

the Eurasians? Have you mixed with either of them? What old ideas and customs are in our way to become as virtuous as you Europeans? Our old idolatry, good for nothing Shastras, the caste system, child marriage, vegetarianism, the Purdah system, want of female education, or what? But are the Europeans so very honest, kind, &c.? Are those that come here a fine specimen of what they are over there? Are they kind to beasts also or only to human beings?

Before you bring such serious charges against us as a nation, think for a moment that our religion, philosophy, ideas and costumes require years of study *even by European*, before a correct, mature judgment can be arrived at concerning their merits and demerits, and that there may be other causes for our present degraded state than those mentioned by you.

Again, what remedy do you propose to make us as pious as—say the Madras Missionaries? Shall we be all Christians, adopt European civilization in its entirety on a sudden, imitate you Sahib—* as much as we can, parade our wives and sisters in the streets, seek husbands for the remarriage of the widows, and burn all our Shastras? For as long as they (the Shastras) remain there is no hope for us.

Yours fraternally,

K. P. MUKHERJI, F. T. S.

BERHAMPUR,)
The 27th Oct. 1889.)

[It was our intention to have replied at some length to this rather wild letter of our respected brother, and to have proved to him, if he is amenable to reason, that he has been fighting a wind-mill and killing the celebrated "Snake in the rope" of Hindu philosophy. Unfortunately, however, the Manager of the *Theosophist*, in accordance with the instructions of the Conductor of the Magazine, has caused this issue thereof to be printed on thicker paper, which necessitates a reduction of 16 or 20 pages of reading matter compared with recent issues, in order to keep the Magazine within the one-rate postage. The Editor does not intend to sacrifice the "SUPPLEMENT," which is the only consolation he has left in life now, and so Brother Mukherji's angry diatribe must only be allowed to rankle in hearts of our readers, and produce its deadly effect unchecked!—Ed.]

SUN AND MOON BREATHS.

TO THE EDITOR.

In case of persons suffering from fever, it has been generally observed that while the fever is on the increase the breath continues to come out and enter in through the right nostril, and when the heat of fever begins to abate, the breath instead of coming out of the right nostril comes out and goes in through the left nostril. Will you or any of your readers kindly let me know through the medium of the *Theosophist* whether this fact is universally true, and whether it has been observed by the medical men of Europe?

According to the Hatha Yog philosophy the breath passing through the right nostril is called the *Surya Vayu* or the sun breath, and the other, *i. e.*, that passing through the left nostril, is called the *moon breath*. The nature of the former is there said to be heating, while that of the latter is said to be cold.

* This word is illegible in the MS. It looks like "Rogues," but it may be "Sages," the reader can take his choice.—Ed.

ओं THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. XI. No. 124.—JANUARY 1890.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

"TO YOUR TENTS, OH ISRAEL!"

"TO your tents, oh Israel!" Such was the cry of the ancient Hebrews, in the time of danger. Every man thereupon hastened to arm himself with his favourite weapon and stood at his own door ready to obey the orders of the general. It is not stated in the Bible that every man ran hither and thither among the tents of his neighbours, declaring that this noble warrior had got his tunic buttoned crookedly, or that noble warrior held his sword by the wrong end; from which it may be inferred that they had no Theosophical Society in those days! Each one instead of criticising the others, girt on his own sword and armed himself with his own shield and javelin, and every noble Jew of them all found the responsibility of accounting for himself quite enough for one Israelite.

What was the consequence? Why, that the Hebrews conquered the Philistines, slew the Amalakites, discomfited the Hittites, annihilated the Jebusites, and made away with all the other nations of Palestine—the "Enemies of the Lord," remaining the undisputed possessors of the Land of Promise, and fortunate usufructuries of Jehovah.

What a lesson for us! Would that we, Fellows of the Theosophical Society, were half as wise in our generation as the children of Israel were in theirs. If each of us were to leave his neighbours to mind their own business, and were to sharpen *his own* sword—of the spirit, don on his own "armour of righteousness," and fill his own pocket with "smooth round stones from the brook" of Wisdom to sling at the heads of our common enemies, the slanderous shafts of malice and bigotry could no more prevail against us than the arrows of a savage against the armour of a steel-clad knight.

But have we got any spiritual swords to gird on? Do many of us know what sort of weapons these are? To judge by appearances, most of us are armed with small philosophical pop-guns, and crooked little intellectual pins, which we stick into any one who comes near, thinking that whether this be friend or foe if we can only make him howl, we are zealously "fighting for the cause." Why do we not each of us look to his own weapons and his own armour and see that they are of a kind fit to meet the attacks of our enemies, instead of teasing each other for the amusement of our Philistines, our Hittites, our Perisites and our Jebusites that press round us on all sides and return our pop-gun cannonade by pelting us with rotten eggs? It is because they despise us, that these aboriginal inhabitants of the philosophic and religious Promised Land which we vain would conquer throw only their rotten eggs at us now,—stupid lies, malicious slanders, clumsy ridicule. They think Theosophy a mushroom "fad," and Theosophists weak-minded sentimentalists or harmless "cranks," and certainly they are not altogether without justification for this opinion, by reason of some of our own goings on, as well as because they are aboriginal heathen, and therefore ignorant and superficial observers.

By-and-bye, however, they will get tired of throwing rotten eggs. They see already that we are learning to step on one side and let them fly by, and that at all events they break no bones. When they realize this, when they find out that their present mode of warfare is a failure, will they not have recourse to something more serious? Instead of flinging the contents of their market baskets at us, will they not tear up the paving stones to throw at our heads?

What weapon have we got that will meet a serious attack on the part of our enemies—enemies ferociously eager to annihilate us? Money we have not; nor social, nor political, nor ecclesiastical influence. What are we trusting to now to defend us from our unscrupulous foes? It is a curious and lamentable thing, but there can be no doubt that we have no other weapon at hand but *controversy*. We expect, apparently, to conquer the world by controversy and, according to Voltaire, whose opinion thereon may certainly be regarded as valuable, since his whole life was one long instance thereof, controversy is no better than a disease from which human beings suffer, and which only attacks the Western nations. The East seems, indeed, to have been hitherto happily free from it. The missionary sallies forth to conquer the heathen to Christ,—Hindu, Buddhist, Parsee,—loaded up to the muzzle with controversy, and he finds the heathen impervious to his argumentative bullets,—unaffected by the subcutaneous injection of the microbe of controversy.

In the early days of Theosophy controversy played but a small part in our propaganda. The Founders followed the admirable policy of the Buddhists of old: they simply presented their doctrines, stated their facts, and left it for the listener to compare for himself the doctrines so presented with the dogmas he had learned. Controversy, it is well known, only makes each side cling all the more tenaciously to its own ideas, and it is a common stratagem to send

a new convert into the controversial field in order that his own faith may be strengthened by what he himself advances in its support.

If you wanted to make a dog leave off gnawing a musty old bone, you would not try to take his treasure from him by controversial methods, if you did not want to be bitten. You would, were you wise, get a nice fresh piece of meat, and carelessly let the dog sniff it; knowing perfectly well that the intelligent animal will then quickly drop his musty bone without any persuasion on your part, and come dancing round you with watery mouth and prayerful tail.

Unfortunately, however, this method is only possible when there is a fair field and no favour. When the purveyors of musty bones to the multitude show themselves determined to drive you and your lump of meat out of the field with blows and loud cries, for fear you would take their customers away from them, it is necessary for you to defend your right to remain there; and so Controversy is born. Still it must be remembered that this method of warfare is merely an ugly necessity for self defence, and by no means the chosen weapon of Theosophy. On the contrary, it is actually incompatible with its principles, which are to respect the ideas of others, and leave one's neighbours free to hold their favourite opinions unmolested.

Now, if this view of the true policy* of the Society be the correct one,—that it is only by placing our ideas quietly and persistently before the world, and avoiding controversy as useless or worse,—that Theosophy can become widely known and understood, then it is evident that our first duty is to conform our endeavours to that method, and to avoid everything that conflicts with it. How is this to be done? What does such conformity imply?

It is self-evident that in the first place it implies the spreading broadcast of tracts and pamphlets which give an elementary knowledge of the nature and aims of Theosophy. We may leave it to other bodies to entertain the vain hope that in a few years the whole world will be of their opinion. We know that even among the educated not many are prepared to accept in its fulness the philosophy we propound, and that comparatively few minds are competent without some preparatory instruction to understand even its elements. But we also know that there are hundreds of thousands, even millions of earnest souls scattered in various parts of the world to whom, could we reach them by our words or our writings, the song we sing and the story we tell would be like enchanted music and sacred history, and who would listen with interest and delight to the teachings of Theosophy, but who are at present ignorant of the very existence of any such system; and we know further, that the Ethics of Theosophy would be willingly accepted by a very large number indeed, were they brought before them and their rationale explained.

*The reader will please understand this word in its good sense, as meaning "a wise method of administration," or "a good principle to be guided by." Every large dictionary gives several distinct meanings for the word "policy," one of which makes it equivalent to "wisdom," another to "worldly wisdom." "Policy," as used in gambling and insurance, comes from a different root altogether.

To anticipate that more than a very small fraction of our efforts to reach these sympathetic souls will bear fruit, would be like expecting every bullet fired in a battle to bring down an enemy. We must keep on quietly and persistently spreading our ideas without stopping to count our gains;—these will make themselves evident in due time. It should be made criminal for a Theosophist ever to say “there is no use in it,” or “it will do no good,” when efforts for propaganda are proposed. Every effort is of some use, and those who do not approve of any particular one, should only be listened to when they have something better to propose as a substitute. Every effort does good, if not to others, at least to the man who makes it; he is stronger and happier after he has exerted himself for the good of the cause, and thus the movement gains strength whether our efforts end in apparent failure or in success.

What is required to enable us to carry on an extended and active propaganda? Some funds are no doubt needful, but that which is most necessary and most important is the *wish* and *will* to do the work. Were our hearts fixed on this great object all difficulties would vanish, and not only funds, but, what is even more important, earnest workers would be forthcoming. How can that wish be generated in the Society? Fortunately, the wish already exists, and so the idea has not now to be planted for the first time in our minds. Were the Fellows canvassed to-day, it is probable that hardly any of them but would acknowledge the enormous importance of a broadcast sowing of the “seed;” but, unhappily, some of them would add that if the seed were sown “the birds would eat it up;” others of them would declare the sowing to be useless because the seed would “fall upon stony ground;” others because the soil is too dry, or too wet, or too something else; and all would urge as an excuse for inaction that we have on hand hardly any seed fit to sow. Oh! what poor, faint hearts we Theosophists seem to have got!

It may be asked: If everyone agrees that the work of propaganda should be vigorously pursued, how is it that so little is being done in the way of organized effort?*

In addition to apathy and hopelessness with regard to results, we are kept too busy criticising each other and finding fault with this, that, and the other, to have much time to devote to any other Theosophical work. We ought to be working shoulder to shoulder for the Cause, and instead of that we are either standing idle because there is apparently nothing for us to do—that is to say, nothing which coincides in all respects with our ideas of what ought to be done—or else because we are busy cultivating in our respective little gardens all the devil’s weeds of jealousy, self-conceit, hypocrisy and pride.

Again, it is only a very innocent person who expects that he will make people good or energetic by telling them that they ought to

* Except in America, where an admirable system for the distribution of Theosophical tracts and pamphlets has lately been organized by the General Secretary, Mr. William Q. Judge, ably seconded by many other leading Theosophists in all parts of the United States.

be so. Good and useful qualities do not come at the word of command, or spring up at a wish. They are things of slow growth which have to be planted and cultivated in each man by himself, and this can only be accomplished by strong will and arduous effort. What is needed is not exhortation, but something definite to do, some aim and end, and some means of attaining to these.

What aim should we place practically before us? Surely, no better one could be found than that already indicated, the spreading of a knowledge of Theosophy. If our minds are occupied by that idea, our thoughts will be gradually drawn off from the personal and critical channels in which they have run so much, to the great regret of everyone concerned, and to the damage of the Cause; and being healthfully occupied and wholesomely nourished, the “bad blood” of the Society will grow pure, so that every little scratch will not fester, as it does now, and make the ugly sores we see,—the divisions, jealousies, and want of unity.

If we really wish to concentrate our efforts upon the work of strengthening the Society in the only way in which any Fellow can strengthen it, outside of himself, namely, by gaining for it friends and sympathisers, it is necessary to bring all our self-control into action in order to avoid being turned aside from that good work. The success with which the old device has been and still is practised by our adversaries, of bringing up side issues and even outside issues in order to take attention away from the main object, is as lamentable as it is extraordinary. It seems to be enough for some one, any one, to cry out any kind of ridiculous nonsense about us or about our ideas for our mental equilibrium to be upset, and an irresistible desire to “defend” ourselves to take possession of us. We seem to fancy that our wheels will not turn unless we stop to clean off the mud from the body of our carriage as quickly as it strikes there. Where is our courage? Where is our self-esteem? Would an astronomer leave his calculations to “answer” a passing tramp who said that he did not know his multiplication table? Would a merchant get up from his desk to “disprove” the assertion of a pedlar that his pack was of more value than all the merchant’s warehouse? Would a philosopher allow himself to be disturbed in some deep meditation by any meddlesome fellow who shouted it at his window that he had never “disproved the charge” of robbing an orchard when he was a small boy, and that unless he answered that accusation to the satisfaction of all the gossips and fools in the country, no value ought to be attached to his philosophical ideas?

Nevertheless, there are reasonable accusations and sensible demands compared with those which are brought against Theosophists and Theosophy. It is a puzzle whether to laugh or to weep about it. Should we weep over the childish way in which both we and the public at large allow ourselves to be thus befooled by these very stale and stupid, but none the less knavish, tricks of our adversaries? Or should we laugh at the audacity exhibited by those who try, only too successfully, to draw the attention of the public and of Theosophists themselves away from the main issue in our case,—away from the grand philosophy now taking

a definite shape under the name of Theosophy,—and to centre it on accidental and unimportant points, or gossip, personal trifles?

If our attention were fixed upon our real work,—upon *delivering to the world the message with which we are charged*,—these efforts of our enemies to distract us, and to draw us out of our entrenchments, would fail completely; and just as attention to our duty as Theosophists makes us indifferent to the opinion entertained or expressed about us, so also indifference to what our enemies say would greatly aid us to attend to our duty.

Let us therefore drop our little disputes in presence of the danger and the necessity we have alluded to;—the *danger* of an attack from without such as we have not yet experienced, which is sure to come the moment that we are considered really dangerous by those who feed the multitude on musty bones; the *necessity* of a common work, by concentrating our attention and efforts upon which we will forget our differences and disputes. We will thus be provided with the two requirements for success,—cohesion and organization within the Society; and stimulating hostility on the outside, pressing us into each other's arms through the necessity of united action against a common enemy.

THE AGE OF SRĪ SANKARĀCHĀRYA.

(Continued from page 107.)

SECTION II.—EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

UNDER this head we propose to include certain records and works, more reliable than those already dealt with, and by a reference to the statements which they make about their authors or Sri Sankarāchārya, the period in which he lived may be more rightly estimated. These are:—

(i) Fahian's, (ii) Hioun Tshang's², (iii) Itsing's³ and (iv) Alberuni's⁴ accounts about India, (v) Sri Rāmānujāchārya's Bhāshya on the Védānta Sūtras, (vi) Bhāmati, a commentary on Sri Sankarāchārya's Bhāshya on the Védānta Sūtras, (vii) Sankshépasārīraka, a condensed commentary on the Védānta Sūtras, in accordance with the previous work, (viii) Purānas, and (ix) List of successors of Sri Sankarāchārya.

