the animals will gladly give their mite. Will then *Theosophists* remain more indifferent to the furtherance of a cause, which they must sympathise with, since they belong to it—than the general public would for street dogs? These seem hard words to say, but they are true, and justified by facts. No one knows better than myself the sacrifices made in silence by a few, for the accomplishment of all the work that has been done since I came to live in London two and a half years ago. The progress accomplished during this time by the Society in the face of every opposition—and it was terrible—shows that these efforts have not been made in vain. Yet, as none of these "few" possesses the purse of Fortunatus, there comes necessarily a day when even *they* cannot give what they no longer possess.

If this appeal is not responded to, then the energy that supports LUCIFER must be diverted into other channels.

Fraternally yours,
H. P. BLAVATSKY.

LUCIFER FUND.

SUMS RECEIVED THIS MONTH.

Countess C. Wachtmeister ...	£10 0 0	J. P. Mill	£1 0 0
G. R. S. Mead	5 0 0	A "Luciferian"	1 0 0
A Clerk	1 1 0	An Indigent Theosophist ...	0 7 6

Subscriptions to be sent to the Honorary Treasurer, the Countess C. Wachtmeister, 17, Lansdowne Road, Holland Park.



NOTICE.

ON Tuesday, November 5th 1889, a lecture will be delivered at *The Westminster Town Hall* by Colonel Olcott, President of the Theosophical Society, on *The Law of Life or Karma and Re-incarnation*.

The chair will be taken at 8 p. m. precisely. Doors open at 7. 30. Reserved seats 2/6; Unreserved 1/.

Theosophical Activities.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

PRESIDENTIAL ORDER.

I. THE desire to amend certain portions of the Rules of the Theosophical Society, adopted in the Convention which met at Adyar in December, 1888, having been notified to me officially by the representatives of three Sections, I hereby, and in accordance with Paragraph 11 of Section E, summon a Special Session of the General Council to meet at Adyar on the 27th of May, 1890, at noon, to consider and vote upon such amendments as may be offered.

II. The Councils of organized Sections shall select one or more Delegates or Proxies to represent them in the Special Session aforesaid.

III. For this reason and because of my necessary absence in Europe upon official business, the Convention will not meet this year as usual. But permission is hereby given to the President's Commissioners to invite all Fellows and Officers of the Society to meet socially at the Headquarters on the 27th of December, for mutual conference, and to listen to lectures upon theosophical topics, if, upon inquiry, they find that such a social gathering would be desired by a reasonable number of Fellows and Branches.

Sections and Branches will be expected to make the usual Annual returns not later than December 1st, so that they may be included in the President's Annual Address and Report.

IV. The Councils of Sections and Fellows generally are earnestly requested to draw up and notify to the President at Adyar, not later than the 1st of February, whatever changes they recommend to be made in the latest revised code of Rules, so that he may intimate the same to all other Sections in ample time for them to instruct their representatives in the Special Session herein provided for.

V. The British Section having misapprehended the intended effect of the new Rules upon the autonomous powers conceded to it in the Constitution granted by me in the month of November last, I hereby declare that the said Section is authorized, pending the final decision of the General Council in the Special Session above summoned, to collect the moneys and apply the other provisions of its Constitution as adopted and by me officially ratified.

VI. Should it hereafter appear that another date than the one I have designated would be more convenient for the Indian and Ceylon Sections, the President's Commissioners are hereby instructed to announce the change in the *Theosophist* and specially notify the General Secretaries of Sections at least three months in advance.

VII. The President's Commissioners will furnish copies of the present Order to all whom it may officially concern. Copies have already been sent to the General Secretaries of the British and American Sections.

H. S. OLCOTT,
PRESIDENT, THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

London, 27th September, 1889.

THE announcement of a lecture on "the Theosophical Society and its Work," to be given in South Place Institute by Colonel Olcott, the President of the Society, drew together an audience of all sorts and conditions of men, that filled in every corner the building whose walls once rang with the eloquence of W. J. Fox. There were to be seen well-known men and women from the scientific and social circles of England, mingling with the dark-skinned children of India and of Japan. Keen-eyed thinker jostled against dreamy-eyed enthusiast, poet rubbed shoulders with doctor, and women were as eager and earnest as men. Annie Besant took the chair, and mindful of a chairman's proper place, briefly introduced the lecturer, standing but for a minute or two between lecturer and expectant audience. Colonel Olcott was warmly greeted, and was listened to with close attention as he sketched the origin and history of the Society, told of its steady growth, expounded its objects, and pointed to the work it had done and the work it had yet to do. A hail of questions followed the address, some apposite, some very much the reverse. A good deal of amusement was caused by an answer from some one in the audience, when a ponderous gentleman in the gallery demanded how Colonel Olcott managed to secure a hearing from Brahmins and Buddhists, when he, the speaker, had spent twenty years in acquiring the knowledge of an Eastern tongue. "Brains" was the answer that rang out like a pistol-shot, to the delight of the audience and the disconcerting of the querist, ere yet the Colonel was on his feet to reply.

Press notices of the Lecture have been myriad in number, and have been sent in to headquarters from every part of the kingdom. As a "send off" for Colonel Olcott's lecturing tour, we could not have had a more satisfactory meeting, and the interest aroused promises well for the progress of Theosophy in England.

The reports in the London papers were on the whole fair, though shewing signs of the bewilderment of the reporters who, instead of a fire, a strike, or a sermon, found themselves plunged into an Oriental jungle. One paper only, the *St. James' Gazette*, shewed that ungenial type of weakness which, unable to be smart without being ill-natured, makes up in bitterness what it lacks in brilliancy.

On Sunday September 29th, at 8 p.m., Col. Olcott delivered a lecture on Theosophy at the Hatcham Liberal Club, New Cross. Although we are undoubtedly to be congratulated on the result, yet the circumstance which led to the President's appearance on the above platform is to be sincerely regretted. Herbert Burrows

F. T. S., a name deservedly held in affectionate respect by the workers of the East End, was to have been the speaker, but, utterly broken down by a dangerous attack of nervous prostration owing to his unflagging and unselfish exertions during the late strikes, had not the strength to fill the post.

That there is a growing interest in Theosophy among the workers is evidenced by the fact that this was, according to the Secretary, the largest and most interested audience of the season; in fact, the hall, holding some four or five hundred people, was crowded to its utmost limit, listeners standing at the bottom six deep. During the address, which lasted about an hour, the lecturer was listened to with marked attention; at first in silence but, as the audience became more familiar with the subject, strong expressions of approbation followed many of the points, ending in hearty applause as the President resumed his seat. As is usual in such clubs and societies, questions and a debate followed. Some fifteen people rose in turn and either asked for information or objected to the statements of the lecturer, finding especial difficulty in the acceptance of a possibility of psychic phenomena or in the probability of re-incarnation as a scientific tenet of philosophy. In this severe trial the lecturer was more successful even than in his address, and invariably gained the applause of the audience, who, first of all sympathising with the questions and objections and thinking them unanswerable, were astonished, apparently not without pleasure, to hear these seemingly insuperable difficulties so readily surmounted.

Two speeches were then made in opposition; one a very clever and witty reasoning by a materialist who, making his own assumptions with regard to re-incarnation and the human Ego, entangled himself in most amusing and paradoxical knots, fondly imagining that he was convicting Theosophy of like absurdities, and so won the good humour of the audience to his side. It was, however, short-lived; for the lecturer, after pointing out the falsity of his assumptions, at once won the smiles back by slyly hinting that if the objector continued to use his brains as vigorously as he had done that evening, he would undoubtedly be a Socrates in his next birth.

The second speaker prophesied for modern scientific and materialistic methods the power of accounting for all phenomena, and contended that Eastern science and thought were not supported by the adhesion of any scientist of repute, instancing Professor Crookes whom he admitted to be the foremost of chemists. The answer was short and trenchant. Whatever the *possibilities* of science may be, it *does not* explain mental phenomena and therefore a prophecy does not aid our investigations: Professor Crookes is a member of the T. S.

At the end of the meeting a hearty vote of thanks was passed to the chairman, and the audience dispersed apparently well pleased with the evening's debate.

COL. OLCOTT'S LECTURING TOUR.

AT MERTHYR TYDFIL.

At the Abermorlais Hall, Merthyr, on Wednesday the 2nd Oct., Col. Olcott delivered a lecture on the question "What is Theosophy?" The Colonel commenced his address by marking the growth that had attended the Theo-

sophical movement during the past 10 years, showing that, without any other means of organized propagandism than the press, the Doctrines of Theosophy had commended themselves to thousands, and the Society had thus grown. Theosophy sought to establish a common ground for Science and Theology. It, therefore, sought to place Religion on its proper basis by bringing it into relationship with exact science. This was the conclusion to which eventually the churches must be forced by necessity.

The Colonel then proceeded to enunciate the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation, describing the former as the law of Ethical Causation and showing the necessity for the latter. He pointed out that orthodox Religion in the West asserted a belief in the Divine Justice, but as it did not teach the existence of the soul prior to incarnation, nor the fact that this life is not the first of its kind, it failed to give any consistent reason for the inequalities of human existence to-day.

The septenary constitution of man's being and the cyclic law of evolution were then explained, the lecturer showing that the existence of other degrees of matter than those known to science and the possibility of other centres of Consciousness than those of the physical body, was a theory which, while it did not clash with the scientific speculations of to-day, afforded a secure basis for the construction of a Religious belief.

In conclusion the lecturer remarked that Theosophy did not intend to offer itself as one more sect to the many which now existed, but it aimed at uniting all in a spirit of religious tolerance and Human Brotherhood.

The lecture was well attended and listened to with interest throughout. A reverend gentleman of the Unitarian Church moved a vote of thanks to the lecturer for his interesting and instructive address, and the Colonel was heartily applauded.

AT TENBY.