1. Fahian visited India about 400 A. C. His accounts are translated by Prof. Beal into English.

2. Hioun Tshang came to India from China in the year 629 A. C., and returned to his country about 645 A. C. He came here chiefly to study the Buddhist literature in Sanskrit. He is one of the most accurate observers, and the accounts he gave of the various parts of his countries he visited, throws a good deal of light on the history of those parts. His 'Travels,' and his 'Life' by two Shamans are now translated into English by Prof. S. Beal.

3. Itsing came to India from China in the last quarter of the 7th century A. C. But his accounts are not yet translated, and it is not known whether he said anything regarding our philosopher.

4. Alberuni came to India from Arabia, about 1031 A. C. His accounts are now translated by Prof. Sachau in two volumes.

We may leave out (i), (ii) and (iv) as they do not say anything about the philosopher; of the rest we may first examine Sri Rāmānujāchārya's Bhāshya and Bhāmati together. The Sārīraka Bhāshya of Sri Rāmānujāchārya is a Visishtādwaitic Commentary on the Brahma Sūtras (Védānta Sūtras), and is an attempted refutation of the Advaitic philosophy as contained in Sri Sankarāchārya's Bhāshya and other works, such as Bhāmati, Panchapādikā, and Vivarana. Sri Rāmānujāchārya's date is a sure ground to stand upon¹. He was born in 1017, and began to write his Bhāshya probably about 1050 A. C. Thus Vāchaspatimisra, the author of Bhāmati, lived *not later than* the last quarter of the 10th century A. C. But as Vāchaspatimisra was only one in the long list of succession of disciples, we may *safely assume* that he lived not earlier than about a century after the philosopher. In other words, the philosopher himself could not have lived except before the middle of the 9th century A. C. It may be that Vāchaspatimisra lived two or three centuries before the time of Sri Rāmānujāchārya, but nothing definite can be deduced as to the period in which he (Vāchaspatimisra) lived, for almost nothing is known of one king Nriga, in whose reign he says he composed the work².

VII. Sankshépasārīraka was written by one Sarvagnamuni or Sarvagnātmā, who calls himself a grand pupil of Sri Sankarāchārya³. There is a certain passage⁴ in his work which shows that he lived during the time of one king Aditya. Prof. Bhāndarkar in his report on the search for Sanskrit MSS. during the year 1882-83 suggests that this king "must be one of the Chālūkyas, and probably one of the four successors of the great Pulakési, whose names ended with Aditya," and holds that "Sankarāchārya must be referred to about the end of the 6th century." Mr. Telang taking up this suggestion, argues as to who this Aditya might be. He says:—

"Professor Bhāndarkar does not say which of the four is in his opinion to be here understood, and there are, no doubt, hardly enough materials before us to form any very definite opinion. In the absence, however, of anything else, it seems to me not unreasonable to hold that the king alluded to, in the passage under consideration, must be the first Vikramaditya, firstly, because Vikrama appears there to have been a powerful and distinguished prince,

1. Vide note 5, p. 104.

2. P. 766, Calcutta Edition. The passage may be thus translated: "I have compiled this Bhāmati during the reign of the famous king Nriga, and whose actions many kings try to imitate, but are not successful."

3. P. I, Benares Edition.

4. P. 522, Benares Edition. The passage may be thus translated: "This Sankshépa Sārīraka, I have composed during the reign of Aditya, of the race of Manu, whose orders are never disobeyed, and who was born in Kshatriya family."

5. This is from a paper entitled 'The dates of Pūrnavarma, and Sankarāchārya' read on the 21st April last before a meeting of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, and is intended to be published in the Journal of that Branch of R. A. S. As the publication would take some time before it can come out of the Press, Mr. Telang kindly sent me a very rough proof, being all that he had of it in print. This paper is in reply to the criticisms passed by Mr. S. P. Pandit, in this preface to his edition of Gaudavaha (a Prakrit poem of Vākpati, written about 800 A. D.) on Mr. Telang's previous article in the *Indian Antiquary* (Vol. XIII, p. 95, et seq) on the date of Sri Sankarāchārya.

and secondly, and more especially because, unless we take the first of the Adityas to be intended, the description will be too indefinite to serve the presumable purpose of the writer. In default of all other data, therefore, we may provisionally accept the suggestion that a grand pupil of Sankarāchārya flourished in the reign of Pulakéśi's son. "Now it is more likely that an author would give the name of the king and not his title. Further Sarvagnātma says that the king was a Kshatriya. We can therefore infer that his full name was something like 'Adityavarma,' *varma* being a termination to show the caste he belonged to. In fact a king of that name reigned immediately after Pulakéśi II,—and somewhere between the years 624—658 A. C.¹ with whom we are inclined to identify the Aditya of Sankshépasāraka. The interval between the philosopher and his grand pupil being such as can be spanned by the life of a single individual—putting it at the lowest estimate, viz., 50 years—it follows that Sri Sankarāchārya must have lived before the last quarter of the 6th century A. C.

VIII. *Purānas*.—Certain Purānas are also said to make mention of the birth of our philosopher; those portions of the Purānas which are said to treat of him are not generally known to exist; and further the passages² alleged to contain his account, cannot be found in any of the existing editions, or manuscript copies of those Purānas.

The Pādmōttara Purāna contains 64 chapters. In the 42nd chapter we find Siva telling his wife Pārvati that several people will be born in the Kaliyug and preach several doctrines, and that he himself would incarnate as a Brahmin, and would destroy the world by preaching Advaita (Idealism). The MS. we have in the Adyar Library is not less than three centuries old, and the Telugu translation of the work is itself more than two centuries old. Vignānbhikshu in his Sāṅkhya Sūtra Bhāshya,³ quotes the very passage to show that even a work so revered as a Purāna tells something against the philosopher. Several followers of Sri Madhāvacharya quoted in their works this particular portion of the Pādmōttara Purāna. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the passages relating to various persons in Kaliyug must only be a later addition made to the Purāna, and those referring to our philosopher, must be by some antagonist of the Advaita philosophy. Similarly we have in the 34th chapter of one Bhārgava Purāna an account of Sri Rāmānujācharya. The only explanation that can be given for such statements is, that whenever any follower of a particular system wishes to exalt the glory of the founder of that system, he interpolates a passage or two in favour of the founder, in a Purāna or some other sacred work.

IX. *List of successors in the Mutts*.—Sringeri Mutt, which is considered the most ancient of these mutts, contains the names of only eleven ascetics before Vidyāranya, viz., Sri Sankarāchārya, Visvarūpa, Nityabódhaghana, Gnānaghana, Gnānōththama, Gnāna-

giri, Simhagirsvara, Isvara Tirtha, Nrisimha Tirtha, Vidyā-Sankara Tirtha, and Bhārati-Krishna Tirtha¹. Vidyāranya became a sanyasi about 1331 A. C., and even granting that he was immediately canonized as a saint, the date of Sri Sankarāchārya would be about the middle of the 8th century, assigning 50 years—and this is more than unusual—to each saint. On the other hand, the other evidences go to prove that he was at least two centuries before this period. The fact that sanyasis cannot have anything to do with worldly objects, such as money, &c., and that Vidyāranya, even a while sanyasi discharged the duties of a minister, although this procedure is wholly unwarranted by the Shastras under pain of expiation, lead us to think that the great philosopher never troubled himself with founding any mutts, or created any funds for their maintenance; but it is very probable that the philosophy he taught his disciples was handed down from one generation of teachers to another, exactly the same way as other sanyasis do at present, viz., without a mutt, or anything else, and scarcely at all mixed up with the world and its allurements. The most famous sanyasi in the succession of gurus to Sringeri Mutt was of course Vidyāranya, and it is very probable that the political influence he had exercised was the cause of these mutts. Gradually, however other sanyasis might have followed this course and established their own several mutts, tracing their line of gurus up to the philosopher, who probably did not possess any such idea. The interval of two centuries above referred to must have been occupied by some of the pupils of the philosopher and their successors, and in their eagerness to find out who lived in those two centuries, the followers became confused, and the whole attempt stopped.² The final solution struck at seems to have been that Surésvarācharya lived 800 years, while the philosopher lived only 32. This may be a mistake for 80 years, and assuming that such was the case, we find that Sri Sankarāchārya flourished about the end of the 7th century A. C.

The other difficulty is that the usual verses of salutation of the Advaites point to Padmapāda, Hástāmalaka, Tanthrōtakācharya, and Vārtikakāra (Surésvarācharya) as the immediate successors of the philosopher. Visvarūpācharya cannot be identified with the last named, and is quite a different person.

1. This is from H. H. Kristnarajawudayar's (the late Maharaja of Mysore). 'Ashtōththarasatanāmāvali' or the 108 names of the last Guru of Sringeri Mutt.

2. Mr. Rice in *Gazetteer of Mysore*, Vol. I, says he obtained his list from the Sringeri Mutt, and his names quite agree with mine, except that the immediate successor of the philosopher is in his list 'Surésvarā Chārya' and in mine 'Visvarūpa.'

ADYAR ORIENTAL LIBRARY, }
September 1889.

N. BHASHYA CHARYA.

(To be continued.)

1. Rice, *Mysore Inscriptions*, p. 71.

2. Such, for example, as Sivarahasyakhanda of Skānda Purāna.

3. Page 8, Calcutta Edition.

"INFIDEL BOB."

(Continued from page 72.)

IN a former article we have listened to Colonel Ingersoll as he described his personal feelings and his platform, and no doubt the reader has already perceived that we were right in saying that Ingersoll does a good deal more than attack the prevailing theological ideas. Through his speeches and writings there runs a vein of religious sentiment, which is, in fact, none other than that which shines through the teachings of Theosophy. He seems to hear a faint echo of the Wisdom Religion, towards whose grand religious philosophy his intuitions are continually drawing him, but against which intuitions he constantly fights, not understanding their meaning. But, at the same time, Ingersoll who laughs at Theological fetishes has an idol of his own, to which he is ever ready to "make puhaj" on the smallest provocation, and which he apparently credits with some of the attributes of a personal God. That idol is "Science." Science, as the term is commonly understood, is composed of the existing sciences. Not very long ago "Science" did not comprehend Electricity or Magnetism. At present it does not take in several subjects which are objects of study to many people, and which appear to be governed by law, like everything else in the universe. If Colonel Ingersoll used the term "Science" so as to include both actual and possible sciences—a knowledge of the whole of nature, whether known or unknown to us at present, and whether visible or invisible to our ordinary vision,—no one would wish to interfere with his private devotions; but he frequently speaks of God Science as if he understood thereby modern science, which modern scientists themselves are generally the first to acknowledge to be very imperfectly acquainted with its own subject-matter, and to leave out of consideration a host of most interesting subjects which are, and always have been, matters of enquiry among men.

Were an idol wanted to replace "Religion," Philosophy would be a better one than Science as the word is now understood; but Philosophy is out of fashion with this generation, and Science (with a big S) is the name by which we conjure. The fact, however, seems to be that Philosophy, Science and Ethics compose a trinity, whose unity is none other than the Wisdom Religion. A student of the Wisdom Religion is at present called a Theosophist, and a man may be a Theosophist without calling himself one, and be a student of the Wisdom Religion without knowing it by that name; and to some extent this seems to be the position of Colonel Ingersoll. His own strong reason and true intuition have enabled him to arrive at a perception of what Theosophists call Karma; his ideas of universal life, and of the grand unity of all things and complete comprehensiveness of nature, are purely theosophical; and he seems to have a perception, somewhat hazy perhaps, of the fundamental difference between DEITY, and A Deity or The Deity,—the former being a necessity of philosophy and even of science, the latter being postulates of Theology. We shall now, by quotations from some of Colonel Ingersoll's lectures and pamphlets,

endeavour to prove our assertion that he is naturally and constitutionally a Theosophist.

He defines Philosophy thus :—

What is Philosophy? It is to account for phenomena by which we are surrounded—that is, to find the hidden cord that unites everything.¹⁸

Our knowledge is, unfortunately very small :—

Can any man have the egotism to say that he has found it all out? No. Every man who has thought, knows not only how little he knows, but how little every other human being knows, and how ignorant, after all, the world must be.⁵

The ignorant are conceited ; the learned are humble :—

The more a man knows the more liberal he is; the less a man knows the more bigoted he is. The less a man knows the more certain he is that he knows it, and the more a man knows the better satisfied he is that he is entirely ignorant. Great knowledge is philosophic, and little, narrow, contemptible knowledge is bigoted and hateful.²³

He confesses his ignorance of the origin of things :—

It is argued that somebody must have made this world. Again I reply I don't know. But I imagine that the indestructible cannot be created. What would you make it of? "Oh, nothing!" Well, it strikes me that nothing, considered in the light of a raw material, is a decided failure. For my part, I cannot conceive of force apart from matter, and I cannot conceive of matter apart from force. I cannot conceive of force somewhere without acting upon something; because force must be active, or it is not force; and if it has no matter to act upon, it ceases to be force. I cannot conceive of the smallest atom of matter staying together without force.¹⁹

Of a First Cause, as distinguished from "the Eternal Cause," he says :—

We grow up with our conditions, and you cannot imagine a first cause. Why? Every cause has an effect. Strike your hands together; they feel warm. The effect becomes a cause instantly, and that cause produces another effect, and the effect another cause; and there could not have been a cause until there was an effect. Because until there was an effect, nothing had been caused; until something had been caused, I am positive there was no cause. Now you cannot conceive of a last effect, because the last effect of which you cannot think will in turn become a cause, and that cause produce another effect. And as you cannot think of a last effect, you cannot think of a first cause; it is not thinkable by the human mind.¹⁹

The difficulty of admitting the existence of an extra-cosmic Deity he states thus :—

To put a God back of the universe, compels us to admit that there was a time when nothing existed except this God: that this

God had lived from eternity in an infinite vacuum, and in absolute idleness. The mind of every thoughtful man is forced to one of these two conclusions; either that the universe is self-existent, or that it was created by a self-existent being. To my mind, there are far more difficulties in the second hypothesis than in the first.²¹

What is called "Law," is not an entity and cannot be a cause :—

Let it be understood that by the term law is meant the same invariable relations of succession and resemblance predicated of all facts springing from like conditions. Law is a fact—not a cause. It is a fact that like conditions produce like results; this fact is law. When we say that the Universe is governed by law, we mean that this fact, called law, is incapable of change—that it has been, and for ever will be, the same inexorable, immutable FACT, inseparable from all phænomena. Law, in this sense, was not enacted or made. It could not have been otherwise than as it is. That which necessarily exists has no Creator.²⁰

Neither does the term "Law" imply a personal Law-giver :—

Mr. Black probably thinks that the difference in the weight of rocks and clouds was created by law; that parallel lines fail to unite only because it is illegal; that diameter and circumference could have been so made that it would be a greater distance across than around a circle; that a straight line could inclose a triangle if not prevented by law, and that a little legislation could make it possible for two bodies to occupy the same space at the same time.²¹

He describes what is the meaning of the term "Law" :—

It is not the cause, neither is it the result of phenomena. The fact of succession and resemblance, that is to say, the same thing happening under the same conditions, is all we mean by law. No one can conceive a law existing apart from matter, or controlling matter, any more than he can understand the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost, or motion apart from substance.²⁰

The law of causation is of universal application :—

Each thing is a necessary link in an infinite chain; and I cannot conceive of this chain being broken even for one instant. Back of the simplest monera there is a cause, and back of that another, and so on, it seems to me, forever. In my philosophy I postulate neither beginning nor ending.²²

What a "Good God" would be like :—

I insist that, if there is an infinitely good and wise God, he beholds with pity the misfortunes of his children. I insist that such a God would know the mists, the clouds, the darkness enveloping the human mind. He would know how few stars are visible in the intellectual sky. His pity, not his wrath, would be excited by the efforts of his blind children, groping in the night to find the cause of things, and endeavouring, through their tears, to see some dawn of hope. Filled with awe by their surroundings, by fear of the unknown, he would know that when, kneeling, they poured out their gratitude to some unseen power, even to a visible idol, it was, in fact, intended for him. An infinitely good being, had he

the power, would answer the reasonable prayer of an honest savage, even when addressed to wood and stone.²¹

Elsewhere he says :—

I believe that the poor savage who kneels down and prays to a stuffed snake—prays that his little children may recover from the fever—is honest, and it seems to me that a good God would answer his prayer if he could, if it was in accordance with wisdom, because the poor savage was doing the best he could, and no one can do any better than that.⁵

After quoting Jehovah's malignant jealousy of other gods, he says :—

Contrast this with the words put by the Hindu poet into the mouth of Brahma: "I am the same to all mankind. They who honestly worship other gods involuntarily worship me. I am he that partaketh of all worship. I am the reward of worship." How perfectly sublime! Let me read it to you again: "I am the same to all mankind. They who honestly worship other gods involuntarily worship me. I am he that partaketh of all worship. I am the reward of worship." Compare these passages. The first is a dun-geon, which cruel hands have daubed with jealous slime. The other is like the dome of the firmament, inlaid with constellations.²⁴

He thus distinguishes between Jehovah and a "Supreme Being" :—

And here, let me say once for all, that when I speak of God, I mean the being described by Moses: the Jehovah of the Jews. There may be for aught I know, somewhere in the unknown shoreless vast, some being whose dreams are constellations and within whose thought the infinite exists. About this being, if such a one exists, I have nothing to say. He has written no books, inspired no barbarians, required no worship, and has prepared no hell in which to burn the honest seeker after truth.²

In another lecture he says :—

There may be, for aught I know, upon the shore of the eternal vast, some being whose very thought is the constellation of those numberless stars. I do not know; but if there is he has never written a Bible; he has never been in favor of slavery; he has never advocated polygamy, and he has never told the murderer to sheathe his dagger in the dimpled breast of a babe.¹⁹

Of Spinoza's idea of God he says :—

To him the universe was one. The infinite embraced the all. That all was God. He was right, the universe is all there is, and if God does not exist in the universe he exists nowhere.²⁵

Ingersoll recurs frequently to this idea of God, which is the theosophical one, showing that it is the idea of a great number of thinkers, both ancient and modern. For instance he says of Haeckel :—

Rejecting all the puerile ideas of a personal creator, he has had the courage to adopt the noble words of Bruno: "A spirit exists in all things, and no body is so small but it contains a part of the divine substance within itself, and by which it is animated." He has endeavoured—and I think with complete success—to show

that there is not, and never was, and never can be, the *creator* of anything. There is no more a personal creator than there is a personal destroyer.²⁵

Of Humboldt he says :—

The object of this illustrious man was to comprehend the phenomena of physical objects in their general connexion, and to represent nature as one great whole, moved and animated by internal forces.²⁰

Ingersoll seems to catch an intuitive glimpse of the great beings behind the scene :—

In accordance with a law not fully comprehended he (Humboldt) was a production of his time. Great men do not live alone; they are surrounded by the great; they are the instruments used* to accomplish the tendencies of their generation; they fulfil the prophecies of their age... Great men seem to be part of the infinite, brothers of the mountains and the seas.²⁰

He lays a very big task upon the shoulders of "Science" :—

Nearly all the scientific men of the eighteenth century had the same idea entertained by Humboldt, but most of them in a dim and confused way. There was, however, a general belief among the intelligent, that the world is governed by law, and that there really exists a connexion between all facts, *or that all facts are simply the different aspects of a general fact*, and that the task of science is to discover this connexion, to comprehend this general fact, or to announce the laws of things.²⁰

He tells us what is the modern conception of the Universe :—

What is the modern conception of the universe? The modern conception is that the universe always has been and forever will be. The modern conception of the universe is that it embraces within its infinite arms all matter, all spirit, all forms of force, all that is, all that has been, all that can be.¹⁴

Is this not the idea of Parabrahm?—

The universe is all there is. It is both subject and object; contemplator and contemplated; creator and created; destroyer and destroyed; preserver and preserved, and within itself are all causes, modes, motions, and effects.²⁶

The idea of the supernatural upsets all our conceptions :—

The moment that the idea is abandoned that all is natural; that all phenomena are the necessary links in the endless chain of being, the conception of history becomes impossible. With the ghosts the present is not the child of the past, nor the mother of the future. In the domain of religion all is chance, accident and caprice.⁴

Then is no "blind agency of Nature" :—

I do not believe that I am the sport of accident, or that I may be dashed in pieces by the blind agency of Nature. There is no

accident, and there is no agency. That which happens must happen. The present is the child of all the past, the mother of all the future.²⁷

Still, this negation of blind agency does not mean belief in the Supernatural :—

To account for anything by supernatural agencies is, in fact, to say that we do not know. Theology is not what we know about God, but what we do not know about Nature.²²

Though not knowing everything, we know some useful things :—

We do not pretend to have circumnavigated everything and to have solved all difficulties, but we do believe that it is better to love men than to fear gods; that it is grander and nobler to think and investigate for yourself than repeat a creed. We are satisfied that there can be but little liberty on earth while men worship a tyrant in heaven.²⁸

We are surrounded by marvels and mysteries :—

We know of no end to the development of man. We cannot unravel the infinite complications of matter and force. The history of one monad is as unknown as that of the universe; one drop of water is as wonderful as all the seas; one leaf, as all the forests; and one grain of sand, as all the stars.²⁸

Of the mystery of Matter he says :—

You say, ah! this is materialism! this is the doctrine of matter! What is matter? I take a handful of earth in my hands, and into that dust I put seeds, and arrows from the eternal quiver of the sun smite it, and the seeds grow and bud and blossom, and fill the air with perfume in my sight. Do you understand that? Do you understand how this dust and these seeds and that light and this moisture produced that bud and that flower and that perfume? Do you understand that any better than you do the production of thought? Do you understand that any better than you do a dream? Do you understand that any better than you do the thoughts of love that you see in the eyes of the one you adore? Can you explain it? Can you tell what matter is? Have you the slightest conception? Yet you talk about matter as though you were acquainted with its origin: as though you had compelled, with clenched hands, the very rocks to give up the secret of existence! Do you know what force is? Can you account for molecular action? Are you familiar with chemistry? Can you account for the loves and the hatreds of the atoms? Is there not something in matter that for ever eludes you? Can you tell what matter really is? Before you cry materialism, you had better find what matter is.⁴

Matter and Force are eternal :—

Matter and the universe are the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. There is just as much matter in the universe to-day as there ever was, and as there ever will be; there is just as much force and just as much energy as there ever was or ever will be; but it is continually taking different shapes or forms; one day it

* "Used" by whom, since there is no personal God?—By the Mahatmas and Chohans?—Ed.

is a man, another day it is an animal, another day it is earth, another day it is metal, another day it is gas—it gains nothing and it loses nothing.⁴

The clergy will have a bad time when universal law is recognized:—

When we abandon the doctrine that some infinite being created matter and force, and enacted a code of laws for their government, the idea of interference will be lost. The real priest will then be, not the mouth-piece of some pretended deity, but the interpreter of nature. From that moment the church ceases to exist. The tapers will die out upon the dusty altar; the moths will eat the fading velvet of pulpit and pew; the Bible will take its place with the Shastras, Puranas, Vedas, Eddas, Sagas and Korans, and the fetters of a degrading faith will fall from the minds of men.²⁹

We are all parts of the Deity, if we only knew it:—

What is more beautiful than the old story from the sufi? There was a man who for seven years did every act of good, every kind of charity, and at the end of the seven years he mounted the steps to the gate of Heaven and knocked. A voice cried, "Who is there?" He cried, "Thy servant, O Lord"; and the gate was shut. Seven other years he did every good work, and again mounted the three steps to Heaven and knocked. The voice cried, "Who is there?" He answered, "Thy slave, O God"; and the gates were shut. Seven other years he did every good deed, and again mounted the steps to Heaven, and the voice said: "Who is there?" He replied, "Thyself, O God"; and the gates wide open flew. Is there anything in our religion so warm or so beautiful as that? Compare that story from a Pagan with the Presbyterian religion!²⁴

The whole Universe is one living fact:—

I love to think of the whole universe together as one eternal fact. I love to think that everything is alive; that crystallization itself is a step toward joy. I love to think that when a bud bursts into blossom it feels a thrill. I love to have the universe full of feeling and full of joy, and not full of simple dead, inert matter, managed by an old bachelor for all eternity.¹⁴

The tale the sea tells to each differs from one to another:—

A man looks at the sea, and the sea says something to him. Another man looks at the same sea, and the sea tells another story to him. The sea cannot tell the same story to any two human beings. There is not a thing in Nature, from a pebble to a constellation, that tells the same story to any two human beings. It depends upon the man's experience, his intellectual development, and what chord of memory it touches. One looks upon the sea and is filled with grief; another looks upon it and laughs.⁷

The revelations of nature are personal:—

The revelations of nature depend upon the individual to whom they are revealed, or by whom they are discovered. And the

extent of the revelation or discovery depends absolutely upon the intellectual and moral development of the person to whom, or by whom, the revelation or discovery is made.²⁶

Our common objective world is really a different subject world peculiar to each:—

The world is to each man according to each man. It takes the world as it really is and each man to make each man's world.²¹

We cannot be satisfied with second-hand revelations:—

If God intends to make a revelation to me He has to make it to me through my brain and my reasoning. He cannot make a revelation to another man for me. The other man will have God's word for it, but I will only have that man's word for it. As that man has been dead for several thousand years, and as I don't know what his reputation was for truth and veracity in the neighbourhood in which he lived, I will wait for the Lord to speak again.^{7*}

R. H.

(To be continued.)

HINDU DAILY PRAYERS AND SUPPLICATIONS.

THE daily Hindu prayers and supplications are known by the names of *Sandhyā Vandanam* and *Nityānushtānām*. The word *Sandhyā* is derived from the word *Sandhi*, which means a *meeting*; it is the meeting of two periods of time, viz., day and night. Hence, *Sandhya* corresponds to the English word *twilight*, which occurs both at sunrise and at sunset. The word *Vandanam* means adoration or prayers. Therefore, the compound word, *Sandhyā Vandanam*, signifies *twilight adorations or prayers*. These prayers are also known by the name of *Nityānushtānam* or *daily supplications*, because they *must* be offered up *every-day*, as a matter of strict duty, by every Aryan, both in the morning and in the evening. In other words, they are *Nityakarmas*, or *compulsory duties*, and are not *Naimittika Karmas*, or *optional duties*. Some *Smritis* or religious laws ordain the performance of *Mādhyaṅnika Sandhyās* or *noon prayer*, and thus the word *Sandhi* is extended in its meaning and is applied to the change from midday to afternoon. The mandatory words of the *Vedas* are:—"Aharahassandhyā mupāsītā," which mean; The twilight prayers must be performed every day. The selection of the time of twilight for these prayers seems to be appropriate, because it is then that almost everything in nature is, more or less, in a state of *sānti* or rest, which greatly contributes to concentration of mind. As cleanliness is next to godliness, *Snana* or ablution must be performed before *Sandhyā Vandana*.

* The numbers attached to the above quotations refer to the following lectures and pamphlets, some of which are now out of print:—4, Ghosts. 5, Defence of Free-thought. 7, Some Reasons Why. 14, Providence, a Reply to the Preachers. 18, Orthodox Theology. 19, How man makes Gods. 20, Law, not God; or the Message of Humboldt. 21, Is all the Bible Inspired? 22, Mistakes of Moses. 23, Intellectual development. 24, Which Way? 25, Saviours of the World. 26, Chinese God. 27, Fact and Faith. 28, Heresy and Heretics. 29, Gods.

The *Prâtas Sandhya* or morning prayer expresses gratitude to the Supreme Being for past acts of grace, beseeches forgiveness for sins committed during the previous night, and prays for further acts of divine grace. It must be performed just before sunrise, when some stars are visible to the naked eye. *Mādhyāhnikā Sandhya* or midday prayer similarly expresses gratitude to God and prays for rain to purify and fructify the earth; it also beseeches God to purify the heart of the devotee from all sins and evil acts. The best time for performing it is when the sun is in the zenith of the place. *Sāyam Sandhya* or evening prayer expresses sentiments similar to those of the morning prayer and asks forgiveness for sins committed during the day-time. It must be performed in the evening just before sunset, when no star is visible to the naked eye. Hence, gratitude and benevolence form the two leading features of these Aryan prayers. "There can be no doubt," says an eminent modern writer "that the whole process of devotion which the Aryans observed is conducive to the preservation of health, to the invigoration of mind, and to the development of the psychic powers."

There is a misconception regarding the *object of worship* in Sandhyā Vandanam. Many foreigners and even some Aryans are under the false impression that it is the material sun that is adored by the Hindus. The fact is, as the sun is the largest and brightest body known to us, as he is the great giver of warmth and light, which are absolutely necessary to the growth of both animate and inanimate substances in the world, and lastly as he is the regulator of time in a remarkably accurate degree, that self-luminous body was chosen by the great Vedic seers of antiquity to represent, as a "symbolic conception," (to use the words of that great modern metaphysician, Herbert Spencer,) of *Parabrahma*, or the Supreme Spirit. The word *savita*, which is used for the sun in *Gayatri*, the essential formula of the *Sandhya*, means the *Creator of the Universe*, i. e., the Supreme Being or God. Again, in the very beginning of the Prayer, the devotee says that he begins *Brahmakarma*, which means *acts of devotion to the Supreme Spirit* (*Brahma Karma samarabhe*). Almost in the very middle of Sandhyā Vandana, there is a clear text which seems to have been put in purposely to warn devotees against falsely thinking that there is more than one Supreme Spirit, and to point out in unmistakeable language that the visible sun is only an outward symbol to represent God. That text is the following:—"Asavadityo Brahma," i. e., *Asa aditya Brahma*: That sun represents the Supreme Spirit. The morning Sandhya is symbolically represented as *Gayatri* or *Brahmī Sakti* or the energy of Brahma, the personification of the creative principle of the Supreme Spirit; it manifests itself as possessing *Rakta varna* or red hue. The midday Sandhya is symbolically represented as *Savitri* or *Raudri Sakti* or the energy of Siva, the personification of the destructive principle of Parabrahma or the Supreme Spirit; it manifests itself as possessing *Sukla varna* or white color. The evening Sandhya is symbolically represented as *Saraswati* or *Vaishnavī Sakti* or the energy of Vishnu, the personification of the protective principle of the Supreme Being; it manifests itself as

possessing *Krishna varna* or black color. The three Sandhyas thus stand for the energies of the *Trimurtis*, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. The union of these three energies is known collectively by the name of *Sandhya Devi* or the energy of prayer. This collective energy is but the "symbolic conception" of *Parabrahma* or the Supreme Spirit as represented by the union of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva.