Colonel Olcott delivered a lecture at the Assembly Rooms, Tenby, on October 3rd. The subject of the address was "Theosophy—the Wisdom-Religion." The lecture was commenced by a definition of the term "Theosophy," and it was said to be equivalent, or nearly so, to the Guptavidya of the East. A study of Aryan literature, during the past 50 years particularly, had shown that there was no school of thought in the present day which had not its parallel and equivalent in the ancient teachings of the East.

Just as we regard the West as the chief school of physics, so we regard the Orient as holding the most reliable views upon metaphysics, and this because it has been chiefly studied there, and thus its teachers are specialists in this direction.

The Colonel then went on to speak of Practical Altruism, which constitutes the primary object of the Theosophical Society, and which, he said, does not admit of the distinctions which circumscribe all existing sectarianism. In reading the report of the address delivered at the Church Congress by the Primate of All England, he had noticed the preponderance of Church politics and the conspicuous absence of any reference to Jesus or his altruistic teachings. If religion had no surer basis than that which rested on political bias, then it was a question only of time as to its power in the world. Amongst all those

who were supposed to be following the teachings of Jesus, how many would have passed into the room to-night if He had been the doorkeeper and had admitted only those who lived as He had directed, the lecturer would not undertake to say. Out in the East a man's security of salvation depended on the class of men with whom he eats. Here in the West it seemed to be a matter of whether he paid his tithes or not. Such was the degraded condition of sectarian and political religion. Humanity however had a common origin, it had a common destiny, and under the necessity of a common nature it should have a common cause. This was the belief and aim of Theosophy, this was its whole platform, and therefore he could see no reason why all who had the interests of the human soul at heart, should not join in the movement which had been thus begun.

After the lecture some questions were asked by the audience and satisfactorily answered by the Lecturer. The meeting was exceptionally large for the season and district, the Hall being filled. A vote of thanks was proposed and heartily responded to.

A drawing-room meeting of some of the members and friends in Tenby was held at the Hon. Mrs. Malcolm's house on the following afternoon, when many questions in relation to the Society and its teachings were discussed.

ON Saturday October 5th, Colonel Olcott arrived in Liverpool where he remains till the 13th, lecturing several times, both in public and private, during his stay there. His principal public lecture has been fixed for the 10th, and on the 9th he is to address a semi-public meeting of the Liverpool Lodge and their friends.

On Saturday October 12th, the Colonel leaves for Dublin where he delivers a public lecture on Monday evening, the 14th. On Tuesday 15th, he lectures at Limerick, on Thursday, 17th, at Belfast, and on Saturday, 19th, a second time in Dublin.

After that date his movements are at present not yet finally settled, excepting that he will lecture in the Masonic Hall Birmingham on Tuesday evening October 29th, with Annie Besant in the chair.

His next lecture in London will be on Tuesday evening November 5th in the Town Hall Westminster.

Among the forces that are working for Theosophy is that of the so-called Hypnotism—Mesmerism under a new name. "Mesmerism," "Animal Magnetism," "Odic Force," and many other names, have been given to the form of influence which has now been introduced into good society and recognised by science under the name of Hypnotism. After the contempt poured on Mesmerism, it would have been too humiliating to admit that it was a real force deserving careful study; so, to preserve the more than papal infallibility of the medical faculty, it was necessary to find a new name for the old thing, and present it under an *alias* which should not shock delicate susceptibilities. Two societies are in process of formation in London, for the study of Hypnotism, and it is already being used, apart from these societies, for moral reform. The *Daily News* has devoted two columns of large type to "Cure by Suggestion," and—after remarking that the "mystery of hypnotism" has been "an avowed factor" in Mrs. Annie Besant's "singular conversion" to the "Theosophy of Madame

Blavatsky"—it proceeds to recount the successes of the Rev. Arthur Tooth—whilom of Hatcham fame—at Woodside, Croydon, in the "mental treatment" of dipsomaniacs and others. Mr. Tooth, throwing a dipsomaniac into the hypnotic trance, tells him that whisky is a violent poison to him, that if he smells it he will feel nausea, and he will be ill if he takes it. In one case a gentleman of forty-three years of age, who was a wreck from the excessive use of stimulants, was under Mr. Tooth's care for four months. He left off the use of alcohol, lived chiefly on a milk diet, "underwent a medical examination and was pronounced to be cured," and has made a fresh start in life. Facts of this sort force indifferent people to believe that "there is something in Hypnotism"; we warn them that if they start with Hypnotism they will find themselves landed, sooner or later, in Theosophy. For the human mind will not rest content in the contemplation of a collection of unrelated facts. Inevitably it will seek for an explanation, it will begin to theorise; and theorising in the psychical realm will draw it nearer and nearer to the Masters in Psychology, the Adepts of the Wisdom of the Orient.

"Going to and Fro in the Earth."

Our Monthly Report.

THEOSOPHISTS cannot complain, just now, that they are suffering from a conspiracy of silence on the part of the press. In fact there seems to be sweeping over England a wave of curiosity and enquiry as regards Theosophy, while we are favoured with enough and to spare of criticism wise and—otherwise. The London *Globe* expatiates on Buddhism in Japan, which, being translated, is Olcott in that sunny land; it dilates on "Spirits in Council," which, being translated, is Theosophy, Olcott, and H. P. B.; yet once more—and all this in the same issue—it considers, "The invention of new Religions," which, being translated, is H. P. B., Olcott and Theosophy. Naturally the *Globe* is hostile, but it does not allow itself to be betrayed into deliberate unfairness, and that is much now-a-days.

* * *

The *Weekly Times and Echo* is enlivened with a controversial correspondence on the respective merits of Atheism, Theosophy, and Christianity, mostly noticeable for the voluminous ignorance shewn by the correspondents of the *isms* they attack, ignorance promptly exposed by other correspondents belonging to the assailed creeds. On the whole, controversy would be more edifying if those who take part in it would take the trouble to acquaint themselves with the views they controvert, and would exclude matters which do not touch on the questions in dispute.

* * *

The *Christian Commonwealth* is much exercised in mind over what it calls "The Buddhist Craze," and it opines that "no one would expect such a person as Mrs. Besant to become enraptured with anything that is not susceptible of the clearest proof, unless her mind had first become somewhat unhinged." This suggestion it borrows from its whilom antagonist, Mr. G. W. Foote, who has been stating from the platform that this is the explanation of Annie Besant's

adoption of Theosophy; he, however, ascribes the unhinging to the loss of her daughter suffered by her twelve years ago at Christian hands. The cause and effect are somewhat far apart in time, and maybe the *Christian Commonwealth*, while adopting the method of attack, will not care to saddle its religion with the responsibility of the "unhinging." We fancy we have read somewhere that a similar accusation was flung at one Paul by a gentleman named Festus; nathless Paul cut a deeper mark in the world's spiritual history than did his somewhat uncourteous judge. May it not be just possible, we venture to whisper, that now, as in earlier times, those who are scoffed at as madmen and dreamers may only be a few steps ahead of their fellows. The *Christian Commonwealth* uneasily admits that among the adherents of "Spiritualism and Theosophy" are some of "the brightest intellects of our day." Is it not conceivable that there may be something to be said for a philosophy that attracts these brightest ones?

* * *

In a Spiritualistic *Weekly*, (not *Light*) we find the following delightful if even malicious "flapdoodles" probably inspired by the wits from the Summer Land.

"We gather that the term 'Mahatma' with which the Theosophists mystify their dupes (*this, from an editor who advertises, and patronises Spiritualistic Mediums!*) is applied to such reformers as Ram Mohun Roy, who was the founder of Brahmoism, as Mr. Oxley recently showed in his article on Chunder Sen. With a term derived from a foreign language Mme. Blavatsky has succeeded nicely in bewildering John Bull, Brother Jonathan, etc. It reminds us of the pious old Scotch woman who derived much holy delight from a contemplation of that 'blessed word—Mesopotamia.'"

The above "reminds" Theosophists of the quack Doctor Dulcamara who, from the eminence of his rickety platform, raised in the midst of a fair, pours on the heads of the "University" men the vials of his wrath. In this case, it is an editor who supports the phenomena produced by the "departed *angels*" through thick and thin, and who attacks those who do not believe in those inaterializing seraphs. It does not take long to expose his ignorance. "Mahatma" is a word as old in India as the Sanskrit tongue. It means "great soul," and as it may be applied to every grand and noble heart Ram Mohun Roy deserved it as much as any other sincere and learned philanthropist and reformer, such as he undeniably was. It is not Mr. Oxley who made the discovery; but the editor of the said Spiritualistic *Weekly* may be pardoned for being ignorant of the fact. As for that other assertion namely, that it is with this "term" that Mdme. Blavatsky has succeeded *in bewildering* John Bull, Brother Jonathan, it is as false as all the rest. The person of that name had never pronounced the term "Mahatma" (having used quite another and a more telling one) in America. It was first used by Mr. Sinnett in his "*Esoteric Buddhism*," because the Hindu Theosophists used it, applying this adjective to the MASTERS. When, oh, when will the benighted editors who bark at our heels, vainly trying to snap at them, "speak the truth and nothing but the truth"—*à la lettre, nota bene*, not as in the present courts of justice.

* * *

Slander of the living and slander of the dead! Quite in the spirit of the modern Press. One of the last skits at Theosophy in the *Evening Express* of Liverpool, asking "who are the Theosophists," gravely informs the public that

the first Theosophists date from the XVIth century and were the "followers . . . of the low-lived humbug, who adopted the high-sounding appellation of Aureolus Theophrastus Paracelsus" . . . a "coarse, vulgar, drunken, and debauched physician, alchemist and astrologer." And then the *Express* winds up its scientific disquisition by the following lofty Parthian arrow: "In his own day his (Paracelsus') reputation chiefly depended upon his position as a 'quack,' for he pretended to the discovery of an elixir for indefinitely prolonging life. Such was the original Theosophist. People may guess the aims of the body who have adopted the designation," (*i.e.*, the Theosophical "body").