Although certain sects of Hinduism differ in minor details in Sandhya, concerning the chanting of certain Vedic texts, &c., yet all sects agree in the necessity of using the *Gayatri Mantra*, or the sacred text of *Gayatri*, at the time of *Arghya Pradana*, or the pouring out of consecrated water three times in adoration, and also at the time of *japa* or spiritual meditation. This holy text is called *Veda Janani*, i. e., the mother of the Vedas. The following elaborate English translation of it shows its universal character:—

"Aum,—the light of the universe, the omniscient and omnipresent, the all containing, in whose womb move all the orbs of heaven, the omnipotent, the self-effulgent, from whom the sun and stars borrow their light, whose knowledge is perfect and immutable, whose glory is superlative, who is deathless, the life of life and dearer than life, who gives bliss to those who earnestly desire it, and saves from all calamities his genuine devotees, and gives them peace and comfort, the all-intelligence, who keeps in order and harmony all and each by permeating all things, on whom is dependent all that exist, the creator and giver of all glory, the illuminator of all souls, and giver of every bliss, who is worthy to be embraced; the all-knowledge and all-holiness,—We contemplate and worship that He may enlighten our intellect and conscience."

From the foregoing facts, it is clear that prayer to God is not only the duty of every Aryan but is also very essential to all men whose hearts overflow with gratitude to Him for the innumerable blessings which He has bestowed, and which He is always bestowing, on mankind and on the universe in general.

(The foregoing is the HINDU TRACT SOCIETY'S *English Tract No. 5*.—Ed.)

ELOHISTIC TEACHINGS.

III.—PNEUMATOLOGICAL.

The Genesis and Evolution of Spirit.

(Continued from page 139.)

FROM infantine beginnings, from child-like curiosity, from a desire to reach the unknown through the known in small things, sprang the riper impulse of inquiry and love of investigation, that slowly developed into the later determination to wrest her secrets from Nature, to penetrate the mystery of Being and learn the meaning of Life, to which human Science owes its origin.

Under the term Science are included, with the approved and classified results of accumulated experience, the processes through which that experience has been derived, and the methods by which it has been applied to facilitate the uses of life.

Knowledge is gained in three ways:

1. By the experience of life, acquired or imparted.
2. By an experimental examination of the workings of nature.
3. By a reasoned interpretation and an extended application of the suggestive results of those workings.

Practically these resolve themselves into two scientific methods the experimental and the reflective.

Consonantly with this division the aims of science are two-fold: for, while experimental science devotes its efforts to promoting the welfare of man, reflective science suggests to him the meaning and object of the natural order of Being in which he finds himself, and, with this, the significance of his own life.

Hence experimental science limits its researches to the systematic examination of the phenomena of nature; whereas reflective science widens these researches in its efforts, by close and accurate reasoning from achieved data, to pass through and beyond the same phenomena to that which underlies them.

The Experimental Inquirer carries on his researches by ingeniously devised and carefully conducted experiments.

The Reflecting Observer seeks, in his investigations, by intellectual analyses for logical results.

The Experimental Inquirer in prosecuting his researches trusts entirely to the evidence of his senses as interpreted by his intelligence.

The Reflecting Observer in his logical investigations relies on the testimony of his intellectual perceptions.

The Experimental Inquirer as the result of his researches sees a mere generative progression from lower to higher orders of Being, by which racial advance is gained at the cost of a transient individuality.

The Reflecting Observer as the outcome of his mental analyses recognizes an unmanifested energy passing through manifested phenomena from a lower to a higher order of Being.

The Experimental Inquirer, interpreting the results of patient research, has determined that the phenomena of nature—collectively considered in their orderly succession as constant resultants of similar antecedents—depend upon, are governed by, and are the outcome and expression of certain definite laws. But unwilling to admit these laws as potencies, declares that they merely set forth the order and sequence of the workings of the Kosmos.

The Reflecting Observer, pondering on the collectivity of the same phenomena, sees in this orderly succession evidence of an energizing cause working in a methodical way towards a predetermined and definite result.

The Experimental Inquirer, unable to demonstrate the existence and presence of anything as underlying the workings of nature, admits that the knowledge of primary causes is beyond the reach of his methods of investigation and therefore outside the range of his research. Were he content to keep his deductions strictly within the lines laid down by this acknowledgment of the limits of physical inquiry, no possible issue could be raised between himself and the Reflecting Observer. Each of the sister sciences would then have its own special sphere of exploration and methods

of examination. Either would be able to make important suggestions, and even to give valuable aid to the other, while both pursued their several independent courses. But unfortunately the Experimental Inquirer refuses to recognize that his inability to discover the inducing cause of transitional phenomena simply indicates the inadequacy of his methods, and demonstrates the impossibility of passing by the processes he uses beyond the phenomena to that which may be manifesting its presence through them. Hence, instead of admitting the possible action of an undetectable directing agency, he rejects the logical inference of an intervening energy; and does this because reluctant to acknowledge a volitional evolution through, a providential over-ruling in, and an intelligential control of the Universe—for so to allow would be to recognize the possible existence of an undemonstrable developing Something to which, under whatever designation, the attributes of Spirit must be imputed.

And yet—even while confessing his powerlessness to discover a First Cause, and although at the same time indignantly denying the existence of Spirit as a volitional agency acting upon and through nature—the Experimental Inquirer finds that he cannot advance a single step in his attempts to explain things as they are without assuming the existence of a working cause and of a material in, on and through which that cause works. These he has, for convenience, been in the habit of terming Force and Matter. But he has never been able to separate either from the phenomena to account for which their assumed interaction has been found necessary. Has never succeeded in demonstrating the existence of the one apart from the other, or from the phenomena, they were supposed adequate conjointly to produce. Hence still further to simplify his position, he is tempted to lose sight of the inducing Force in the induced movement, and to regard Matter and Motion as his penultimate, matter in motion as his ultimate principle.

But so to conclude is to evade the initial difficulty, for motion is a consequence before it becomes a cause: so that the effects it produces are attributable to the inciting cause of the motion, whatever that cause may have been—whether physical or volitional.

Thus the Experimental Inquirer, unable to detect the presence of a first cause, and unwilling to accept what he cannot demonstrate, fails absolutely to solve the mystery of Being and to ascertain the meaning of Life, and this is why to him it has no meaning—save as a transient condition and relation.

But to hold that the initiation of the natural order is veiled in an impenetrable mystery, while maintaining that the existence of an undetectable first cause cannot be allowed, is to admit that the problem of Creation is insoluble, and yet this admission necessarily carries with it the inference that things always have been and probably always will be what they now are, as regards the visible operations of nature; and therefore that, as the apparent result of an indeterminate working, they cannot have a determinate aim.

Now such a view brings the Experimental Inquirer face to face with a dilemma which cannot be evaded. For under it he must

either give up his favourite doctrine of progressive evolution, and so renounce the very foundations of his advancing science, or else acknowledge that an undemonstrable cause has consecutively produced organic out of inorganic Existence, volitional and intellectual out of instructive Being, a higher out of a lower order of Life. And yet so to admit is to allow that, Force as well as Matter, that Force and Matter are, in phenomenal and manifested existence, passing through a progressive evolution in which Force (under whatever designation) develops that it may be itself developed.

Such an admission, unavoidable in the position he is seeking to establish, brings the Experimental Inquirer into a difficulty which must eventually cause him to ask if only of himself—what is this inducing, this compelling cause, this energizing Force from the recognition of the necessary existence of which I cannot escape without renouncing the indispensable basis of the science I uphold? What is this something, indistinguishable from Nothing, which is at once the cause and subject of the progressive evolution on which the intellectually deduced but undemonstrable orderly advance of nature depends? In what would this inconceivable Something, gradually developed by evolution, and endowed successively with instinct, volition, intelligence and reason, differ from Spirit, whose existence I have hitherto denied? Why should I not allow that Force is undeveloped Spirit—Spirit which has not attained to perception, volition and intelligence? Why should I hesitate to acknowledge that Spirit is but Force which by process of evolution has acquired perception and volition, and in its higher phases an advancing intelligence? My theory of natural evolution rests, after all, on a presumption which is incapable of direct proof, why should not the orderly working of nature be as good evidence of an orderly Worker—of a Worker working from within, not from without—as the orderly outcome of that working, consecutively studied, is held to be of a determinate orderly evolution?

* * * * *

To deny the possible existence of Spirit, as developed Force, while admitting the necessary existence of a Force, as an inducing cause, and with this its consecutive, that is spontaneous action in the evolution of form—for consecutive becomes spontaneous action where the law of sequence is not a potency but only a recognized line of advance—is as unscientific as irrational: for, Why should not the inducing Force be reacted upon and developed through the natural, that is, the life uses of the forms it produces and develops? And, why should not this development of acting Force through reacting form proceed on parallel lines with the evolution of Form? Until the Experimental Inquirer has demonstrated that the energizing cause of natural evolution is not the subject of the evolution it causes; until he has proved that, while progressively individualizing and personifying Matter, and thus gradually making it a medium through which instinct, volition, intelligence and reason can be and are manifested in living forms, itself remains a mere energizing potency inseparable from

the elements of dissolving form of the dead body which during life it had animated, he places himself in the false position of denying on the one hand what he affirms on the other. Whereas by simply admitting that evolution in nature is a two-fold process under which development of Force, or its change into Spirit, is the necessary result of the evolution of form through the direct action of Force; that under this two-fold process the developing Force is reacted upon and developed by the life uses of the form it has, by evolution, produced and developed; and that this action and reaction are going on simultaneously, the one as the natural consequence of the other, he gains a rational view of the intent of nature and learns the meaning of his own life.

But so admitting, he is driven to the further admission, not merely of the possible but of the probable, nay, even of the necessary existence of an invisible order, which underlies the visible order of nature and manifests itself through the workings thereof with which he is familiar. And this necessity compels him, from his point of view, to reject the only reasonable way out of the dilemma into which his methods of research have driven him. And yet in this way he might learn that the reason of man is able to answer the questions itself suggests, by logically demonstrating, through their workings, the existence and nature of, at any rate, those secondary causes, the presence of which eludes the scalpel of the anatomist and the test tube of the chemist.

Will the Experimental Inquirer, after considering the subject from this point of view, venture to deny that the evolution of Force is possible? Can he affirm that nothing leaves the body at death? Is he in a position to assert that an individualization and personification, a substantialization of Force is not progressively going on in association with the individualization and personification of Matter? Do the results of his researches enable him to show that the individualizing and personifying Force whose workings are manifested in evolution does not proceed in some unperceived way from form to form, from body to body—entering each successive order, each successive form, each successive body by process of generation; using each successive order, each successive form, each successive body as an agency through the life uses of which to acquire in succession and develop by further use the characteristic faculties of reasoning beings; and quitting each body in succession at death, when that body ceased to be of beneficial use to it? Do the conclusions at which he has arrived authorize him to reject the view that in man this thus evolved and developed Force, having already attained to a degree of advance co-ordinate with his form, is undergoing a further process of evolution; and that since the outcome of this further evolution has not, so far, been manifested in planetary life, it is only gained by a return to the invisible state from which the order of terrestrial evolution took its departure? So to affirm would be rash indeed.

The difficulty of the Experimental Inquirer here is, that the just previously animated body is not abandoned by Force at death. What he perceives is a change in the direction of the action of the

operating forces: so that, whereas hitherto they have maintained the existence and viable relations of the bodily form, they now occupy themselves with the decomposition and dissolution of the body.

But then the bases of science are, in their ultimates, hypotheses.

The existence of Force and, its correlative, Matter, or of a primary substance energizing itself, though a necessary assumption for a scientific theory, is, after all, a mere hypothesis, even the recently demonstrated so called radiant Matter being but an inexplicable phenomenal effect.

On this hypothesis the assumed, the more than assumed, the all but demonstrated orderly evolution of nature rests.

Is it an unreasonable extension of the hypothesis of natural evolution to assume that the invisible cause of the visible phenomena of nature should be itself undergoing an invisible, an unperceived and undemonstrable substantial evolution conjointly with, and through the reaction upon itself of the visible material evolution it is producing? Admitting the existence of an invisible, an unperceived, a not to be demonstrated cause—that is, admitting the existence of energizing Force, as the operating Developer of the invisible, unperceived and not to be demonstrated basic Matter of nature—Why should this energizing Force, this one energizing substance which underlies the phenomenal world be exempt from the operations of the working itself produces?

But if an unobserved evolution of Force is going on in nature, simultaneously with the observed evolution of Matter it is producing, then just as all Matter is not undergoing the evolution of Form but only a proportion thereof, so will only a proportion of Force be going through the formative evolution to which it is thus subjected. Hence the great volume of the energizing Force working in nature, with the great bulk of its energized Matter, or, in other words, the vast preponderance of energizing substance which constitutes the veiled basis of the natural, while acting in and promoting the development going on, will itself partake but in a very subordinate degree therein.

The recognition of these mutually interacting relations, which is unavoidable under the conditions stated, will serve to explain and account for the difficulty which has so far prevented the Experimental Inquirer from perceiving that an evolution of Force, or, should he prefer so to view it, of energizing substance, is going on in association with the evolution of Form; far under them he will realize that three conditions of Force, correlative with the three conditions of Matter through which these act, or three qualities of energizing substance, are as necessary to this evolution as to the evolution of Form. Hence, just as he classifies Matter as inorganic, organic and animated, so should he classify Force (or energizing substance) as physical, organizing and vitalizing.

But, under this classification he will find himself compelled to admit that, even as Matter passes from the inorganic through the organized to the animated state, so does that which underlies Matter, whether designated Force, Energizing Substance or Spirit, pass from the physical through the organizing to the animating

condition; and that whereas only a physical force acts in inorganic matter, an organizing and an animating force co-operate therewith in the production and animation of living forms—these three having been evolved by and proceeding from an original primary energy.

From this point of view the question cannot be avoided—What becomes of the animating Force at death?

The hitherto organizing then becomes a disorganizing process. Physical (of course including chemical) force carries on the work of decomposition and dissolution, and reduces the elements of the inanimate body to a condition under which they are prepared to go through further changes.

But the animating is the most developed, is the higher Force.

From this position, Which is the more reasonable hypothesis? The assumption that the animating Force is dissipated at death, as are the constituent elements of the inanimate body; or the suggestion that it has passed in its developed state to the invisible order which has been the energizing cause of the evolution? Will it help the Experimental Inquirer in his decision here to remind him that the constituting elements of the animated body have no permanent relation to that body, but undergo a continuous disintegration and reintegration through the unintermitting action of the processes of life (which induce ceaseless change therein until death puts an end to the reintegrating process) the animation of the body being uninterrupted?

Under such a view only a certain proportion of the primary Force working on, in and through physically energized and organizable Matter, or, in other words, only a certain proportion of the energizing substance producing the phenomena of nature, is undergoing the evolution of manifested life.

But by this process of evolution it is brought into another state, a state which distinguishes it from the physically actuated energizing substance from which it has been evolved.