The editors of papers desiring to support their reputation of literary catapults, engines used by the ancient Greeks and Romans for throwing stones and missiles at the enemy, would do well to train their young men and themselves in History. The first historical Theosophists—*i.e.*, those who first used the name, not those who first taught the doctrines—according to the best writers, were the *Neoplatonists* of the Eclectic Theosophical system in the third century, and even earlier.* Paracelsus was not a "quack"; and if he is to be called so, then the Patriarch of the French Chemists, Dr. Brown Sequard who claims now to have discovered the elixir for prolonging life, and Professor Hammond who supports and corroborates him,† ought to share in the flattering epithet. There are more "quacks" *inside* than *outside* of the royal and imperial colleges of surgeons and physicians. As to the fling that concludes the ignorant attack, it falls harmless. The aims of the T. S. are now better known than ever, and no one need be ashamed of them. We only wish the aims of the *civilized* press were as lofty.

* * *

The editors of *LUCIFER* offer their sincerest condolences to the Chief of the Detective Department of the Government of India. His most cherished ancient delusion has been shattered. He had inoculated the Anglo-Indian mind with the notion that H. P. Blavatsky was "a Russian spy"; and *faute de mieux* the enterprising emissary and detective of the London Society for Psychical Research had adopted the same theory to injure his intended victims of the T. S. By repercussion the idea had spread through Anglo-Indian channels, like the cholera *bacillus*, to some extent, to the mother country. The Theosophical Society was founded, its phenomena produced, and the "Adepts" *invented*, you see, as a screen for "Russian intrigues" in India—as stated in the famous "Report" of the S. P. R. That no Russian roubles could be traced from the St. Petersburg Bureaux into our pockets, nor any sign be detected of our enjoyment of a "spy's" emoluments, was a trifling detail; the theory was convenient and enthusiastically adopted. But now comes the Russian censor to prick the balloon in which our amiable traducers were soaring above the level of homely facts; and if they are not endowed with adamant "cheek," such as the American humourist assigns to the "lightning-rod canvasser," they must perceive the ridiculous position in which they are placed. Denied a "spy's" reward, and left by the heartless "Imperial censorship" to die or live, as we best may, Mr. Pobedonostseff would

* *Vide* "The Key to Theosophy," 1st chapter.

† See *North American Review* for September 1889, first article, "The Elixir of Life," by Dr. William A. Hammond. The ingredients of which Dr. Brown Sequard's *elixir* is composed are, moreover, of such a filthy nature that the school of modern *Vivisectors* can alone boast of it. The Theosophists call this *elixir* blasphemy against nature and bestiality, if not black magic.—[ED.]

forbid his compatriots even to read what we Theosophists write. The popular tradition that the antipathy between the Russian and British Governments is fanned by the Conservative party is thus now disproved by the above fact and also by the following: Mr. Smith, the leader of the House of Commons boycotts LUCIFER in his railway book-stalls, while the Imperial Russian censorship does the same for us in the Empire of the White Tzar. Whether this is a result of the exchange of confidential dispatches, or the benevolent interference of our Karma, which, by causing our literature to become "forbidden fruit," must end by making it the more attractive to both publics—it is not for us to say. Yet we humbly thank his Excellency the chief Censor of the Russian metropolis for the wide advertisement given to us. In any other country it would at once double the circulation of our books; in this country of paradoxes, however—"God knoweth."

Meanwhile we cut out the comminatory paragraph from the *Pall Mall Gazette* of Sept. 20th, inviting to it the attention of our readers and those benighted editors who are inclined to still see in "Mdme. Blavatsky"—"a Russian spy."

ENGLISH BOOKS PROHIBITED IN RUSSIA.

Mr. F. von Szczepanski, of the well-known house of Carl Ricker, at St. Petersburg, sends to the *Publishers' Circular* the following complete list of all English publications the prohibition of whose sale in Russia has been decreed by the Imperial censorship during the first six months of the current year:—

AMARAVELLA, "PARABRAHM." Translated by G. R. S. Mead. Revised and enlarged by the Author. 1889.

BLAVATSKY (H. P.), "THE SECRET DOCTRINE: the Synthesis of Science, Religion, and Philosophy." 2nd edition. 1888.

Drage (G.), "Cyril: A Romantic Novel." 1889.

Gunter (Arch. Clav.), "That Frenchman!" 1889.

Ingersoll (R. T.), "Social Salvation: A Lay Sermon." 1888.

Ingersoll (R. T.), "The Household of Faith." 1888.

Krapotkine (P.), "In Russian and French Prisons." 1887.

"Ladies' Treasury of Literature." Edited by Mrs. Warren. Vol. XIII.

Sergeant (L.), "The Government Year Book." 1889.

SINNETT (A. P.), "THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT." April 15, 1888.

Stepniak, "The Russian Peasantry." 2 vols. 1888.

Swallow (Henry F.), "The Catherines of History." Second edition. 1888.

"THEOSOPHY AND THE CHURCHES: Lucifer to the Archbishop of Canterbury."

Watson (Sydney), "Marie, the Exile of Siberia." (Horner's Penny Stories for the People.)

Angels and ministers of grace, defend us! What have the poor Theosophists, the conservative Mr. A. P. Sinnett included, to do in the company of such terrible personages as Messrs. Stepniak and Krapotkine? We fervently hope that the "mild" Theosophist is not going to be confounded by Mr. Pobedonostseff with the warlike Nihilists?

* * *

We can do no better before closing our laborious journey "to and fro in the Earth" than by quoting from a paper—of some ornithological name—a clever skit at the hopeless ignorance of the world about Theosophy. It is a faithful

record of the average conversation about it in the London drawing-rooms, during afternoon "teas":—

"AFTER HEARING MRS. BESANT.

MISS SMYTH: Oh! my dear Miss Jonesky, how glad I am you have called. I hear you went to hear Mrs. Besant on Sunday. What is all this talk about your trying to get a profit out of Phisosophy?

MISS JONESKY (*severely*): Trying to become a prophetess of Theosophy, I suppose you mean, my dear.

MISS S.: Yes, that's it. Sit down and tell us all about it.

MISS J.: Well, my love, you can't think what a sweet thing it is—all about *Altruism* and *Karma*, and the reincarnation of the *Ego* and—er—*Karma-rupa*, and *Prana* and *Linga Sharira*, er—er—er.

MISS S.: Oh! that must be nice. And what do they all look like?

MISS J.: What do which look like?

MISS S.: Why, the *Prana* and the *Karma* and the *Ego* and—the other dear little things!

MISS J.: (*with a very superior smile*): My dear child, you don't understand. *Karma* is a kind of state that—er—as Mrs. Besant says "presides over each reincarnation, so that the *Ego* passes into such physical and mental environment as it deserves."

MISS S.: Does it really, now? How exquisitely lovely! And what about the other darlings?

MISS J.: Well, the *Sat* or Be-ness is a sort of—er—esoteric cosmogenesis that—er—in fact—differentiates *Altruism*, and *Karma* by the *Linga Sharira* or astral body, and is the causation of the *Ego*, assuming the *Manas*, or something of that.

MISS S.: How delightfully soothing it seems! Let us go and have some. (*Exeunt enthusiastically.*)"

* * *

"H. P. BLAVATSKY 'EXPELLED'!"

THE newest cock and bull story giving the rounds as we find in a paragraph just received is the following:—

MADAME BLAVATSKY.

Much excitement is caused in esoteric circles by a published statement of Dr. Coues, who asserts that Madame Blavatsky has been expelled from the Theosophical Society.

This is from the New York correspondent of the *Sunday Times*. We offer our thanks to him and beg to inform the credulous correspondent of two facts. 1. It is Dr. Coues who was publicly expelled from the T. S. for untheosophical statements. 2. We have read that the Small Branch of the American T. S. called the *Gnostic*, threatened through their President Dr. Coues to expel Mdme. Blavatsky—from *their hearts*, I suppose, as this was their sole privilege. But as the said Branch was officially *unchartered* by the Council of the American Section at the same time that its President was expelled—the threat remained what it always was—a poor boast dictated by wounded vanity.

ADVERSARY.

Correspondence.

WHAT SHALL WE DO FOR OUR FELLOW-MEN.

You have obliged my friends and myself by answering or annotating my letter to you in your number of July 15th. Will you allow us to continue this discussion? Several letters which I have received in consequence of this correspondence not only from Germany, but also from England,* make it appear likely that your readers on the other side of the Channel also take an interest in this all-important question. As the purport of my former communication has been misunderstood, I have now made this question the title of my present letter, in order to emphasize the point. My friends and I did not ask: Shall we do *anything* for our fellow-men or *nothing*? but: *What* shall we do for them?

You agree with us—as your note *d* to my last letter (pg. 431) unmistakably shows—that the ultimate Goal which the mystic or the occultist have to strive for, is not perfection IN existence (the “world”) but *absolute being*: that is, we have to strive for deliverance FROM all existence in any of the three worlds or planes of existence. The difference of opinions, however, is this: Shall we now, nevertheless, assist all our fellow-men indiscriminately in their *worldly* affairs; shall we occupy ourselves with their national and individual Karma, in order to help them to improve the “world” and to live happily *in* it; shall we strive *with* them to realize socialistic problems, to further science, arts and industries, to teach them cosmology, the evolution of man and of the universe, etc, etc,—or on the other hand, shall we only do the best we can to show our fellow-men the road of wisdom that will lead them *out* of the world and as straight as possible towards their acknowledged goal of absolute existence (*Para-Nirvana, Moksha, Atma*)? Shall we consequently only work for those who are willing to get rid of all individual existence and yearning to be delivered from all selfishness, from all strivings, who are longing only for eternal peace?

Answer. As the undersigned accepts for her views and walk in life no authority dead or living, no system of philosophy or religion but one—namely, *the esoteric teachings of ethics and philosophy of those she calls “MASTERS”*—answers have, therefore, to be given strictly in accordance with these teachings. My first reply then is: Nothing of that which is conducive to help man, collectively or individually, to live—not “happily”—but less *unhappily* in this world, ought to be indifferent to the Theosophist-Occultist. It is no concern of his whether his help benefits a man in his *worldly* or *spiritual* progress; his first duty is to be ever ready to help if he can, without stopping to philosophize. It is because our clerical and lay Pharisees too often offer a Christian dogmatic tract, instead of the simple bread of life to the wretches they meet—whether these are starving physically or morally—that pessimism, materialism and despair win with every day more ground in our age. Weal and woe, or happiness and misery, are relative terms. Each of us finds them according to his or her predilections; one in worldly, the other in intellectual pursuits, and no one system will ever satisfy all. Hence, while one finds his pleasure and rest in family joys, another in “Socialism” and the third in a “longing only for eternal peace,” there may be those who are starving for truth, in every department of the science of nature, and who consequently are yearning to learn the esoteric views about “cosmology, the evolution of man and of the Universe.”—H.P.B.

* Perchance also, from Madras?—[Ed.]

According to our opinion the latter course is the right one for a mystic ; the former one we take to be a statement of our views. Your notes to my former letter are quite consistent with this view, for in your note *c* you say : "Paranirvana is reached only when the Manvantara has closed and during the 'night' of the universe or Pralaya." If the final aim of paranirvana *cannot* be attained individually, but only solidarily by the whole of the present humanity, it stands to reason, that in order to arrive at our consummation we have not only to do the best we can for the suppression of our own self, but that we have to work first for the world-process to hurry all the worldly interests of Hottentots and the European vivisectioners having sufficiently advanced to see their final goal of salvation are ready to join us in striving towards that deliverance.

Answer. According to our opinion as there is no essential difference between a "mystic" and a "Theosophist-Esotericist" or Eastern Occultist, the above cited course is *not* "the right one for a mystic." One, who while "yearning to be delivered from all selfishness" directs at the same time all his energies only to that portion of humanity which is of his own way of thinking, shows himself not only very *selfish* but is guilty of prejudice and partiality. When saying that *Paru*, or *Parinirvana* rather, is reached only at the Manvantaric close, I never meant to imply the "planetary" but the whole *Cosmic* Manvantara, *i.e.*, at the end of "an *age*" of Brahmā, not one "Day." For this is the only time when during the *universal* Pralaya mankind (*i.e.*, not only the terrestrial *mankind* but that of every "man" or "*manu*-bearing" globe, star, sun or planet) will reach "solidarily" Parinirvana, and even then it will not be the whole mankind, but only those portions of the mankind which will have made themselves ready for it. Our correspondent's remark about the "Hottentots" and "European vivisectioners" seems to indicate to my surprise that my learned Brother has in his mind only our little unprogressed *Terrene* mankind?—H. P. B.

You have the great advantage over us, that you speak with absolute certainty on all these points, in saying : "this is the esoteric doctrine," and "such is the teaching of my masters." We do not think that we have any such certain warrant for *our* belief ; on the contrary, we want to learn, and are ready to receive, wisdom, wherever it may offer itself to us. We know of no authority or divine revelation ; for, as far as we accept Vedantic or Budhistic doctrines, we only do so because we have been convinced by the reasons given ; or, where the reasons prove to be beyond our comprehension, but where our intuition tells us : this, nevertheless, is likely to be true, we try our best to make our understanding follow our intuition.

Answer. I speak "with absolute certainty" only so far as my own *personal* belief is concerned. Those who have not the *same* warrant for their belief as I have, would be very credulous and foolish to accept it on blind faith. Nor does the writer believe any more than her correspondent and his friends in any "authority" let alone "divine revelation"! Luckier in this than they are, I need not even rely in this as they do on my *intuition*, as there is no *infallible* intuition. But what I do believe in is (1), the unbroken oral teachings revealed by living *divine* men during the infancy of mankind to the elect among men ; (2), that it has reached us *unaltered* ; and (3) that the MASTERS are thoroughly versed in the science based on such uninterrupted teaching.—H. P. B.

In reference, therefore, to your note *c*, it was not, nor is it, our intention "to inflict any criticism on you" ; on the contrary we should never waste time with opposing anything we think wrong ; we leave that to its own fate ; but we try rather to get at positive information or arguments, wherever we think they may offer themselves. Moreover, we have never denied, nor shall we ever forget, that we owe you great and many thanks for your having originated the present movement and for having made popular many striking ideas hitherto foreign to European civilization. We should now feel further obliged to you, if you (or your masters) will give us some reasons, which could make it appear likely to us,

why paranirvana could *not* be attained by any *jiva* at any time (*a*), and why the

Answer (a). There is some confusion here. I never said that no *jiva* could attain Parinirvana, nor meant to infer that "the final goal can only be reached solidarily" by our present humanity. This is to attribute to me an ignorance to which I am not prepared to plead guilty, and in his turn my correspondent has misunderstood me. But as every system in India teaches several kinds of *pralayas* as also of Nirvanic or "Moksha" states, Dr. Hübbe Schleiden has evidently confused the *Prakrita* with the *Naimittika* Pralaya, of the Visishtadwaita Vedantins. I even suspect that my esteemed correspondent has imbibed more of the teachings of this particular sect of the three Vedantic schools than he had bargained for; that his "Brahmin Guru" in short, of whom there are various legends coming to us from Germany, has coloured his pupil far more with the philosophy of Sri Ramanujacharya, than with that of Sri Sankaracharya. But this is a trifle connected with circumstances beyond his control and of a Karmic character. His aversion to "Cosmology" and other sciences including theogony, and as contrasted with "Ethics" pure and simple, dates also from the period he was taken in hand by the said learned guru. The latter expressed it personally to us, after his sudden *salto mortali* from esotericism—too difficult to comprehend and therefore to teach,—to *ethics* which any one who knows a Southern language or two of India, can impart by simply translating his texts from philosophical works with which the country abounds. The result of this is, that my esteemed friend and correspondent talks Visishtadwaitism as unconsciously as M. Jourdain talked "prose," while believing he argues from the Mahayana and Vedantic standpoint—pure and simple. If otherwise, I place myself under correction. But how can a Vedantin speak of *Jivas* as though these were *separate* entities and independent of JIVATMA the one universal soul! This is a purely Visishtadwaita doctrine which asserts that Jivatma is different in each individual from that in another individual? He asks "why parinirvana could *not* be attained by any *jiva* at any time." We answer that if by "jiva" he means the "Higher Self" or the *divine ego* of man, only—then we say it may reach Nirvana, not Parinirvana, but even this, only when one becomes *Jivanmukta*, which does *not* mean "at any time." But if he understands by "Jiva" simply the *one life* which, the Visishtadwaitas say is contained in every particle of matter, separating it from the *saiva* or body that contains it, then, we do not understand at all what he means. For, we do not agree that Parabrahm only *pervades* every Jiva, as well as each particle of matter, but say that Parabrahm is inseparable from every Jiva, as from every particle of matter since it is the *absolute*, and that IT is in truth that Jivatma itself *crystallised*—for want of a better word. Before I answer his questions, therefore, I must know whether he means by Parinirvana, the same as I do, and of which of the *Pralayas* he is talking. Is it of the *Prakrita* Maha Pralaya, which takes place every 311,040,000,000,000 years; or of the *Naimittika* Pralaya occurring after each *Brahma Kalpa* equal to 1,000, Maha Yugas, or which? Convincing reasons can be given then only when two disputants understand each other. I speak from the esoteric standpoint almost identical with the Advaita interpretation; Dr. Hübbe Schleiden argues from that of—let him say *what* system, for, lacking omniscience, I cannot tell.—H.P.B.

final goal can only be reached solidarily by the whole of the humanity living at present. In order to further this discussion, I will state here some of the reasons which appear to speak against this view, and I will try to further elucidate some of the consequences of acting in accordance with each of these two views:

1. The unselfishness of the Altruist has a very different character according to which of the two views he takes. To begin with *our* view, the true Mystic who believes that he can attain deliverance from the world and from his individuality independent of the Karma of any other entities, or of the whole humanity, is an Altruist, because and so far as he is a monist, that is to say, on account of the *tat tvam asi*. Not the form or the individuality, but the *being* of all entities is the same and is his own; in proportion as he feels his own *avidya*, *agnana* or unwisdom, so does he feel that of other entities, and has compassion with them on that account. (*b*) To take now the other view: Is not the altruism of an

(*b*). To feel "compassion" without an adequate practical result ensuing from it is not to show oneself an "Altruist" but the reverse. Real self-development on the esoteric lines is *action*. "Inaction in a deed of mercy becomes an *action* in a deadly sin." (*Vide The Two Paths* in the "Voice of the Silence," p. 31.)—H.P.B.

occultist who sees himself tied to the Karma of all his fellow-men, and who, on that account, labours for and with them, rather an egotistical one? For is not

at the bottom of his "unselfishness" the knowledge that he cannot work out his own salvation at any lesser price? The escape from selfishness for such a man is self-sacrifice for the "world"; for the mystic, however, it is self-sacrifice to the eternal, to absolute being. Altruism is certainly considered one of the first requirements of any German Theosopher we can or will not speak for others—but we are rather inclined to think that altruism had never been demanded in this country in the former sense (of self-sacrifice *for* the "world"), but only in the latter sense of self-sacrifice to the eternal.(c)

(c). An Occultist does not feel "himself tied to the Karma of all his fellow men," no more than one man feels his legs motionless because of the paralysis of another man's legs. But this does not prevent the fact that the legs of both are evolved from, and contain the same ultimate essence of the ONE LIFE. Therefore, there can be no *egotistical* feeling in his labours for the less favoured brother. Esoterically, there is no other *way, means or method* of sacrificing oneself "to the eternal" than by working and sacrificing oneself for the collective spirit of Life, embodied in, and (for us) represented in its highest divine aspect by Humanity alone. Witness the *Nirmanakāya*,—the sublime doctrine which no Orientalist understands to this day but which Dr. Hübbe Schleiden can find in the Hind and IInd Treatises in the "*Voice of the Silence*." Naught else shows forth the eternal; and in no other way than this can any mystic or occultist *truly* reach the eternal, whatever the Orientalists and the vocabularies of Buddhist terms may say, for the real meaning of the *Trikāya*, the triple power of Buddha's embodiment, and of Nirvāna in its triple negative and positive definitions has ever escaped them.