Thus considered, the admission of the existence of three classes of forces, emanating by evolution from a single primary energy and acting in association to produce a predetermined and definite result, becomes an unavoidable necessity.

Of these one has been individualized by passing through the evolution of manifested life, whereas the others have remained in the unindividualized state.

But the individualized Force (or energizing substance) has been progressively and successively personified and intellectualized.

Hence, to distinguish individualized, personified and intellectualized from mere physical Force, a distinctive designation was required.

Whatever this designation might have been, it would attribute to the developed Force the qualities and characteristics acquired thereby through evolution.

But these qualities and characteristics are precisely those imputed to Spirit.

Whence the logical conclusion that Force and Spirit were originally one, derived from the same genetic source; so that Spirit,

correctly defined, is simply developed Force—Force which has gone through a natural process of evolution.

* * * * *

The origin of the designation "Spirit" has now to be considered.

This designation, which has come to us through the Hebrews, is the outcome of an idealistic evolution, whose progress has closely followed the evolutionary course of its developing subject.

The word "Spirit" represents the archaic word-sign *R'ch*, preserved in and handed down as the primitive Hebrew word *Ruach*.

The primary meaning of this word was, "Energizing Space;" and it was used in this sense because, according to the teaching of the Elohist, Space was regarded as the source of the creative Energy.

But a materializing medium was required for Energizing Space.

Thence energizing came to be looked upon as Energized Space; and then energized Space was held to be an Energy proceeding from Space.

In the meantime the word *Elohim* had been adopted to represent the creative forces of nature.

For these forces a supreme force was supposed to be required.

This was gained in *El Elohim*, "The Force of the forces;" from which an outflowing Energy was found in *Ruach*.

As time went on, *Elohim* became *Elohim chajim*, "Vital," or rather "Vitalizing forces;" and then *Ruach elohim chajim* was rendered "the energy of the life-giving forces."

Now a further need made itself felt—the need of a Deity.

Under it *Elohim* was individualized as a God, and, in *Elohim chajim*, looked up to as a Life-giving God, when *Ruach elohim chajim* was transformed into "the Energy of the Life-giving God."

But *Elohim*, even as a Life-giving God, could not be separated from the original Elohist forces thus individualized and unified. Hence the deified forces individualized in *Elohim* were imagined to have, in this Unity, preceded the creative forces or primitive *Elohim* of the Elohist; and these were then held to have proceeded out of or emanated from that Deity, which was thus in reality a figurative aggregation or combination of themselves.

In consequence of this the primitive *Elohim*, or forces of nature, came to be regarded as Divine Emanations, and, under this aspect, were ultimately classified as Sephiroth.

These were assumed to have been ten in number, in a descending and in each descended order, as representing idealizations of the ten primitive numbers; and were divinized as attributes of the Deity from which they were supposed to have emanated—but this was a later development.

At a considerably earlier period *Elohim* was personified in *Jehovah Elohim*, and then was in *Elohim chajim* regarded as the Living God; but even so, as *Elohim* had originally proceeded from Space, *Elohim chajim* was ranked as the first Emanation therefrom, and the thus derived Source of the other Sephiroth.

Under this developed view, through which *Elohim* became God—the knowable but non-manifested personification of the unknow-

able and impersonal Source of all, veiled in Space—*Ruach* was transformed into the representative of the Sephiroth, and thus in *Ruach Elohim* became the "Sephiroth (Heb. SPIRIT, which through the Latin *Spiritus* passed into "Spirit") of God."

Consequent on the personification of *Elohim*, a characterizing type and materialized form was needed for *Ruach*, as emanating therefrom.

This was found in the atmosphere, as inspired and expired by living beings—the outbreathing representing the giving forth or procession of *Ruach Elohim*, the Spirit of God, from that God of which it had been constituted the Spirit; and the inbreathing, the inspiration of the same Spirit, on which the spiritual life of man was held to depend, as did his natural life on the inhalation of its material type and figure, the atmospheric air.

Viewed under and through this material form in energetic action, wind came to be considered as the vesture of Spirit, and then *Ruach* acquired its attributed significance "Wind."

But even so Spirit, as represented by *Ruach*, had to be treated as immaterial.

To do this it was necessary to reduce wind to the status of a mere symbolical vesture for or symbol of Spirit.

This necessity, only recognized later and by less mystical minds, led to the verbal separation of the one from the other.

This was done by the Greeks, who called Spirit *Pneuma* and Wind *Anémos*.

The example of the Greeks was followed by the Latins, who adopted the Hebrew designation *Sephiroth* as *Spiritus*, and called the wind *Ventus*.

But then they saw in the human Soul a refined materialization of the individualized spirit personified in man, and therefore named it *Anima*, as though to revive under that appellation the original association of Wind and Spirit by attributing to the Soul the characteristic properties of materialized spirit: so that *anima* can be regarded as denoting a recombination of *pneuma* and *anémos* and signifying a modified reproduction of *Ruach*.

* * * * *

Spirit—viewed as modified, as developed Force—in reality rests on a physical basis.

Commencing in the earth, the Spirit individualized by the planetary body was, in the first instance, a mere expectancy, as far as the outcome of the evolution to be initiated through its instrumentality was concerned.

The qualities and characteristics which were to come of this expectancy were to be derived through the progressive uses of organized and animated life.

Hence the Spirit of the earth could only gain these through the animated life of the planet.

This animated life was to be produced through it by what might be termed a generative action applied from without.

This action introduced first inorganic and then organizing cellular action to the aggregated molecular mass of the solidified earth.

In the individual cells of this agency the earth became the mother of offspring after its kind.

Of these cells a life-giving potency constructed, built up so to say, living forms in progressively advancing orders.

The spirits individualized by and passing through these living forms acquired, by the life uses thereof, the characteristic qualities of the life through which they were passing, and with this the power of transmitting the same by generative process from form to form as re-embodiment selves, in a progressively advancing order.

At each successive death these individualized spirits repassed to their spirit mother, the Spirit of the earth, whose substance they thereupon contributed to build up and endow with the qualities and potencies derived through organic life, just as the functioning cells in the organizing state had collectively and in successive association contributed to build up the living bodies of animated life: so that the physical basis of spirit becomes through evolution a medium for the organization of potential substance, after the method of the organization of embodied animated life. Thus the Spirit of the earth is the absorbing recipient of the disembodied spirits of its offspring, who are the bearers of, and duly constituted transmitting imparters or channels conveying to it the potencies derived through their uses of animated life. In this way the evolving potencies of the developing Spirit of the earth, including its power of intelligential action, are reflections of the potencies of animated life, from which indeed they are thus derived and of which they are therefore reproductions: so that the individualized spirits of animated life, culminating in the Spirit of man are, as regards the Spirit of the earth, simply organs for acquiring and vehicles for transmitting these potencies to that Spirit. Hence the ultimate fate of these organs is thus foreshadowed as a final reunion with their spirit parent, in whose substance their transitional and transient individualities will be at length absorbed and disappear. Not that this functional action terminates here, for the entire evolution is but preparatory to the return of the Spirit of the earth to and its reabsorption by the invisible substance of the unknown and unknowable God—transparent Space—from which it took its original departure, and which is indeed progressively going on.

* * * * *

This comprises in brief the etiology and evolutionary course of spirit. But it does not include the whole outcome thereof, for another and higher evolution is simultaneously proceeding, as the culmination of the natural evolution whose methods and results have been thus and so far summarized.

The incentive to the evolution of form through which the evolution of spirit has been gained, is appetite.

The indulgence of appetite increases the aptitude for the indulgence thereof, and this aptitude expresses itself as an evolution of form, in which the growth of appetite through indulgence induces the progressive development of embodied life.

But conjointly with the evolution of form, through the indulgence of appetite, there proceeds a development of Will; for the desire to indulge, continuously gratified, leads to the progressive transformation of desire into Will—the Will to yet more fully indulge the appetency of appetite; so that the distinctive and distinguishing mark of developed spirit is the possession of a strong and resolute Will.

Now the aim of the final stage of the evolution of spirit is *the elimination of Will*: for unyielding volition is incompatible with the renewed condition of the Divine substance, for restoration to which the whole evolution is a preparation—seeing that in it Will has to give way to and disappear in duly controlled desire.

This elimination has, so far, been seen to be effected by the dissolution of the personality and the doing away with the individuality, on the persistency of which its continuance depends; for where individuality and personality disappear volition can have no place.

But there is another way of procuring the elimination of Will, under which the individuality and personality are retained.

This way is the conversion of spirit into soul.

This conversion takes place in the individual human being who so lives that in him appetite is changed into affection; selfish and self-seeking appetency into unselfish and self-forgetting Love.

To such persons the human form is a matrix in which the human soul is progressively built up: so that when these persons die the self leaves the body no longer as a mere spirit, but as a personal being—a soul, which passes to the soul state.

This change only takes place, can only take place in those who, during and by their uses of their transient lives, overcome appetite and root out Will through the development of self-forgetting love; because only such beings would be fitted for the soul state.

These have been unconsciously preparing, for this change throughout the entire evolution, which has been a selective process from the outset—a selective process under which the victims of the self-seekers are, by their unavoidable, their involuntary and enforced surrender thereof, predisposed to that voluntary disregard of self which prepares them for the final change.

Thus, when the evolutionary course of spirit is studied as a whole, three very different issues are seen to await it at the close of its last embodiment, in the human form; and of these, each individualized spirit will pass to the one for which it has fitted itself by its evolutionary career.

These three issues or states are:—

1. *Personal*—which the personified spirit or soul enters as a Divine Impersonation, to lead a personal life in the soul state.
2. *Impersonal*—a transitional state, passing through which the spiritualized spirit is absorbed by and disappears in the Divine substance.
3. *Elemental*—the earth bound state, reached by the materialized spirits because they have failed to fit themselves for restora-

tion to the Divine substance. This is a retrograde condition in which the degraded spirit, gradually losing its acquired attributes, passes through a dissolving process into the passive state of latent force, whose potencies can only be recalled to activity through a renewed evolutionary course induced by a stimulus inciting it from without.

HENRY PRATT, M. D.

THE "SATNAMIS."

THE Chamárs lay claim to a very high antiquity among the inhabitants of the district of Chhattisgarh; but the truth of their assertions appears open to doubt. They all call themselves Raidásis—a name which none of them can explain, but which evidently comes from Rai Dás—a Chamár reformer and disciple of Rámánand, who is said to have lived about the fifteenth century in the country lying to the south of Oudh and in Rewá. They have been so long settled in Chhattisgarh that they seem to have no kind of tradition, even in the remote past, of any other home. As a body they possess active and well set figures, are more brown than black in color, and are less marked in features than the easy and higher classes. They are fairly energetic and industrious cultivators, are somewhat tenacious of their rights, and considerable numbers of them have attained a position of comfort and respectability. A description of the religious movement which has given prominence to these Chamárs is as follows:—"Ghási Dás, the author of the movement, like the rest of his community, was unlettered. He was a man of unusually fair complexion and rather imposing appearance, sensitive and silent, given to seeing visions, and deeply resenting the harsh treatment of his brotherhood by the Hindus. He was well known to the whole community, having travelled much among them, had the reputation of being exceptionally sagacious, and was universally respected. By some he was believed to possess supernatural powers, by others curative powers only, by all he was deemed a remarkable man. In the natural course of events it was not long before Ghási Dás gathered round himself a band of devoted followers. Whether impelled by their constant importunities or by a feeling of personal vanity, or both causes combined, he resolved on a prophetic career, to be preceded by a temporary withdrawal into the wilderness. He selected for his wanderings the eastern forests of Chhattisgarh, and proceeded to a small village called Girod on the outskirts of the hilly region, bordering the Jonk river, near its junction with the Mahánadi. He dismissed the few followers who had accompanied him with the intimation that in six months he would return with a new revelation, and mounting the rocky eminence overhanging the village, disappeared into the distant forest. Meanwhile the followers, who had accompanied him to the foot of that henceforth mysterious hill were active in spreading through the whole Chamár community his

farewell message, with the warning that all should appear at Girod, as the termination of the six months' interval approached.

"Among a superstitious people these tidings worked marvels, and created a perfect ferment of expectation. During the period of suspense nothing else was talked of, and the public mind anxiously looked for some revelation. As the close of the appointed time drew near, Chamárs from all parts of Chhattisgarh flocked to Girod. The scene as described by an eye-witness was strange and impressive. The roads leading to this hitherto unfrequented hamlet were traversed by crowds of anxious pilgrims. The young and old of both sexes swelled the throng—mothers carrying their infants, and the aged and infirmed by stronger arms. Some died by the way, but the enthusiasm was not stayed. At last the long-looked-for day arrived, and with it the realisation of the hopes of this hitherto despised community. In the quiet of the early morning their self-appointed prophet was seen descending the rocky eminence overhanging Girod, and, as he approached, was greeted with the acclamations of the assembled crowd. He explained to them how he had been miraculously sustained for the period of six months in the wilderness; how he had held communion with a higher power; and how he had been empowered to deliver a special message to the members of his own community. This message absolutely prohibited the adoration of idols, and enjoined the worship of the Maker of the universe without any visible sign or representation, at the same time proclaiming a code of social equality. It appointed Ghási Dás the high priest of the new faith, and added the proviso that this office would remain in his family for ever.

"The simple faith thus enunciated may best be termed a 'Hinduised deism,' for there were mixed up with it certain social and dietary regulations copied from Brahmanism. The movement occurred between the years 1820 and 1830, and is scarcely half a century old. It includes nearly the whole Chamár community of Chhattisgarh, who now call themselves 'Satnamis,' meaning thereby that they are the worshippers of 'Sat Nam' or 'The True One'—their name, and a very appropriate one, for God. They would fain bury the opprobrious epithet Chamár among other relics of the past, did it not with traditional pertinacity, and owing to the hatred of Brahmans, refuse to forsake them. In the early years of the movement an effort was made to crush its spread, but in vain, and Ghási Dás lived to a ripe old age to see the belief he had founded a living element in society, constituting the guide and directing the aspirations of a population exceeding a quarter of a million. He died in the year 1850, at the age of eighty, and while the work he accomplished by our clearer light seems darkened with prejudice, ignorance and imposture, yet there can be no doubt he did a good fight in demolishing, even within a small area, the giant evils of idolatry, and thus perhaps preparing his community for the reception of a higher and purer faith. On the death of Ghási Dás he was succeeded in the office of high priest by his eldest son Bálak Dás. This Bálak Dás carried his feeling of equality to so high a pitch, that he outraged all Hindu society by assuming the

Brahmanical thread. Whenever he appeared he offensively paraded the thin silken cord round his neck as an emblem of sacredness, and hoped to defy Hindu enmity under cover of the general security against violence afforded by British rule. So bitter, however, was the hostility he raised, and so few the precautions he took against private assassination, that his enemies at last found an opportunity. He was travelling to Raipur on business, and remained for the night at a roadside rest-house. Here a party of men, supposed to be Rajputs, attacked and killed him, at the same time wounding the followers who accompanied him. This occurred in the year 1860 and the perpetrators were never discovered. It exasperated the whole Chamár community, and a deeper animosity than ever now divides them from their Hindu fellow citizens.