If our correspondent believes that by calling himself "theosopher" in preference to "theosophist" he escapes thereby any idea of *sophistry* connected with his views, then he is mistaken. I say it in all sincerity, the opinions he expresses in his letters are in my humble judgment the very fruit of sophistry. If I have misunderstood him, I stand under correction.—H. P. B.

2. It is a misunderstanding, if you think in your note *e*, that we are advocating entire "withdrawal or isolation from the world." We do so as little as yourself, but only recommend an "ascetic life," as far as it is necessary to prepare anyone for those tasks imposed upon him by following the road to *final* deliverance from the world. But the consequence of your view seems to lead to joining the world in a *worldly* life, and until good enough reasons are given for it, we do not approve of this conduct. That we should have to join our fellow men in all their *worldly* interests and pursuits, in order to assist them and hasten them on to the solidary and common goal, is contrary to our intuition.(a) To strive for the

Answer. (a) It is difficult to find out how the view expressed in my last answer can lead to such an inference, or where have I adv.sed my brother Theosophists to join men "in all their *worldly* interests and pursuits! Useless to quote here again that which is said in note *a*, for every one can turn to the passage and see that I have said nothing of the kind. For one precept I can give a dozen. "Not nakedness, not plaited hair, not dirt, not fasting or lying on the earth. . . not sitting motionless, can purify one who has not overcome desires," says *Dhammapada* (chap. 1., 141). "Neither abstinence from fish or flesh, nor going naked, nor the shaving of the head, nor matted hair, etc. etc., will cleanse a man not free from delusions" *Amagandha Sutta* (7, 11). This is what I meant. Between salvation through dirt and stench, like St. Labro and some Fakirs, and worldly life with an eye to every interest, there is a long way. Strict asceticism in the midst of the world, is more meritorious than avoiding those who do not think as we do, and thus losing an opportunity of showing them the truth.—H. P. B.

deliverance *from* the world by furthering and favouring the world-process seems rather a round-about method. Our inclination leads us to retire from all *worldly* life, and to work apart—from a monastery or otherwise—together with and for all *those* fellow-men who are striving for the same goal of deliverance, and who are willing to rid themselves of all karma, their own as well as that of others. We would assist also *ali* those who have to remain in worldly life, but who are already looking forward to the same goal of release, and who join us in doing

their best to attain this end. We make no secret of our aims or our striving ; we lay our views and our reasons before *anyone* who will hear them, and we are ready to receive amongst us *anyone* who will *honestly* join us.(b) Above all,

(b). So do we. And if, not all of us live up to our highest ideal of wisdom, it is only because we are *men* not gods, after all. But there is one thing, however, we never do (those in the esoteric circle, at any rate) : *we set ourselves as examples to no men*, for we remember well that precept in Amagandha Sutta that says : "Self-praise, disparaging others, conceit, evil communications (denunciations), these constitute (moral) uncleanness " ; and again, as in the *Dhammapada*, "The fault of others is easily perceived, but that of oneself is difficult to perceive ; the faults of others one lays open as much as possible, but one's own fault one hides, as a cheat hides the bad die from the gambler."—H. P. B.

however, we are doing out best to live up to our highest ideal of wisdom ; and perhaps the good example may prove to be more useful to our fellow-men than any organized propaganda of teaching.

By the bye, in your note you couple together *Schopenhauer* and *Eduard von Hartmann*. In this question, however, both are of opposite opinions. Schopenhauer, like most German mystics and theosophers, represents the views of Vedanta and (exoteric) Buddhism, that final salvation can, and can only, be individually attained independent of time and the karma of others. Hartmann, however, verges much more towards your opinion, for he does not believe in *individual* consummation and deliverance from the world ; he thinks all mysticism and particularly that which is now known as Indian philosophy, an error, and demands of everyone as an altruistic duty to give himself up to the world-process, and to do his best in order to hasten its end. (He is the "clever modern philosopher" whom I have mentioned on page 435).(c)

(c). As I have never read von Hartmann, and know very little of Schopenhauer, nor do they interest me, I have permitted myself only to bring them forward as examples of the worst kind of pessimism ; and you corroborate what I said, by what you state of Hartmann. If, however, as you say, Hartmann thinks "Indian philosophy an error," then he cannot be said to *verge* toward *my* opinion, as I hold quite a contrary view. India might return the compliment with interest.—H. P. B.

3. There is, and can be, no doubt that Vedanta and (exoteric) Buddhism do not hold your view, but ours. Moreover, one could scarcely dispute that Lord Buddha—whatever esoteric doctrine he may have taught—founded monasteries, or that he favoured and assisted in doing so. Whether he expected all his disciples to become Bodhisattvas may be doubtful, but he certainly pointed out the "happy life" of a Bhikshu as the road to salvation ; he expressly abstained from teaching cosmology or any worldly science ; he never meddled with the worldly affairs of men, but every assistance he rendered them was entirely restricted to showing them the road to deliverance from existence. And just the same with Vedanta. It prohibits any attachment to worldly views and interests, or enquiries after cosmology or evolution *a fortiori* socialism and any other world-improvement. All this Vedanta calls *Agnana* (Buddhism : *Avidya*), while *Gnana* or wisdom—the only aim of a sage (*Gnani*)—is but the striving for the realization of the eternal (true reality, *Atma*).(a)

Answer (a). It depends on what you call Vedanta—whether the Dwaita, the Adwaita, or the Visishtadwaita. That we differ from all these, is no news, and I have spoken of it repeatedly. Yet in the esotericism of the *Upanishads*, when correctly understood, and our esotericism, there will not be found much difference. Nor have I ever disputed any of the facts about Buddha as now brought forward ; although these are facts from only his *exoteric* biography. Nor has he invented or drawn from his inner consciousness the philosophy he taught, but only the method of his rendering it. Buddhism being simply esoteric *Bodhism* taught before him secretly in the *arcana* of the Brahminical temples, contains, of course, more than one doctrine of which the Lord Buddha never spoke

of in public. But this shows in no way that he did not teach them to his Arhats. Again, between "attachment to worldly views or interests" and the study of Cosmology, which is *not* "a worldly science" however, there is an abyss. One pertains to religious and philosophical asceticism, the other is necessary for the study of *Occultism*—which is not Buddhistic, but universal. Without the study of cosmogony and theogony which teach the hidden value of every force in Nature and their direct correspondence to, and relation with, the forces in man (or the principles) no occult psychophysics or *knowledge of man as he truly is, is possible*. No one is forced to study esoteric philosophy unless he likes it, nor has anyone ever confused Occultism with Buddhism or Vedantism.—H. P. B.

Agnani (misprinted in the July number page 436: *agnam*) signified just the same as what is rendered by "fool" in the English translations of the Dhammapada and the Suttas. It is never understood "intellectually" and certainly does not mean an *ignoramus*, on the contrary, the scientists are rather more likely to be *agnanis* than any "uneducated" mystic. *Agnani* expresses always a relative notion. *Gnani* is anyone who is striving for the self-realization of the eternal; a *perfect gnani* is only the *jivanmukta*, but anyone who is on the road of development to this end may be (relatively) called *gnani*, while anyone who is less advanced is comparatively an *agnani*. As, however, every *gnani* sees the ultimate goal *above* himself, he will call himself an *agnani*, until he has attained *jivanmukta*; moreover, no true mystic will ever call any fellow-man a "fool" in the intellectual sense of the word, for he lays very little stress on intellectuality. To him anyone is a "fool" only in so far as he cares for (worldly) existence and strives for anything else than wisdom, deliverance, paranirvana. And this turn of mind is entirely a question of the "will" of the individuality. The "will" of the *agnani* is carrying him from spirit into matter (descending arch of the cycle), while the "will" of the *gnani* disentangles him from matter and makes him soar up towards "spirit" and out of all existence. This question of overcoming the "dead point" in the circle is by no means one of intellectuality; it is quite likely that a sister of mercy or a common labourer may have turned the corner while the Bacons, Goethes, Humboldts, &c., may yet linger on the descending side of existence tied down to it by their individual wants and desires. (*b*)

(*b*). *Agnam*, instead of *agnani* was of course a printer's mistake. With such every Journal and Magazine abounds, in Germany, I suppose, as much as in England, and from which LUCIFER is no more free than the Sphinx. It is the printer's and the proof-reader's Karma. But it is a worse mistake, however, to translate *Agnani* by "fool," all the Beals, Oldenbergs, Webers, and Hardys, to the contrary. *Gnana* (or, *Jnāna*, rather) is Wisdom certainly, but even more, for it is the spiritual knowledge of things divine, unknown to all but those who attain it—and which saves the *Jivanmuktas* who have mastered both *Karmayoga* and *Jnānayoga*. Hence, if all those who have not *jñāna* (or *gnana*) at their fingers' end, are to be considered "fools" this would mean that the whole world save a few Yogis is composed of fools, which would be *out-carlyleing* Carlyle in his opinion of his countrymen. *Ajnāna*, in truth, means simply "ignorance of the true Wisdom," or literally, "Wisdomless" and not at all "fool." To explain that the word "fool" is "never understood intellectually" is to say nothing, or worse, an Irish bull, as, according to every etymological definition and dictionary, a *fool* is one who is *deficient in intellect* and "destitute of reason." Therefore, while thanking the kind doctor for the trouble he has taken to explain so minutely the vexed Sanskrit term, I can do so only in the name of LUCIFER'S readers, not for myself, as I knew all he says, *minus* his risky new definition of "fool" and *plus* something else, probably as early as on the day when he made his first appearance into this world of *Maya*. No doubt, neither Bacon, Humboldt, nor even the great Hæckel himself, the "light of Germany," could ever be regarded as "gnanis"; but no more could any European I know of, however much he may have rid himself of all "individual wants and desires."—H. P. B.