"Bálak Dás was succeeded nominally by his son Sahib Dás, a child, but really by his brother Agar Dás, who is now virtually high priest. The duties of this office are more of a dignified than onerous character. The high priest decides finally all questions involving social excommunication, and prescribes the penalty attending restoration. For those who can attend on him personally or whom he can arrange to visit, he performs the ceremonies at marriage and on naming children; at the latter ceremony a head necklace, in token of entrance into the Sat Nami brotherhood, is placed round the neck of the child. It is not absolutely necessary, however, that the high priest should officiate at any ceremonies. They are sufficiently solemnised by meetings of the brotherhood. Most Chamárs once a year visit the high priest, and on those occasions a suitable offering is invariably made. They have no public worship of any kind, and consequently no temples; they have no written creed, nor any prescribed forms of devotion. When devotionally inclined, it is only necessary to repeat the name of the deity and to invoke his blessing. No idol of wood or stone is seen near their villages. They have a dim kind of belief in a future state; but this does not exercise any practical influence on their conduct. Their social practices correspond for the most part with those of Hindus. They ignore, however, Hindu festivals. As a rule they are monogamists, though polygamy is not specially prohibited. Their women are not in any way secluded from public gaze, and are, equally with men, busy and industrious in home and field pursuits. In fact in most of their arrangements, to a superficial observer, the Chamárs present nothing peculiar, and it is only after enquiry that many of their distinguishing features are discovered.

"The account thus given has been gathered from oral testimony—a source of knowledge liable to error and exaggeration. In its main features, however, it is accurate; disputed points have not been touched. One is whether Bálak Dás was accepted as an Incarnation; most Satnamis deny regarding him as such. Some forms of prayer, collated from Hindu authors, are said to exist among the teachers, but these are quite unknown to the people, and the act or devotion which a Satnami practises is to fall prostrate before the sun at morn and eve and exclaim 'Sat Nam'!

'Sat Nam'! 'Sat Nam'! translated literally 'God! God! God!' or perhaps implying 'God, have mercy, have mercy!' Turning to their social practises it is found that they eat no meat. They will not even drink water except from one of their own caste and liquor is prohibited. They marry ordinarily at the age of puberty, the parents selecting a bride; the marriage itself is purely of a civil nature, being celebrated by the elders, with a feast given to the friends of the family. They bury their dead without any religious ceremony, and in every day life their moral notions are not rigid. A fatal split in the community has arisen from a most trivial cause—the use of tobacco. In the first outbursts of religious enthusiasm, which animated the followers of Ghási Dás, it would seem that drink and tobacco were simultaneously forsaken. The use of liquor apparently was a weakness which was easily and effectually overcome, but the strange solace which smokers appear to find in tobacco and more especially a labouring population, possessed irresistible charms. A reaction set in, and finally a considerable portion of the community returned to their pipes. To talk of pipes in connection with an eastern people seems an anomaly, but in Chhatisgarh it is strictly correct. The books of northern India is unknown here, and in its stead the broad 'palas' leaf is folded into a pipe-like shape with a bowl at one end in which dry tobacco is placed. It is called a 'chungi,' is universally indulged in by all classes and field labourers, by its use, break the dull monotony of their daily toil. The Satnamis who again took to chungis come to be opprobriously designated as 'Chungeás' by their brethren, and retain the appellation. They maintain their orthodoxy, and urge that Ghási Dás had a subsequent revelation conceding the use of tobacco to his people, and that consequently in his later years he absolutely withdrew his original prohibition. The Satnamis thus remain divided into two grand sections—the 'smokers' and 'non-smokers.' It is said that the smokers eat meat, are not real Satnamis, but as a body they perfectly repudiate the insinuation. The Satnamis thus described are a strange and interesting people, and as a special mission has lately been inaugurated for their enlightenment and instruction, they are perhaps destined in the future to exercise an influence proportioned to their numbers and position in the annals of Chhattisgarh. There is no class more loyal and satisfied with our rule than this community, and if it should happen that, like the Kols, they are favourably impressed with missionary teaching, a time may come when they will be a source of strength to our Government."

[The foregoing very interesting account of a curious sect has been sent us by brother Ishan Ch. Das of Mussoorie. It is taken from the *Gazetteer of the Central Provinces of India*, edited by Charles Grant, Esq., Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, (Edition of 1870) pages 100—118.

The residence of the high priest of the Satnamis is at the village Bandhar (Latitude 21°-24'; Longitude 82°-8'), about 30 miles N. E. of Raipur City.—Ed.]

THE VISIT OF APOLLONIUS TO THE MAHATMAS OF INDIA.

SOMEWHERE about 1840 years ago, Apollonius of Tyana, the great adept—then 40 years of age and resident at Antioch in Syria—set out to visit India.

Philosopher though he was, he thought, as most of us think in the actions of our life, that he was acting under the impulse of his own judgment. He had heard of the existence there of a College of Sages or Sophoi. With all the humility of a mind eased of the self-sufficiency of his own personality, he thought he could learn something from them. A longing seized him to go to them. He acted on that longing; but he knew not at the time whence that longing came.

We have almost a first hand account of this journey. Damis, Apollonius' fellow-traveller and friend, kept a journal of their travels, and his note book fell into the hands of Philostratus, the Greek historian, when he was writing the life of Apollonius. The account is very detailed, and to lovers of the Philosophies of the East interesting. I propose, therefore, to give for the benefit of those who have not had the privilege of reading the original story in the Greek, an abstract of such portions as relate especially to the Mahatmas, their mode of life, powers, knowledge, and place of abode.

With regard to this last point I should like to say a preliminary word. It would be exceedingly interesting to me—for reasons best appreciated by students of Psychometry—to be able to locate exactly the place of residence of this College of Mahatmas in India, and it has occurred to me, I might get help from some of the readers of the *Theosophist* if I laid before them the facts bearing on the question as given by Philostratus. But I must give a word of warning about a difficulty. Greek historians unfortunately were all very bad geographers. What little they knew about India was gained from Alexander's expedition, and that was about as much as we knew of Central Africa fifty years ago. We knew that there were two big rivers—the Nile and the Niger—and one set of people called Negroes, and some mountains called the Mountains of the Moon. Similarly with the average Greek of B. C. 50, all big rivers in India were the Indus or Ganges, all mountains the Caucasus, and all people beyond Persia, Indians. So we cannot go much by names. Damis himself may have gone wrong in this, as we know there is no such thing as a universal name of a big river among uneducated people. Each district calls the river by its own local name, and the traveller has to conjecture himself what the river is. A more sure guide to us will be the number of days taken for the journey and the description of the place itself. Damis' note-book could hardly go wrong over this.

Taking with him two family slaves to act as secretaries, Apollonius first went to Nineveh, where he met with the native of the place called Damis, who attached himself as a Chela to him and was useful as an interpreter on his way through Persia. They proceeded to Babylon, where they had to stay for 13 months, while

Apollonius was introducing himself into the favour of the Parthian King Bardanes, from whom he finally succeeded in getting not only the necessary permit, but also a guide and camels, and what was more, the gold plate on the leading camel announcing them guests of the king.

Journeying thus at ease through a rich and fertile country, and royally entertained everywhere without expense, they reached the Caucasus that divide Media from India. Caucasus (Grāvakāsas) means the white-headed or snow-topped mountains: here probably the Hindoo Koosh of Afghanistan—for on the other side of them was a narrow river called the Copen, which might be the Cabul. Here they first encountered men riding on elephants and dromedaries. The natives were merry in those days; as the Indians they met were singing, dancing or rolling about drunk with palm toddy. This looks more as if they were in the happy valley of Kashmir, but perhaps the Cabul valley was like that before the Mussalmans came there.

Across the river they saw a mountain, called Nysa, rising up into a peak like Tmolus in Lydia with a temple on its summit, the walls of the grounds round which were formed of thick evergreen shrubs, laurels, vines and ivy. Nysa has been identified with the old Sanskrit or Hindi Nishadha.* Near it was a rock Aornus, with a wonderfully high precipice or escarpment identified by some as Ranigarh.

On their way to the Indus they fell in with a lad about thirteen years old riding an elephant, and urging him on "with a crooked rod which he thrust into him like an anchor." There is a little touch, showing the immutability of Indian customs and the accuracy of the details.

They crossed the Indus at a place where it was 40 stadia, *i. e.*, 8,000 yards breadth.† A letter from Bardanes gained them the favour of the Indian Satrap of the district, who supplied boats to cross and a guide to take them as far as the Hydraots. The guide brought them to Taxila, where his rajah had a place. Here we have a definite point to go on. This city, as big as Nineveh, is minutely described; its wonderful temples, the streets, the form of the houses, the dress of the inhabitants (cotton fabric was a wonder to the Greek), the palace, unpretentious and simple—the images, decked with pearls, *having, as is usual with the barbarians in sacred things, a symbolical meaning.* It has been identified to Takshasila existing near Mani Kyala, a few miles east of Rawul Pindi in the Punjab. Apollonius had a long interview with the Rajah Phraotes, who seems to have been a noble minded and philosophical king of the good old Aryan type—what is more, he seems to have been a Chela of the Mahatmas and acquainted with Greek philosophy.

He told the interesting story of his life to Apollonius, while a state banquet, which is minutely described, was being given to the guests, and the attention of the rest was absorbed in watching the feats of jugglers. Apollonius, at the king's private table, uninterested in the proceedings, asked the king how he came to know Greek

* Near Nooshera, a little E. of Pashawur.

† Probably at Attock the river may have been in flood.

and acquire his philosophy. The king's story was that his father as a boy, deprived of his kingdom, had fled beyond the Hydaspes, and though the king of the country had offered to adopt him, had preferred to live among the Brahmans. These Brahmans, Apollonius was informed, were not the same as the Sophoi that Alexander came across. Those were the Oxydracæ, a warlike body who were more dabbles in philosophy than philosophers. These Brahmans had a domain somewhere between the Hyphasis and the Ganges, and if Alexander had attempted to invade their territory, they would have repelled him not with human weapons, but with thunders, lightnings, tempests. But they saved themselves this necessity by the force of their will, which affected the appearance of the sacrificial victims of Alexander, and so dissuaded him from his intention. These Brahmans taught his father Greek and philosophy, and sent him out again into the world at 20 years of age in order to marry the daughter of the Hydaspian King, his protector. Phraotes was his only son, and was reared in Greek fashion by his father until twelve years of age, after which he was sent to the College of the Brahmans and treated by them as a son. Meanwhile his parents died. When he was 19 years old and sent out into the world (probably his Gurus caused the disaster to come upon him for his character's sake), all his estates were forfeited by the king, his uncle, and he became a pauper, supported by four of his mother's servants. One day when he was reading the Greek tragedy of the Heraclidæ in his hut, a messenger comes to him with news that events in his father's old kingdom were so altering, that if he would return there he could probably recover his family throne. Taking the subject he was reading as an omen, he went and won back the kingdom he now ruled over.

The kind King after three days' hospitality presented Apollonius with fresh camels, provisions, a guide and a letter of introduction addressed to the Grand Master of the Mahatmas as follows: "The King Phraotes to the Master Iarchas and all the wise men with him, greeting: Apollonius, a very wise man, thinks you wiser than himself, and has travelled hither to learn your doctrine. Send him back knowing all you know. Your lessons will not be lost, for he speaks better, and has a better memory than any man I ever knew. Show him, Father Iarchas, the throne on which I sat when you gave me the kingdom. His followers are worthy of all praise, if only for submitting to such a man. Farewell."

After two days' journey from Taxila, they came to the plain on which Alexander's Trophy stood. Then they crossed the Hydraotis,* and traversing several countries reached the Hyphasis, and 30 stadia from the river they came across more traces of

* Judging by the present road from Manikyala, two days' journey brings us to the Salgram ferry over the Jhelam. Therefore the Hydraotis here must be this river. As no mention is made of crossing mountains immediately, the travellers could not have gone on from Salgram up the Kashmir route to Poonch via Kotli, but must have continued over the plains via Rajnori. This would bring them to the Chenal at Aknoor ferry close to Jammu—where the favourite route into Kashmir now commences. The description of the Hyphasis as navigable and then broken would, however, suit the Jhelam better than the Chenab. Probably Damis has confounded what he heard about the two rivers.

Alexander in the shape of altars to Ammen and other deities and a bronze pillar with the inscription "Here Alexander made a limit to his expedition." The Hyphasis is described as "navigable at its source, going through a plain, but lower down impeded by rocks which caused dangerous eddies—as broad as the Danube—with similar trees on its banks, from which the people obtain an unguent used in bridal ceremonies, its forests abounding in peacock and its Jheels with wild asses with a horn on their forehead (? rhinoceros) from which drinking cups of magical virtues are made—the right of hunting these is reserved to the King." Putting aside considerations of names, this reads uncommonly like a description of Nepal now, and it may well have been that of Kashmir then.

Here they crossed the spur of Caucasus which stretches down towards the Red Sea. All the Indian Ocean was called the Red Sea by the Greeks: so this may have been the Himalayas or the Kashmir mountains near. Or am I off the scent and are they the Aravulli Hills and the Hyphasis the Lûni? At any rate the headlands or spurs of the mountains produced what the Greek called cinnamon, but which he describes as a shrub like the shoots of a young vine and which goats were passionately fond of. What can this be? Certainly not the cinnamon of Ceylon. On the cliffs grew frankincense trees (? the Babul) and pepper plants, which last grew on precipices frequented by monkeys, who helped the natives to gather the clustered berries. On the other side of these mountains was a large plain—the largest in India—stretching 15 days' journey to the Ganges, and eighteen days to the Red Sea (Indian Ocean). Measuring journeys by camel rides this might still refer to the Kashmir frontier. This plain was intersected by canals communicating with the Ganges—the land black and very productive, bearing wheat with enormous stalks (Indian corn), millet and a small kind of grape, with agreeable bouquet, and a tree with leaves like the laurel and fruit like a pomegranate within the husk of which was an apple of hyacinth colour and the most exquisite flavour (? Mango-steen or Lechee). This flora agrees more with that of Kashmir at present than that of the great Punjab Plain. Perhaps Philostratus mixed up Damis' account of the two. Coming down the mountains they witnessed a hunt after a huge snake 30 cubits long (? python or rock-snake) with fiery crests and potent eyes. At the foot of the mountain they came to a large city called Paraka, where the inhabitants are great snake hunters and charmers. Here again Kashmir is indicated—a country always remarkable for Naga worship. Perhaps Paraka is Jammu, or, if the mountains they had passed were the Pir Panjal Pass, even Srinagar which is about four days camel ride from the pass. Proceeding on they came upon a shepherd playing a pipe, and tending a herd of white deer kept for the sake of their milk.

Four days' journey on through a well cultivated country brought them to the stronghold behind which the Sophoi secluded themselves. Here their guide bade his camel kneel and fell on his face with awe. The people of the country feared these sages more than the king. The king himself consulted them as an oracle. The

stronghold was a hill rising sheer up from the plain about as high as the Acropolis, is at Athens.* It was fortified besides with a belt of rock on which impressions of hoofs, beards and faces might be traced. About the top a cloud generally hung, within which the Sophoi dwelt invisible. There were no gates or forts.

Now comes the interesting part of the narrative: the itinerary so far, I have thought necessary to give, as a clue to guessing where this great Brotherhood lived at this time.