4. As we agree, that all existence, in fact, the whole world and the whole of its evolutionary process, its joys and evils, its gods and its devils, are *Maya*

(illusion) or erroneous conception of the true reality : how can it appear to us worth while to assist and to promote this process of misconception ? (a)

Answer. (a.) Precisely, because the term *maya*, just like that of "agnana" in your own words—expresses only a *relative* notion. The world . . . "its joys and evils, its gods and devils," and men to boot, are undeniably, when compared with that awful reality *everlasting eternity*, no better than the productions and tricks of *maya*, illusion. But there the line of demarcation is drawn. So long as we are incapable of forming even an approximately correct conception of this *inconceivable* eternity, for us, who are just as much an *illusion* as anything else outside of that eternity, the sorrows and misery of that greatest of all illusions—human life in the universal *mahamaya*—for us, I say, such sorrows and miseries are a vivid and a very sad reality. A shadow from your body, dancing on the white wall, is a reality so long as it is there, for yourself and all who can see it; because a reality is just as relative as an illusion. And if one "illusion" does not help another "illusion" of the same kind to study and recognise the true nature of Self, then, I fear, very few of us will ever get out from the clutches of *maya*.—H.P.B.

5. Like all world-existence, time and causality also are only *Maya* or—as Kant and Schopenhauer have proved beyond contradiction—are only *our* conditioned notions, *forms* of *our* intellection. Why then should any moment of time, or one of our own unreal forms of thought, be more favourable to the attainment of paranirvana than any other ? To this paranirvana, Atma, or true reality, any manvantara is just as unreal as any pralaya. And this is the same with regard to *causality*, as with respect to *time*, from whichever point of view you look at it. If from that of absolute reality, all causality and karma are unreal, and to realize this *unreality* is the secret of deliverance from it. But even if you look at it from the *agnana*-view, that is to say, taking existence for a reality, there can never (in "time") be an end—nor can there have been a beginning—of causality. It makes, therefore, no difference whether any world is in pralaya or not; also Vedanta rightly says that during any pralaya the *karana sharira* (causal body, agnana) of Ishvara and of all jivas, in fact, of all existence, is continuing.(b) And how could this be otherwise ? After the destruc-

(b.) This is again a *Visishtadvaita* interpretation, which we do not accept in the esoteric school. We cannot say, as they do that while the gross bodies alone perish, the *sukshma* particles, which they consider uncreated and indestructible and the only real things, alone remain. Nor do we believe any Vedantin of the Sankaracharya school would agree in uttering such a heesy. For this amounts to saying that *Manomaya Kosha*, which corresponds to what we call *Manas*, mind, with its volitious feelings and even *Kamarupa* the vehicle of the *lower* manas, also survives during pralaya. See page 185 in *Five Years of Theosophy* and ponder over the three classifications of the human principles. Thence it follows that the *Karana Sarira* (which means simply the *human Monad* collectively or the reincarnating ego), the "causal body" cannot continue; especially if, as you say, it is *agnana*, ignorance or the *wisdomless* principle, and even agreeably with your definition "a fool." The idea alone of this "fool" surviving during any pralaya, is enough to make the hair of any Vedanta philosopher and even of a full blown Jivanmukta, turn grey, and thrust him right back into an "agnani" again. Surely as you formulate it, this must be a *lapsus calami* ! And why should the *Karana Sarira* of Iswara let alone that of "all Jivas" (!) be necessary during *pralaya* for the evolution of another universe ? Iswara, whether as a personal god, or an *intelligent* independent principle, *per se*, every Buddhist whether esoteric or exoteric and orthodox, will reject; while some Vedantins would define him as Parabrahm *plus* *MAYA* only, *i.e.* a conception valid enough during the reign of *maya*, but not otherwise. That which remains during pralaya is the eternal potentiality of every condition of *Pragna* (consciousness) contained in that plane or *field* of consciousness, which the Advaita calls *Chidakasan* and *Chinmatra* (abstract consciousness), which, being absolute, is therefore perfect *unconsciousness*—as a true Vedantin would say.—H.P.B.

tion of any universe in pralaya, must not another appear ? Before our present universe must there not have been an infinite number of other universes ? How could this be, if the cause of existence did not last through any pralaya

as well as through any kalpa? And if so, why should any pralaya be a more favourable moment for the attainment of paranirvana than any manvantara?

6. But if then one moment of time and one phase of causality were more favourable for this than any other: why should it just be *any* pralaya after a manvantara, not the end of the *maha-kalpa* or at least that of a *kalpa*. In any kalpa (of 4,320 millions of earthly years) there are 14 manvantaras and pralayas and in each maha-kalpa (of 311,040 milliards of earthly years) there are (36,000 × 14) 504,000 manvantaras and pralayas. Why is this opportunity of paranirvana offered just so often and not oftener, or not once only at the end of each universe. In other words, why can paranirvana only be obtained by spurts and in batches; why, if it cannot be attained by any individuality at its *own* time, why must one wait only for the whole of one's present fellow-humanity; why not also for all the animals, plants, amœbas and protoplasms, perhaps also for the minerals of our planet—and why not also for the entities on all the other stars of the universe? (a)

Answer. (a.) As Dr. Hübbe Schleiden objects in the form of questions to statements and arguments that have never been formulated by me, I have nothing to say to this.—H.P.B.

7. But, it appears, the difficulty lies somewhat deeper still. That which has to be overcome, in order to attain paranirvana, is the erroneous conception of separateness, the selfishness of individuality, the "thirst for existence" (*trishna, tanha*). It stands to reason, that this sense of individuality can only be overcome individually: How can this process be dependent on other individualities or anything else at all? Selfishness in the *abstract* which is the cause of all existence, in fact, *Agnana* and *Maya*, can never be *all together* removed and extinguished. *Agnana* is as endless as it is beginningless, and the number of jivas (atoms?) is absolutely infinite; if the jivas of a whole universe were to be extinguished in paranirvana, jivaship and agnana would not be lessened by one atom. In fact, both are mere unreality and misconception. Now, why should just one batch of humanity have to unite, in order to get rid each of his own misconception of reality? (b)

(b.) Here again the only "unreality and misconception" I can perceive are his own. I am glad to find my correspondent so learned, and having made such wonderful progress since I saw him last some three years ago, when still in the fulness of his *agnana*; but I really cannot see what all his arguments refer to?—H.P.B.

Summing up, I will now give three instances of the difference in which, I think a Mystic or (exoteric) Buddhist, Bhikshu or Arhat, on the one side, and an occultist or theosophist on the other, would act, if both are fully consistent with their views and principles. Both will certainly use any opportunity which offers itself to do good to their fellow-men; but the good which they will try to do, will be of a different kind.

Supposing they meet a poor, starving wretch, with whom they share their only morsel of bread: the mystic will try to make the man understand that the body is only to be kept up, because that entity which lives in it has a certain spiritual destination, and that this destination is nothing less than getting rid of all existence, and, at the same time, of all wants and desires; that having to beg for one's food is no real hardship, but might give a happier life than that of rich people with all their imaginary worries and pretensions, that, in fact, the life of a destitute who *is* nothing and who *has* nothing in the world, is the "happy

life"—as Buddha and Jesus have shown—when it is coupled with the right aspiration to the eternal, the only true and unchangeable reality, the divine peace. If the mystic finds that the man's heart is incapable of responding to any keynote of such true religiousness, he will leave him alone, hoping that, at some future time, he too will find out that all his worldly wants and desires are insatiable and unsatisfying, and that after all true and final happiness can only be found in striving for the eternal.—Not so the occultist. He will know that he himself *cannot* finally realise the eternal, until every other human individuality has likewise gone through all the worldly aspirations and has been weaned from them. He will, therefore, try to assist this poor wretch first in his worldly affairs; he will perhaps teach him some trade or handicraft by which he can earn his daily bread, or he will plan with him some socialistic scheme for bettering the worldly position of the poor.

Answer. Here the "Mystic" acts precisely as a "Theosophist or Occultist of the Eastern school" would. It is extremely interesting to learn where Dr. Hübbe Schleiden has studied "Occultists" of the type he is describing? If it is in Germany, then pitying the Occultist who *knows* "that he himself *cannot* realize the eternal" until every human soul has been weaned from "worldly aspirations" I would invite him to come to London where other Occultists who reside therein would teach him better. But then why not qualify the "Occultist" in such case and thus show his nationality? Our correspondent mentions with evident scorn, "Socialism" in this letter, as often as he does "Cosmology?" We have but two English Socialists, so far, in the T.S. of which two every Theosophist ought to be proud and accept them as his exemplar in practical Buddha—and Christ-like charity and virtues. Such socialists—two active altruists full of unselfish love and charity and ready to work for all that suffers and needs help—are decidedly worth ten thousand Mystics and other *Theosophers*, whether German or English, who talk instead of acting and sermonize instead of teaching. But let us take note of our correspondent's second instance.—H.P.B.

Secondly, supposing further the mystic and the occultist meet two women, the one of the "Martha" sort, the other of the "Mary" character. The mystic will first remind both that every one has, in the first instance, to do his or her duty conscientiously, be it a compulsory or a self-imposed duty. Whatever one has once undertaken and wherever he or she has contracted any obligation towards a fellow-being, this has to be fulfilled "up to the uttermost farthing." But, on the other hand, the mystic will, just for this very reason, warn them against creating for themselves new attachments to the world and worldly affairs more than they find absolutely unavoidable. He will again try to direct the whole of their attention to their final goal and kindle in them every spark of high and genuine aspiration to the eternal.—Not so the occultist. He may also say all that the mystic has said and which fully satisfies "Mary"; as "Martha," however, is not content with this and thinks the subject rather tedious and wearisome, he will have compassion with her worldliness and teach her some esoteric cosmology or speak to her of the possibilities of developing psychic powers and so on.

Answer. Is the cat out of the bag at last? I am asked to "oblige" our correspondent by answering questions, and instead of clear statements, I find no better than transparent hints against the working methods of the T.S. ! Those who go against "esoteric cosmology" and the development of psychic powers are not forced to study either. But I have heard these objections four years ago, and they too, were started by a certain "Guru" we are both acquainted with, when that learned "Mystic" had had enough of Chelaship and suddenly developed the ambition of becoming a Teacher. They are stale.—H.P.B.

Thirdly, supposing our mystic and our occultist meet a sick man who applies to them for help. Both will certainly try to cure him the best they can. At the

same time, both will use this opportunity to turn their patient's mind to the eternal if they can ; they will try to make him see that everything in the world is only the *just* effect of some cause, and that, as he is consciously suffering from his present illness, he himself *must* somewhere have consciously given the corresponding and adequate cause for his illness, either in his present or in any former life ; that the only way of getting finally rid of all ills and evils is, not to create any more causes, but rather to abstain from all doing, to rid oneself of every avoidable want and desire, and in this way to lift oneself above all causality (karma). This, however, can only be achieved by putting good objects of aspiration into the place of the bad, the better object into that of the good, and the best into that of the better ; directing, however, one's whole attention to our highest goal of consummation and living in the eternal as much as we can, this is the *only* mode of thought that will *finally* deliver us from the imperfections of existence.

If the patient cannot see the force of this train of argument or does not like it, the mystic will leave him to his own further development, and to some future opportunity which might bring the same man near him again, but in a more favourable state of mind.

Not so the occultist. He will consider it his duty to stick to this man to whose Karma, as to that of everyone else, he is irremediably and unavoidably bound ; he will not abandon him until he has helped him on to such an advanced state of true spiritual development that he begins to see his final goal and to aspire to it "with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his might." In the meantime, however, the occultist will try to prepare him for that by helping him to arrange his worldly life in a manner as favourable to such an aspiration as possible. He will make him see that vegetarian or rather fruit-diet is the only food fully in accordance with human nature ; he will teach him the fundamental rules of esoteric hygienics ; he will show him how to make the right use of vitality (mesmerism), and as he does not feel any aspiration for the nameless and formless eternal, he will meanwhile make him aspire for esoteric knowledge and for occult powers.

Now, will you do us the great favour to show us reasons *why* the mystic is wrong and the occultist right, or why paranirvana should not be attained by any individuality and at any time, when its *own* karma has been burnt by *gnana* in *samadhi*, and independent of the karma of any other individual or that of humanity.

Yours sincerely,

HÜBBE-SCHLEIDEN.

Neuhaugen bei *München*, September, 1889.

Answer. As no Occultist of my acquaintance would act in this supposed fashion no answer is possible. We theosophists, and especially your humble servant, are too occupied with our work to lose time at answering supposititious cases and fictions. When our prolific correspondent tells us *whom* he means under the name of the "Occultist" and *when* or *where* the latter has acted in that way, I will be at his service. Perhaps he means some Theosophist or rather member of the T.S. under this term? For I, at any rate, never met yet an "Occultist" of that description. As to the closing question I believe it was sufficiently answered in the earlier explanations of this reply.

Yours, as sincerely

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

TO ALL WHO TAKE A PRACTICAL INTEREST IN THEOSOPHY.

IN the June number of this magazine I published an appeal for help and co-operation in the important work of influencing the press of this country in the subject of Theosophy.

My efforts in obtaining the interest of editors of newspapers and other journals have met with much greater success than I could have anticipated, proving beyond doubt that Theosophy is now attracting general attention, and that the influence of the press can be utilized to a very great extent in popularizing the subject.

This simply means that thousands who might not otherwise hear of it will have their minds directed to Theosophy, and Theosophists well know that the little grain of seed, planted in the right soil, soon takes root, and may become a mighty tree.

The number of workers who are now helping me in this special way, are quite inadequate to deal with the ever-increasing amount of work, and I greatly need the co-operation of all who are practically interested in spreading the knowledge of Theosophy, if only to the small extent indicated in my last appeal (*vide* June number). I have received very few replies to that appeal, perhaps because it has not reached the right persons, perhaps because Theosophists have not realized the importance of *doing what they can*, however little that may be, or the fact that however small may be the help they can give individually, *collectively* their help is of the greatest importance and value.

Trusting that those who are willing to devote a little spare time to the work will communicate with me, and that others will respond by co-operating in one or other of the ways indicated in my last appeal,

I remain

Yours fraternally

A. A. M. DE PALLANDT.

36 Bryanston St. Hyde Park W.

We are asked to publish the following letter, addressed to the editor of the *Lorus*.

Mon cher Gaboriau,

À la page 707 du dernier No. du *Lotus*, je lis les lignes suivantes à propos de Mme. Blavatsky :—

“ Elle avait pris soin elle-même, lors d’une visite que *nous* lui fîmes, *Amara-vella* et moi, à Ostende, en Novembre 1886, d’entretenir ce sentiment en *nous*, refusant avec une habileté merveilleuse, que *nous* prenions alors pour de la sincérité, toutes les attaques portées contre elle. . . . *Nous* avons reconnu petit à petit notre erreur. . . . ”

Je demande à protester contre cette invasion de ma personnalité. Une fois déjà je me suis trouvé impliqué dans une affaire dont je ne voulais pas me mêler extérieurement, lorsque tu publias *in extenso* une lettre que tu m’avais demandé “ pour lire à quelques amis en séance privée. ” Je n’ai pas protesté alors, car je

venais d'apprendre à mes dépens le prix du silence. C'est par le silence encore en cessant d'écrire dans le Lotus, que j'ai protesté contre les attaques de personnalités qu'il contient depuis quelques mois. Et si je viens de t'envoyer un article pour le dernier numéro, c'était que jugeant la leçon suffisante, je tenais à montrer que je n'ai aucune rancune personnelle contre qui que ce soit encore moins contre un vieil ami. Je suis fâché que tu aies cru devoir interpréter soit mon silence, soit la rupture de ce silence, d'une façon qui m'oblige à protester publiquement.

Mes opinions au sujet de notre "mère spirituelle" sont diamétralement opposées aux tiennes. J'ai vécu avec elle assez longtemps et assez intimement pour savoir à quoi m'en tenir. Telles qu'elles, je garde mes appréciations, d'abord par ce qu'en occultisme on apprend à refuser de juger ses frères ou de se laisser juger soi-même d'après les mesures du monde où l'on "cancane," et ensuite pour ne pas embarrasser de nouveaux problèmes les lecteurs du Lotus, que doivent déconcerter déjà pas mal les courbes d'esprit de cette revue, plus compliquées encore que celles de "la monade humaine rentrant dans l'unité."

Enfin, espérons qu'une dernière courbe nous ramènera tous au même centre, car, comme tu dis, nous sommes tous jeunes, et nous n'avons pas dit notre dernier mot.

AMARAVELLA.

25 Septembre, 1889.

INCARNATION OF THE DEVACHANIC ENTITY.

ESOTERIC Science teaches that after death the three lowest principles in man get dispersed on earth, while the four higher are projected into *Kama-loka*, which is a sort of purgatory. Here the fourth and the lower half of the fifth expend their force, after which the upper half of the fifth (the higher Personality) assimilates itself with the sixth. Thus the two-and-a-half highest principles pass into Devachan, the Heaven of Esoteric Religions. Life in Devachan is more or less of the nature of a happy dream, extending over a period which, to us, appears enormous. This ethereal existence of subjective activity takes up from one to two thousand years, by which time the face of the earth has undergone numerous changes. When the Devachanic dream is at last over, the Entity is unconsciously borne along the current of its Karmic impulse, and is said to incarnate in a human body. The body with which it is allied is exactly suitable to the nature of its past Karma.

This doctrine, so logical, reasonable, and just, needs some additional explanation.

A vegetable seed is cast into the ground, it sprouts up and becomes a tree. The animal, as the human protoplasmic speck grows in the womb and in course of time is born after its kind as an animal, or human young one.

The acts of a self-conscious being alone produce Karma. In plants and animals the highest principles are rudimentary, and there being no previous Karma for these, we inquire what it is that causes the various transformations in plants and animals at each succeeding birth.

The materialist places the vegetable and the animal seed on the same level as the human seed, and argues that just as the latent force or forces in the first two

develop them to the plant and animal respectively, so does the human seed grow into a man without any external addition. Esoteric science, however, explains that a Devachanic entity must join a human seed before the latter can become a man. It is, therefore, very important to know at what time the Devachanic entity joins the human fetus, and could any birth take place without a Devachanic entity being allied to it.

And now comes a question which has a very wide significance. The number of human monads in any given manvantar, although appearing to be unlimited, is, in reality, limited. Vast numbers of Devachanic entities are always awaiting to incarnate, and want suitable human embryos to ally themselves with. These embryos could only be supplied by human beings, under certain conditions.

Now it is a fact that in all ages there have been a few men and women who have resolutely, and from pure motives or from motives of necessity (as in the case of those who have not sufficient means to support their offspring) refrained from entering into those conditions which supply the human embryo. It is very reasonable to suppose that there must be many Devachanic entities which would find very fitting habitations in the embryos were they generated by several men and women who now deliberately lead a single life, and do not help in the work of procreation.

Do not such men retard the progress of the Devachanic entities ?

One of the three cardinal rules for the practice of the Initiate is to avoid sexual relationship. We know very well that a very, very small and infinitesimal portion could alone try to become true Initiates. Yet, in the aspiration after higher life, several men, though comparatively infinitesimal in number, would prefer to lead a single life from choice. Do they not, as shown above, violate a natural law in throwing back Devachanic entities whom they would have supplied with human bodies.

Humanity could only progress through a series of rebirths. Rebirths mean incarnations in human bodies from time to time, and these bodies must be procreated, otherwise there could be no rebirths.

Are those men, therefore, who deliberately abstain from the work of procreation wanting in any duty to humanity ? Do they not, in ever so small a degree retard the progress of humanity ?

It may be that while on the one hand such persons may retard progress to some extent, they may further progress in other respects, and it is as well to understand thoroughly the merits and demerits involved in the abstention practised in this particular.

N. D. K.

The editor's reply to the above will appear next month.

THEOSOPHICAL (?) DOGMATISM AND INTOLERANCE.