The travellers were preparing to put up in a village not the eighth of a mile from the hill of the Sophoi, when they perceived a young man running towards them. He addressed them in Greek. They were not much surprised at this, as even the villagers spoke that language. But when he addressed Apollonius by name, they were struck with astonishment; all but the sage himself who was now filled with confidence, and remarked, "I now feel that the men we have come to see are wise indeed: they know the future."†

The message was "Would Apollonius come to an audience just as he was by himself? *They themselves* especially requested it." Noticing the Pythagorean touch of this appellation of the Masters, the philosopher followed the youth up the hill on the south side. At the foot he observed a well some 24 feet deep, over the mouth of which a dark vapour hung rising as the heat of day increased and resplendent with rainbow colours at noon. The soil was of scarlet or vermillion ore (? Iron or Cinnabar). Above it was a crater from which issued a lead-coloured flame without smell or smoke, and which bubbled up with a volcanic matter that rose to its brim but never overflowed (? A mud volcano or fumerole or oilfield). To lovers of Sophia this outer world is but symbolical of the inner. Consequently to these Sophoi the well was the well of the Test and the crater the fire of Pardon. Here also were two vessels of black stone—the urns of the winds and of the rain by which these elements could be controlled. Statues of great gods also stood about, especially of Apollo, Minerva and Bacchus. Here also was fire worshipped and hymns raised daily to the Sun's rays and at night to a sacred fire which flamed on no altar or hearth, but took shape and body and floated in mid air, where it remained unchanged during the hours of darkness.

The student of ancient rites will at once think of parallel phenomena in the Pillar of Fire and Shechina of the Israelite, so in the Parsee Fire-worship of Zoroaster and primitive Aryan Hindu records.

Once in addressing the Egyptians, Apollonius thus described these Sophoi, "I have seen Brahmans who dwell on the earth and yet not on the earth; in places fortified and yet without walls; and who possess nothing and yet all things." Surely these words would describe the Mahatmas of Thibet in the present day, whose only life on the earth is reported to be the projection of their Astral Double, and who have undergone the Great Renun-

* If they could have got so far as Srinagar in the time the Takht-i-Soleiman (Solomon's seat) might answer this description.

† Would there not have been plenty of time for a messenger to have reached the Sages from Phraotes, to say that Apollonius was coming?—Ed.

ciation. The words too will remind the student of teachings of the great mystic Paul of Tarsus.

They wore their hair long and on their head a white mitre. They went barefooted. Their coats were without sleeves, made of a wild cotton, oily in nature, whiter than the whitest of wool and softer, which the earth gives up for them alone. They carried a staff or wand and wore rings of magical power.

They were seated on brazen stools, and their chief, Iarchas, on a raised throne of bronze, ornamented with golden images. As Apollonius approached, they saluted him with their hands and Iarchas welcomed him in Greek, asking for the king's letter, and remarking before he opened it that there was a letter delta left out in one of the words. After reading the letter, he remarked, "Well and what do you think of us?" Apollonius simply replied that the fact that he was the first of the Greeks to undertake such a long journey in order to visit them answered that question. Then ensued a curious conversation—a Sage interrogating and a Sage replying. "In what, pray, do you think us wiser than yourself?" "Your views, I think, are wiser and more divine, but even should I find that you know no more than I, I shall have learnt this at least—that I have nothing more to learn." "Well," said the Indian, "other people usually ask their visitors whence they come and who they are, but we, as a first proof of our knowledge, show strangers that we know them."

Then he told Apollonius who his father and mother were and all the events of his journey, how he had picked up Damis, what they had said and done on the journey, and all this so distinctly and fluently that he might have been a companion of their route. Apollonius, astonished, asked him how he managed to know all this so minutely, and was told that he himself had the power of a similar knowledge, but that it wanted more development, and that they would be glad to assist him in such a task as they could see his excellent qualities. For they could see into the very soul tracing out its qualities by a thousand signs.

"But," said Iarchas, suddenly breaking off, "It is now midday. Will you join us in our devotions?"

Then they adjourned to their bath in a pellucid stream. First anointing themselves with an unguent which caused a profuse perspiration, they jumped into the water in this state. After bathing, they put garlands on their heads and made a procession to their temple with their souls intent on their hymn. There standing in a circle round Iarchas, they beat the ground with their staves till undulating vibrations began to set in along the ground, and they were levitated some three or four feet in the air. As they floated they raised a weird sweet hymn that reminded the Greek of the Pæans of Sophokles which he had heard sung at Athens to Æsculapius. When the service was over, Iarchas called the youth with the anchor and bade him look after Apollonius' companions. As swift as a swallow he vanished and reappeared and told Iarchas that he had seen after them.

LUCKNOW.

F. W. THURSTAN, M. A.

(To be continued.)

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

(From the "Indian Mirror," November 22, 1889.)

THE Theosophical Society has done more for India than some people are aware of. Though constantly *en evidence* before the public, Theosophy and the Theosophical Society are still abstractions to many men even in India. We, however, who have watched the Theosophical movement from its initiation at New York, the transference of its activity to these shores ten years ago, and the unexampled success of its ideas ever since throughout the country, must acknowledge that if the affairs of India now command universal attention in both hemispheres, the Theosophical Society ought to have every credit for it. When the founders of the Society landed at Bombay in 1879, they did not find even half a dozen Indians ready to receive their ideas of an Universal Brotherhood, and not even the idea of an Indian Brotherhood. Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, who had come to India, as they said to learn and acquire the wisdom of the East at the feet of Indian sages, found that the sages were at a discount in the country of their birth and work, that the educated Indians knew them not, and that those whose pride it should have been to worship Sankaracharya and Buddha Goutama, worshipped Huxley and Herbert Spencer instead. In fact, the Light of Asia had been completely quenched, so far as India at least was concerned. With an enthusiasm, however, which a firm conviction of the sacredness and potentiality of their mission alone could generate, the founders of the Theosophical Society went to work, and proceeded to create order out of chaos, and light out of darkness. And they were mightily misunderstood. The people held aloof from them. Europeans jeered at them. The Government followed their movements with suspicion and distrust. But it was shortly acknowledged that the Russian lady and American gentleman were terribly in earnest. They had not the slightest intention of retiring from the field. They made many and large sacrifices. They literally *slaved* at their work. Colonel Olcott spoke frequently before the public, and Madame Blavatsky toiled *eighteen hours at a stretch* at her desk in order to find the wherewithal to feed her beloved Society. What Charlatan ever did honest work or endured a tithe of the privations, which Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott went heroically through in order to force the claims of the Theosophical Society on the public? Theosophical ideas at length began to spread. Ceylon was taken by storm, and the Christian Missionaries, who had long held sway in the island, retired in favour of yellow-robed priests of Buddha, and the five sacred precepts were heard once more loud in each Dagobah's rounded pile. In India the Theosophical Society began gradually to increase in numbers, and to grow in influence. Its leading ideas were found to be practicable. Its claims on behalf of Eastern philosophy and science and literature were recognised in quarters where they used to be before laughed out as absurd and preposterous. The educated community in India, the thinking portion of it at all events, turned to examine the lore left to them by their ancestors. And soon a

community of spiritual thought and purpose began to spread through the land. The Hindu, the Moslem, the Jain, the Parsi, commenced an union of intellectual brotherhood, and as they fraternised more and more, they wondered why they had held aloof, each from the other, so long, and how they should have neglected to claim their common legacy. Soon every large town had its branch of the Theosophical Society. The annual conventions at the head-quarters of the Society, the precursors and models of the National Congress, brought hundreds of the representatives of the most different and distant communities together, and they became periodical jubilees of the revived affection among the hitherto divided members of the great Indian family.

To become good Theosophists was to become good citizens. The Theosophists were not only to be brothers among themselves, but also brothers to all men with whom the word brought them in contact. Theosophists in India, therefore, began to look about them to see if they could not ameliorate the lot of their fellows. They realised that life was real and earnest, and accordingly they worked with a will for their fellow-Indians, and the common cause of their country. Whatever may be our own personal impressions, we will not in this place claim the triumph of the National Congress as triumph of the Theosophical Society. It is far too wide a demand to be conceded without demur. But this much we will undertake to say, that the Theosophical Society brought the people of India together, proved their inheritance and made them deservedly proud of this beloved Bharat Khund. Another claim which we may with confidence urge on behalf of the Theosophical Society, is the recruiting of influential foreigners in the cause of India. The first important convert to Theosophical ideas from among Englishmen was, strangely enough, the then Editor of the *Pioneer*, Mr. A. P. Sinnett. And Mr. Sinnett brought Mr. Hume, our dear, old long-tried friend. At one time, Mr. Hume was idolised by Theosophists, as he is now being idolised by the country at large. Was it not a great and marvellous fact that this Englishman, affluent, eminent in service, and proud of the race from whom he sprang, should meekly bow his head before the holy Indian cause, and adopt India as his home for which he was prepared to make any and every sacrifice? This marvel then, is the work of the Theosophical Society.....The light of Asia is slowly reaching the West. Europe and America look upon the phenomenon with bewildered wonderment, but they still look on. In England Theosophical ideas are compelling public attention, and the discourses of Colonel Olcott are being heard with intelligent respect. Theosophy has a great future before it in England. It has already put forth a wonderful phenomenon in London. It has converted Annie Besant, the famous hard-headed materialist and agnostic, into an expectant enquirer of Theosophical truths. The influence of Mrs. Besant in England is widespread and far-reaching. She has for years been the fellow-worker in the English people's cause of Mr. Charles Bradlaugh. And behold another marvel still, these so-called atheists, once the horror of mankind all over the world, compel to-day the world's attention, and the

world is in a manner at their feet. And these two great souls are leagued to-day to work for the amelioration of pantheistic Hindus and Parsis and Buddhists and theistic Mahomedans. Who could have dreamt of these wonders a few years ago? And yet, as we write, we feel that we have not yet exhausted the marvels. More wonderful events have still to follow. Happy those who have seen, and who will see, with fear and yet with hope!

THE YAVANAS.

PANDIT Bhashya Charya, in his article on 'The Age of Patanjali,' makes over ten references to various parts of Sanskrit Literature to show who the Yavanas were, and concludes that "the Indians apply the term Yavanas to all foreigners who were living west to the Indus." To our mind the references themselves lead to no such conclusion. Here are a few passages to the point, which will go to shew that the Yavanas were people of a particular country to the S. W. of Madhyadésa. In Chapter 14 (Brihat Samhita) on Kúrmavibhága,* Stanzas 17 to 19 run as follows:—

17. "The Asterisms of Swáti, Visákha and Anúrádhá, represent the S. W. Division, consisting of the countries of Palhava, Cambhoja, Sindhu, Souvira (Jetch Doab), Badavámukha, Arava, Ambashtha, Kapila, Nárimukha, Anarta (Kattywar);

18. "Phénagiri, Yavana, Makara, Karnapraveya, Parasika, Sudra, Barbara, Kirata, Khanda, Kravya, Asia, Abhira, Chanchuka;

19. "Hémagiri, Sindhukalaka, Raivatuka (Girinar), Suráshtra (Gujerat), Badura, Dravida, and Mahárnavá."

From Stanza 18 it would appear that Yavana was a particular country, and the Yavanas were people of that country, as are observed already. It will be interesting if these countries can be identified by their present names. That the description extends to countries beyond India will be evident from such countries as China, Gándhara (Candahar), Asia (a small District in the S. and W. of Asia Minor. Acts xvi. 7) and the like, mentioned in the course of the chapter. Again Stanza 27 refers to 'Huna' as a country included in the northern division of the earth, though the present Hindus apply the term to all white-skinned men. Mlechha seems to be a generic term, for Stanza 21 refers to the 'rude Mlechha countries in the West.'

Now whether the Greeks were really Yavanas is a point for determination. In Chapter 7 (Brihat Jataka) on Ayurdaya, Varáhamihira says that the Pindáyurdáya years are those given by Maya, Yavanáchárya, Manithiha, and Parásara. Utpala, the commentator, says that Yavanáchárya was a Mlechha astrologer. Quotations from Yavanáchárya's work on horoscopy are given by Utpala throughout his commentary on the Brihat Jataka. His knowledge of Sanskrit must have been really deep. Herodotus (?) is, I believe, referred by some Europeans as the Yavaná-

* The geographical division of the earth, and of India in particular, corresponding to the 27 asterisms of the Lunar Zodiac.

chárya of the Hindus. It is doubtful whether he could have picked up such a knowledge of Sanskrit unless he had spent a number of years in India. This fact can be ascertained from his biography; for though the Hindus are mentioned as "peculiarly non-recording people," the Greeks were not so.

Some more light will be thrown on the subject by a reference to Stanza 8, Ch. I, Brihat Jataka. Here are given certain names for the 12 signs of zodiac, 11 of which do not appear to be of Sanskrit origin. The stanza itself is as follows: "Kria Tauvuri Tituma Kulira Leya Pathona Tuka Rourpyakhyah Tonkshika Akokere Hridrogascha Antyabhamchetham." Dr. Kern considers not only the first 11 terms, but also the 12th term Antyabha (a pure Sanskrit word, which literally means, the last sign, viz., Pisces) a Greek term; nay more, he says that the last term 'Ittham' (Thus) is also a Greek word! This justifies Pandit Bhashyacharya's remark that the knowledge of Sanskrit possessed by the Western Orientalists is "very superficial." Perhaps Bhatta Kerna (as Dr. Kern chooses to call himself) thought that those were a 13th sign of Zodiac! Utpala the commentator is silent as regards the etymology of the first eleven terms. If the words be really of Greek origin, then it would go to show that the intercourse between the Hindus and the Greeks must have been considerable, and that Yavanáchárya himself was not improbably a Greek.

Again as regards the Mádhyamikas the Pandit says they were the people of Madhyadésa. True, but Mádhyamika was one of the countries of Madhyadésa,* and that Sákéta (Oudh) is also one of them will be evident from stanzas 2 to 4, Ch. 14. B. Samhita, St. 2. The asterisms of Krithika, Rohini, and Mrigarisa represent the Mádhyadésa, or central Division consisting of the countries of Bhadur, Arimeda, Mandurya, Salwa, Neepa, Ujjhana, Maru Vatsa (Allahabad), Ghosha, the countries bordering on the Jumna and the Saraswati, the countries of Matsya (Jeypore) and Mádhyamika.

3. * * * * *

4. Sákéta (Oudh), Kanku, Kuru (Delhi), Kálakóti, Kukura, the Páriyátra (Western portion of the Vindhya) Mountains, Oudumbare, Kapishthala (Karthál) and Gajahárya." Panini therefore rightly describes the Madhyamikas as "people or towns belonging to Madhyadésa."

N. CHIDAMBARAM IYER.

EDYATHANGUDI.

YAVANAS AND MADHYADESA.

(A reply to Mr. Chidambaram Iyer's article on the Yavanas.)

Our brother Mr. N. Chidambaram Iyer takes objection to the conclusion drawn in my article on 'The Age of Patanjali,' which appeared in the Theosophist for September last, regarding the question of the identification of the Yavanas, and with reference to

* And not another name for Madhyadesa.

the statements made by Indian writers. His arguments may be thus summarized:—

(1.) That to his mind the references given by me bearing on the interpretation of the term 'Yavana' do not lead to any such conclusion as I arrived at, viz., "that the Indians apply the term 'Yavanas' to all foreigners who were living west to the Indus."

(2.) That certain passages from the Brihatsamhita of Varāhamihira go to show that the Yavanas were people of a particular country called Yavana, lying south-west of Madhyadēsa.