FOR the 27,599th time, Mr. Richard Harte, in his official capacity as editor of the "Theosophist" assures the world, that "the Theosophical Society does not advocate or promulgate any opinions, has no creed and belongs to no party," and for the 27,599th time nobody believes what he says ; because we have only to open at random any page of the "Theosophist," to find it filled with the most vituperative language and the vilest abuse of everything that does not bear the

stamp of Adyar ; *i.e.*, the "imprimatur" of Richard Harte. Moreover, it is an old played out jesuitical trick, to attempt to distinguish between a church and the members of which that church is composed, and to say that no matter how wicked the clergy or the representatives of a sect may be, their villany does not affect the sanctity of the church or sect. A sect can have no existence apart from the members of which it is composed, and if the representatives of such a sect advocate certain doctrines and denounce everybody as being a fool who will not accept them—then these doctrines must be regarded as belonging to that sect as a whole.

"One who has been a Reader of the 'Theosophist,' but who does not want any more of it. In the name of many who are in the same predicament."

The above is inserted because it is our invariable rule to publish rather reproofs than laudation from our correspondents. If you want to know yourself ask your enemies, not your friends, to describe you ; and however great the exaggerations, you will find more truth, and profit more by the opinion of the former than by that of those who love you. But so much conceded, and agreeing that the acting editor of the *Theosophist* may often deserve blame for his ill-tempered remarks, dictated to him however, only by his sincere zeal for, and devotion to, theosophy, if his remarks are contradictory and *untheosophical*, so are the present observations of our correspondent. Both are members of the T. S., both act *untheosophically* and therefore both "affect the sanctity of Theosophy, or the body of its followers." Moreover, when the President returns to Adyar in January next, it is he who will take once more the *Theosophist* into his hands. Meanwhile, it is true to say, as he good-naturedly does in the September No. (p. 763) that Mr. Harte is inexperienced in the *role* of theosophical editorship. "He (the acting editor), has not got me into *quite* as many rows as Mark Twain did his Editorial Chief, but he may in time !" adds Colonel Olcott. "Forgive and forget," if you are a Theosophist. —[Ed.]

"LATER-DAY TRACTS."

HAVE you seen the little *brochures* of the Religious Tract Society? They are called *Later-day Tracts*. They profess to illustrate the absence of system in every system of belief. Yes, these gentlemen professors, who execute the contract, are very clever. They do most ingeniously make manifest that nothing is good—except Christianity. Well, Christianity is good too. Not the Christianity of the professors, but that of the "lowly Jesus." But I have a few words to say about these *Later-day Tracts*.

They are very dangerous to Theosophy. They are drawing a knife round the tree which it is the second object of our Society to cultivate—the study of the literature of the Orient. That beautiful tree has enchanted us. Its sweet perfume has overpowered us. But why does this magnificent tree find the soil of the Occident so sterile? why does it not command millions of votaries? You will not believe my reply, but it is on account of the *Later-day Tracts* of the Religious Tract Society.

Ah, when one sees a herd of cattle rushing forward with their heavy thundering tramp, one concludes that nothing can stop them except a deep chasm in their path. But even the good gods cannot provide an earthquake at short notice for stopping these ungainly, stupid animals ; and so even the gods themselves lose the battle when they stand up against dulness. Youthful deities of surpassing beauty are hurled down and trampled beneath their destructive hoofs.

How then can you expect to stand up against the tremendous onslaught made by the professors in these *Later-day Tracts*? There is but one method of combating their unspeakable stupidity. Do you not know that there is a desire in man's nature for that which is pleasing—that it is natural and necessary for a man to turn to the pleasant and to flee from the dull? Conceive, then, the fatal effect of these tracts upon study of the literature of the Orient. "If," say these British people, after reading one of their tracts,—“if Oriental Scripture is such ponderous stuff as this, so uninteresting, so unmeaning, we will have none of it.” And so they shun our world-embracing thought, our profound philosophy.

I have said there is but one way of combating the evil. It is this. In every locality where the Theosophical Society has a branch, let the secretary invite the people in the district (especially the nearest “professors”) to write short essays (such as the *Later-day Tracts*) on some dogma or detail of the popular belief. The beauty of the vicarious Sacrifice, the success of the Missionary System, or any other item which, in the writer's opinion, calls for special remark.

By this means the Secretary will procure from outside an abundance of more silly, pompous, and illucid contributions than he could possibly manufacture inside the walls of the Theosophical Society during a life-time. Thereupon he will immediately establish a Religious Tract Society (or, if he does not like euphuism, an “Other Religions Damnation Society”), and, having printed the silliest and dullest of these essays (an Eclectic committee to be judges), he will send them forth to bring desolation upon the gentle, create disgust amongst the æsthetic, and flatter the spirit of cant and ribaldry amongst the ignorant. For this is what the *brochures* of the Religious Tract Society are doing for Oriental Scripture.

The effect of these measures in the British Isles, where orthodox Christianity has yet, from custom, so firm a grasp, will of course, be slow. But in India, China, Japan, and such countries to which—since here our excellent professors are somewhat scarce—we might export a few tons of “Damnation” tracts the effects of which would indeed be startling.

Personally I deplore it. I deplore the fact that the good gods have no weapon with which to overcome stupidity. Yet I rejoice that it is given to mortal man through his imperfect nature to fight stupidity with like stupidity. And in order to secure an unlimited supply I would recommend our Theosophists to have recourse to the above-mentioned subterfuge, in order to attain popularity.

JAQUES Q—.

Dieppe, Sept., 1889.



Every tree has its shadow, and every cry has its laugh.

A thousand sorrows do not pay a debt.

First tie your horse fast to a post, and then put your trust in God.

A sweet tongue draws the snake from the earth.

Stretch your legs according to the length of your quilt.

(*Turkish Proverbs.*)

Reviews.

POSTHUMOUS HUMANITY.*

Translated from an article by DR. HUBBE SCHLEIDEN in the SPHINX for September.

AFTER a general consideration of the work itself, Dr. Hubbe Schleiden proceeds to speak as follows :

“Of this, for our movement epoch-making book, an English translation by Henry S. Olcott is now before us. This gentleman, the present President of the Theosophical Society, has had opportunities of making many and various observations and experiments in the field of supersensuous phenomena, such as have fallen to the lot of no other European. In his present translation of d’Assier, he corrects and completes the author by means of notes with an able and masterly hand, and while the impression of the original is in no way confused or weakened by these additions, they yet considerably add to the value of the work.

“Moreover, this English edition offers a further advantage to those investigators on the field of the psychical and magical, who have a horizon somewhat wider than that of their own race. President Olcott, namely, has utilised the organisation of his Society, which possesses 179 branches and 35,000 members scattered all over India, to ascertain by means of circular letters, what knowledge and views on these subjects prevail in the various parts of India. His circulars contained 16 questions upon the ideas held as to the states or abodes of beings not belonging to our earth-life, upon the views held as to the nature of these (different) beings, their relation to living men, as to any possible intercourse with them, further as to the opinions current as to ghostly occurrences, as to any knowledge of telepathic appearances or of verified predictions received from the dead, as to the practice of enchantment and magic, as to mental healing and voluntary projection of the double.—The answers to these questions, received from the most various parts of India, will be found arranged and collected under each separate question ; and this appendix to the book affords valuable scientific material.

“D’Assier’s work, more especially in this translation, is precisely adapted for those beginners in occult investigations who are still influenced by materialism. It is written with logical clearness and calm, one might say with coolness, and gives no openings for attack. It goes no further than a man altogether unprepared could well be induced to follow ; but nevertheless it goes altogether in the right direction.”

* POSTHUMOUS HUMANITY, A STUDY OF PHANTOMS. By A. D’ASSIER, member of the Bordeaux Academy of Sciences. Translated and annotated by H. S. OLCOTT. London, G. REDWAY.

IRISH INDUSTRIES.*

HERE is an author who writes from the heart. A son of Erin, every page of whose book glows with love of country and kinsman. The work is a survey of the past condition and present state of the agriculture, manufactures, industries, natural resources, fluctuations of population, and possibilities of poor Ireland. The author's statistics evince the most patient labour and conscientious exactitude on his part, while his hints of the ways and means to elevate the condition and improve the prospects of the nation are practical and judicious. Dr. Daly's book supplies a literary want and will long be ranked as a necessary and trustworthy work of reference in the library of a British statesman.

“SEA SIGNS, NOTES TO NATURE AND MISCELLANEOUS
POEMS.” †

A VOLUME of verse, mostly short pieces, nicely printed on thick paper with ample margins, and bound with neat simplicity. So much for the exterior of a volume of which the contents are somewhat unequal in merit. Several of the pieces have real swing and go in them, and would make admirable songs if set to music by a sympathetic composer.

Mr. Mallett has a happy knack of rhythm and neat expression, but none of the pieces in the present volume afford sufficient scope to enable one to judge of his real power. Among the best is a short poem, “The Castaway,” written specially for recitation, showing decided dramatic faculty. Two others, entitled respectively “We are merely in the Dawn” and “I promised,” strike a bold note of hope in the future of Humanity and in the possibilities of development yet latent in his nature.

* Glimpses of Irish Industries. By J. BOWLES DALY, LL.D.

† By JOSIAH MALLETT.—THE ENGLISH PUBLISHING CO.



COUNSEL.

Seek not to walk by borrowed light,
But keep unto thine own.
Do what thou doest with all thy might,
And trust thyself alone.

Work for some good, nor idly lie
Within the human hive,
And though the outward man should die,
Keep thou the heart alive.

Strive not to banish pain and doubt
In pleasure's noisy din :—
The peace thou seekest for without,
Is only found within.

If fortune disregard thy claim,
By worth, her slight attest,
Nor blush and hang thy head for shame
When thou hast done thy best.

What thy experience teaches true,
Be vigilant to heed ;
The wisdom that we suffer to
Is wiser than a creed.

Disdain neglect, ignore despair,
On loves and friendships gone.
Plant thou thy feet, as on a stair,
And mount right up and on !

ALICE CAREY.