(3.) While accepting Patanjali's interpretation of the term Mādhyamikān, which is 'people or towns of Madhyadēsa,' he adds that 'Mādhyamika was one of the countries of Madhyadēsa, and not another name for Madhyadēsa, and that Sākēta (Oude) was one of them.'

He does not, however, go to the length of making any attempt whatever to prove, either by interpreting on, or construing my references in any way, that they do not lead him to any such conclusion as was arrived at by me. He entirely depends on a single passage in the Brihatsamhita for his conclusions, and he does not explain the term 'Madhyadēsa,' as used by the ancient writers. In the article on "The Age of Patanjali," the term 'Yavana' was explained with reference to the sense in which it was used in several works, such as those of Manu, Goutama and other law-givers, Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata, Vishnu Purāna, and several famous poems—all of which are older than Varāhamihira's works. The conclusion drawn was a general one, and the explanation given by Mr. Chidambara Iyer on the authority of the Brihatsamhita, cannot be forced on the other passages referred to in my article. My idea would have become plainer if he had read the last sentence of the 2nd para. of note 2, given in page 729, from which it is evident that the signification of the term varied with each individual writer. Of course that the term 'Mléchha' was a generic term applied by Aryans to all the Non-Aryans who lived beyond the Āryāvarta, is evident from the ancient Codes of Manu, Vasishta, Vishnu, &c., just in the same way as the terms 'barbarians,' 'Gentiles,' and even 'Kaffirs' were applied by the ancient Greeks, Jews, and Mahomedans to those beyond their pale. But the Mléchhas living north-west of the Āryāvarta, whether they were Egyptians, Chaldeans, or Assyrians, Asiatic Greeks, Persians, Arabs, Bactrians or Tartars, or even Mahomedans, were invariably called by the Indians by the name of Yavana. As this matter was dwelt upon in our previous article we need not write them again here. But as a full treatment of the question of the identification of the Yavanas would have occupied a disproportionately large space in an article on 'The Age of Patanjali,' we thought it better to reduce the question to the smallest compass; and seeing that Dr. Rajendra Lal Mitra had already written a 'protracted disquisition' in the 2nd volume of his 'Indo-Aryans,' and that as I was of the same opinion as himself, the best thing I could do was to give a few references and conclusions, leaving the reader to

study the elaborate essay of the learned Doctor; for which purpose I made a reference to that work in the 1st note of p. 729.

The Bhāratavarsha is described in the Vishnu Purāna (2nd Amsa, 3rd chapter) in this way. "Its eastern borders are occupied by the Kirātās, the western by the Yavanas, while the middle (portion) is occupied by Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas, and Sudras engaged in their several fixed occupations of sacrifice, war, trade, &c." In verses 10 and 14 of the same chapter we read that the rivers of the Panjab are described as within the Bhāratavarsha; and elsewhere in the same chapter Scinde, Souvira, are said to be situated in the Bhāratavarsha; and if 'the Yavanas' were living on the western borders, it naturally follows that they lived in a tract situated to the west of Scinde, that is, to the west of the Indus. The geographical divisions given by Varāhamihira, who lived about 505 A. C. (and this date is only adopted here for the sake of argument), are of India as it geographically existed during his time. These divisions cannot be considered to have been geographically the same as those described by Pānini and Patanjali, who lived several centuries before Varāhamihira's time. Patanjali describes (chapters 2 and 6 of the Mahābhāshya) the Āryāvarta of his time as bounded on the north and south by the Himalayas and the Vindhya, and on the east and the west by the Black Forest in Behar, and the Aravalli Hills respectively. Pānini's Āryāvarta included the Panjab, Cashmere, Scinde, the modern provinces of Candahar and Cabul, or the territories beyond the Indus in which his birth-place Salāthura was situated, and a description of which he gives in the fourth chapter of his grammar. These descriptions show that the boundaries of the Āryāvarta were different in the times of each of these writers. History teaches that between the Alexandrian invasion (in the 4th Century B. C.) and the times of Varāhamihira (6th Century A. C.) several foreign nations and tribes invaded India, settled in Cashmere, portions of the Panjab, the northern portions of Scinde, and it is therefore quite probable that those foreigners who settled in those parts were called Yavanas, and the country itself called Yavana by Varāhamihira. In modern Indian History we have the similar case of Rohilkund (literally the territory of the Rohils), a district in the North-western Provinces being called after the Rohillas, a class of Patans, having settled there.

Varāhamihira's division, given in the 14th chapter of his Brihatsamhita, includes the countries of Bhāratavarsha and those that lie beyond it, such as Pahlava (Persia), Kulata (the modern Khelat), Gandhara (Candahar), the Yavana Country, &c. From this, however, it does not follow that Varāhamihira meant that the Yavana country was not on the western side of the Indus.

The references to Brihatjataka, made by Mr. Chidambara Iyer, and in re the Yavanas, are quite irrelevant to the point. It is not necessary that the Yavanāchārya therein mentioned should possess any knowledge of Sanskrit, but this work like Tājuk and Ramala* might have been translated into the Sanskrit by some

* Two astrological works belonging to Arabia, and translated into Sanskrit by Nilakanta and another.

Sanskrit scholar, and that translation quoted by Varāhamihira in his work. It is not unnatural to suppose that some foreigner—Arab, Grecian, or Persian—might have come to India, studied Sanskrit, and written such works in that language. Cases of that sort are not wanting. Hiouentsang came to India in 629 A. C., remained 17 years in India, studied Sanskrit in several of its branches, translated many Buddhist Sanskrit works into Chinese, and carried many Sanskrit works to China. The same is the case with Itsing, a Chinese, who came to India in the last quarter of the 7th, and Alberuni, an Arabian, who came to India in the early period of the 11th century.

Pythāgoras is said to have studied for several years science and philosophy under the gymnosophists of India, as would appear from Lewis' History of Philosophy. The names of the Zodiac as given in the Brihajjātaka of Varāhamihira may be of Grecian, Assyrian or Chaldean origin, and it is not possible to say anything definite in the matter, the general supposition pointing to the Chaldeans as they were famous for their cultivation of the astrological science.

And now about the term 'Madhyadésa.' Varāhamihira (vs. 1—4, Chap. XIV of the Brihatsamhita) takes up certain countries in India for a 'Madhya' or a centre for the purpose of arranging the countries both in and beyond India, as known to him, and corresponding to the different Nakshataras, or asterisms. These asterisms are distributed at the rate of three for each of the eight directions, with three for the centre, thus making up 27 in all.

Let us now examine the first verses of chap. XIV, and find out what the author's real import is, and whether he uses in a 'technical' sense meaning a particular country, as was used by Manu* and Amarasimha. In the first verse he says he divides the countries of the earth into nine divisions, beginning from the centre or 'Madhya' of Bhāratavarsha and going round the eight directions, and corresponding to the 27th lunar asterisms at the rate of three beginning from Krittika for each division. No such term as 'Madhyadésa,' however or any other to indicate any particular tract occurs in this verse. In verses 2 to 4, he enumerates the various countries that form the 'Madhya' or centre which he has chosen for astrological purposes. After so enumerating, he concludes by saying in the 4th verse 'Madhyamidam,' literally 'thus in the centre;' that is, these countries should be considered as the centre of the division he proposed. In the expression 'Madhyamidam,' 'madhyam' is *viseshya*, and 'idam' *viseshana*, the whole expression meaning 'the countries above enumerated.' The translation of the 2nd verse given by Mr. Chidambara Iyer is inaccurate so far as the

* Manu thus describes Madhyadésa (Chap II, v. 21 of his Code); 'That which lies midway between Himavat and Vindhya, to the east of Vinasana, to the west of Prayaga (Allahabad) is known as 'Madhyadésa.' All the commentators on Manu, such as Mādāthithi, Kullūka, &c., explain Vinasana as the place where the river Sarasvati submerges underground. The same description occurs in the Purushōtama's and Hémachandra's Lexicons (p. 144 of the former, and p. 17 of the latter).

expression represent the 'Madhyadésa' is concerned, and it runs thus :—

'The constellations of Krittika, Rōhini, and Mrigasiras represent the Madhyadésa or central division consisting of the countries of Bhadra, &c.'

It may perhaps be said that although the word 'désa' does not appear after the word 'Madhyam,' still it may be considered as 'adhyāhara' (understood). Should it be so considered, then 'madhyam' must be of masculine gender in order to qualify the *viseshya* 'désa.' On the other hand, 'madhyam' is in the neuter gender, and cannot therefore be a *viseshana* qualifying the *viseshya* 'désa.' But, as said before, 'Madhyam,' the correct word in the expression is a *viseshya* to the *viseshana* 'idam;' and such being the case, i. e., 'madhyam' being a *viseshya* in the neuter gender,—can only mean 'centre,' and nothing else. If Varāhamihira wished to convey the idea of a particular country, as is apparently understood by Mr. Chidambara Iyer, he would have used instead of 'Madhya' any such expression as 'Madhyadésa,' or 'Madhyamaha' (both being of masculine gender), just as Manu and Amarasimha did. The word 'Madhyāt' in the first verse, and 'Madhyam' in the 4th, have the same meaning, viz., 'centre,' but they can never mean 'a particular country' as the expression 'Madhyadésa' does.

It will thus be seen that Mr. Chidambara Iyer is not correct in saying that Varahamihira called the countries he enumerated in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th verses as 'Madhyadésa,' and in confounding the same with the expression 'Madhyadésa' as used by Patanjali in his Mahābhāshya. When once this confusion is cleared, it is easy to see that the 'Mādhyamika,' as used by Varāhamihira in the 2nd verse, means the same as the Madhyadésa and Madhyamaha, used by Manu and Amarasimha respectively. It is not also reasonable to suppose that Varāhamihira differed from Manu and Amarasimha in his description of Madhyadésa. Agreeing that the terms Mādhyamika, of Varāhamihira, and Madhyadésa, of Manu, are identical, it does not follow that the 'Yavana' country which is said to lie S. W. of it was on this side of the Indus: and it would also be plain that Sākēta (Oude) was quite a different country from Madhyadésa or Mādhyamika, of Varāhamihira. All that I wanted to give out was the definition of the term 'Mādhyamikān' as given by Patanjali since he mentions it; and it was explained in Patanjali's own words to mean 'the people or towns of Madhyadésa.' I regret the confusion of Mr. Chidambaram Iyer in this matter.

In conclusion, I beg his pardon in pointing out his mistake when he says that "Pānini therefore rightly describes the Madhyamikas as 'people or towns belonging to Madhyadesa.'" Pānini never explained the term 'Mādhyamikān' in his grammar Ashtādhyāyī, but Patanjali did in his Mahābhāshya.

PANDIT N. BHASHYA CHARYA.

ADYAR ORIENTAL LIBRARY.

Reviews.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

A LECTURE ON THE CHRISTIAN AND HINDU DOCTRINES OF CREATION, by CH. VENKATACHALAM PANTULU GARU, Masulipatam, 1889.—This is an attempt to prove that the world was made out of nothing by a personal God, and that this theory is a much more reasonable supposition than those on which Hindu philosophy is founded. The author proclaims himself on the cover a Christian convert.

WAS SWEDENBORG A THEOSOPHIST, by J. L. WILLIAMS, published by JAMES SPEERS, London, 1889.—This little fifty four-page, 12mo. is an attempt to disprove the thesis that Swedenborg was a Theosophist. It is clearly and forcibly written, and the writer is evidently very well up in his Swedenborg. He does not seem to be as well informed about Theosophy, however, and so long as he remains so fanatical an adherent as he evidently is of Swedenborg as interpreted by himself it is probable he will be mentally unable to do justice to any other system, however much he may desire to be impartial.

A HAND-BOOK OF TEMPERANCE. Edited and published by a Member of the Calcutta Band of Hope: Calcutta, 1889.—As its name implies, this little book gives a mass of information about the temperance movement and the evils of drink. It is written in Bengali, and will no doubt do much good among those who are ignorant of the English language.

THE ASTRAL LIGHT, by Nizida Theosophical Pub. Co. Lim. London, 1889, half 8vo, p. 181.—Nizida is a well known contributor to Theosophical and Spiritualistic periodicals, and being clairvoyante, is entitled to speak with some authority on the subject of the astral world. In this little treatise Nizida does not give us a description of that world, but goes in for philosophizing, as the subtitle of the work indicates: "An Attempted Exposition of Certain Occult Principles in Nature with some Remarks upon Modern Spiritism."

ADDRESSES DELIVERED BEFORE THE LONDON SPIRITUALIST ALLIANCE during the years 1884 to 1888. Published by the authority of the Council. Demi 8vo, London, 1889.—These addresses are reprinted from *Light* and form a valuable contribution to the *Light* literature of Spiritualism,—there being always a soupcon of after-dinner speechiness in addresses of this kind,—a flavour of self-congratulation and mutual admiration which, however serious the subject and able the speakers, seems somehow to warrant the application of the name "light literature" to them. We cordially recommend this little book to those who wish to know the leading ideas of some of the leading minds in modern Spiritualism.

CAN IT BE LOVE? by WM. C. ELTON SERJEANT; London. Theos. Pub. Co. Lim. 1689, pp. 79.—This is not a novel, but a little treatise on a big subject, as its subtitle indicates: "A Suggestive Enquiry into the Nature of Something, which the World admits yet cannot recognize; being a Legacy from the Living to the Dying." The author writes vigorously always, and, as a rule, gives the reader more paradoxes to the page than any other writer we know of, which is a great point in his favour for those who delight in getting into a state of spirituo-intellectual obfuscation. Love, of course, is the "Something" which underlies the whole creation, and accounts for all the pain, misery, callousness and carnage we everywhere behold.

ओं

THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. XI. No. 125.—FEBRUARY 1890.

सत्यात् नास्ति परो धर्मः ।

THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH.

[Family motto of the Maharajahs of Benares.]

TEARING OFF THE "SHEEP'S CLOTHING."*

A WESLEYAN publication, entitled *The Ceylon Friend*, published in Colombo, contains an article in its issue for November 1889, entitled "What is the object of the Theosophical Society?" in which are some misconceptions, more mis-statements, and a general amount of unfairness, that show

"The rarity
Of Christian Charity,"

when the missionary thinks he can stab an opponent in the back.

The writer says that, as one of the objects for which the Theosophical Society was founded, is to form a nucleus of a Universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste or color, "the founder of this Society must be either remarkably ignorant of the world's history or remarkably audacious." Again, he says:—"The ideas of the unity of the human race and the equality of all men spring up in the train of Christianity; and grow stronger as the teaching of Christ is more widely known and more fully obeyed." And again, that the founder of the Theosophical Society "must be aware that the ground is occupied," here speaking of forming a society for the purpose of securing a fuller feeling of brotherhood.

* This powerful defence of our position was sent to the Editor in the shape of a letter, headed: "The Theosophical Society and the *Ceylon Friend*." We have taken the liberty of altering the title to a more general one, and inserting the communication as an article. Were the Rev. Triggs and the *Ceylon Friend* considered in any other light than as pegs upon which to hang an argument, they would appear to have an importance which they by no means possess. Dealt with in a "Letter to the Editor," they would assume that importance; whereas, their names occurring in an article, as samples of their class, leaves their obvious insignificance undisturbed. Moreover the intrinsic merit of the article fully warrants its promotion from the "Correspondence" to the "Text."—Ed.

You are free:



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



to **Remix** — to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:



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



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



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

With the understanding that:

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

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

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

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

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