

The letters are full of the new life to which Israfel is leading the writer and his correspondent, the visions are descriptions of the glories of Israfel, and the poems are partly in praise of Israfel and partly on other mystical subjects.

The ideas expressed in the letters are noble and elevated, and the poems and visions contain many beautiful lines, but to our un instructed mind there is a vagueness about Israfel that is anything but satisfactory. We have a strong prejudice against poems the subject matter of which is unintelligible to us. We know that poets are made of finer clay than we are, and we acknowledge their right to use metaphors and images the full meaning of which does not lie on the surface, but we prefer to see a golden thread running through all their web of fancy that we can recognise and admire, and trace from one end to the other. Now our difficulty with this book has been to find out who Israfel is.

At first we thought he was the Logos in some form or other, but we went on a little farther and found it explicitly stated that Israfel was not the Logos. Then we thought that Israfel was perhaps the light of the Logos, and in one place he is called the torch-bearer of Christ, but that would not quite do either. He does not seem even to be the guru; he has a form on earth and also a symbolical form. On the title page he is called "The Angel Israfel, whose heartstrings are a lute, and who has the sweetest voice of God's creatures." This we believe is taken from Sale's Koran, and Israfel is properly a Mahomedan angel, one of the three that appeared to Abraham to warn him of the approaching destruction of Sodom, and one of his future duties will be to sound the last trump at the resurrection. From these particulars we should be inclined to think Israfel one of the denizens of the deva kingdom, who, however good they may be, are yet not immortal; and complete union with one of whom is a bar to the attainm ent of immortality by a human being. But we cannot suppose that the author meant this, as he seems to tell us that Israfel will help him to final initiation. Israfel may be a personation of the complete harmony that exists in all things, but we are not certain whether this is the right interpretation either.

In spite of these defects others may enjoy reading the book. But when the truths of occultism are so vast—when, as Levi says, the truths of God surpass and transcend all the imaginations of men, we cannot see why a poet-occultist should not strive to be more exact in his imagery. Then his verses would be real helps to others, and, it may be, guides to a higher life. We fear that poetry is responsible for a good many false conceptions of spiritual things, for the poet, though if a true poet he is a seer also, is apt like other untrained seers to sometimes mistake refraction for reflection.

to compass the result of coming to an end by being “blown out” in Nirvana. Obviously, if annihilation were the end of each individual consciousness, the logical policy would be to eat, drink, sin and be merry as long as it lasted. Why endure desperate privations to accomplish that which must accomplish itself anyhow? And the ingenious explanation given is, that human nature being better really than the Buddhist creed, the candidates for Nirvana exert themselves for the altruistic purpose of extinguishing the fires of “Karma” as far as they are concerned, which would otherwise, after they had passed away, engender other human beings in this suffering world. How a religion which puts such a blank and dreary prospect before each person in turn as that which Buddhism is thus supposed to put, should render this unselfish programme acceptable, is recognised by some of the writers named above as a profound and wonderful enigma. But for scholarship of a certain kind words and phrases are of commanding importance. It counts for nothing if a conclusion is offensive to common sense and incompatible with our knowledge of human nature. So long as there are texts supported by philological erudition that uphold the theory that Buddha taught any given doctrine, the too scholarly critic will set aside broad and general conclusions out of keeping with such texts as unsubstantial and delusive. It may sometimes, however, be safer to trust broad conclusions than narrow interpretations of language. The notion that hundreds of millions of Buddhists are content in the light of a faith that contravenes the deepest craving of human nature—and not only this, but that they are able to lead remarkably good lives on a theory that robs them of all hope of reward for so doing and exempts them from all punishment for evil doing—is infinitely more absurd than the alternative supposition that even the most profound European scholars may misunderstand the language of the Buddhist Scriptures. All the more should this reflection have operated to render modern critics of Buddhism cautious in trusting too completely to the literal meaning of phrases, in view of the paradoxical methods of expression that find so much favour with Eastern writers.

In reading them one must always be on the look out for hidden meanings that revolutionise the literal sense of the words employed, and the grandest thoughts are most constantly veiled in a symbology that is not by any means recognisable as such by the graces of poetic character. An apparently straightforward narrative of physical events may be in truth a subtle spiritual allegory: an apparently specific statement may derive all its importance from an unexpressed qualification which the wit of the student is left to supply; and which, when supplied, may be recognised as compatible with the original statement, but which the Eastern teacher may have purposely held back, that it might, when discovered by the student for himself, take hold of his imagination all the more firmly. We now live in an age when writing must be made intelligible for those who run while reading. But that has not been the principle on which Oriental Scriptures have been compiled.
employ the word. The whole confusion arises from the play of cross purposes. In the Catechism, for instance, the question is asked
"Does Buddhism teach the immortality of the soul?" and the reply is as follows: "Soul it considers a word used by the ignorant to express a false idea. If everything is subject to change, then man is included and every material part of him must change. That which is subject to change is not permanent, so there can be no immortal survival of a changeful thing." Going on then to explain that the new personality of each succeeding reincarnation is the aggregate of the "Skandhas" or attributes of the last, the Catechism takes up the question whether this new aggregation of Skandhas is the same being as that in the previous birth; the answer is: "In one sense it is a new being, in another it is not. During this life the Skandhas are constantly changing, and while the man A. B. of eighteen, yet by the continual waste and repairation of his body, and change of mind and character, he is a different being. Nevertheless the man in his old age justly reaps the reward or suffering consequent upon his thoughts and actions at every previous stage of his life. So the new being of a rebirth, being the same individuality as before with but a changed form, or new aggregation of Skandhas, justly reaps the consequences of his actions and thoughts in the previous existence."

The simplest common sense, therefore, applied to the problem will show that Buddhism does not deny that primary idea which Western theologians have in their minds when they talk about the immortality of the soul. It will not accept as correct an expression so inexact metaphysically, but it is grossly misrepresented when Western theologians try to persuade their hearers that it repudiates the fundamental idea which the Western populace associates with the inexact expression. In the sense that the man of forty is the same being that he was at eighteen, the new person reborn is the same being as the former person who generated his Karma, and his mere non-recollection in his new birth of his former adventures is not held by Buddhism at all events to impair the identity. The Catechism deals with this point as follows: "The aged man remembers the incidents of his youth, despite his being physically and mentally changed. Why then is not the recollection of past lives brought over by us from our last birth into the present birth? Because memory is included within the Skandhas; and the Skandhas having changed with the new existence, a new memory, the record of that particular existence, develops. Yet the record or reflection of all the past lives must survive, for when Prince Siddartha became Buddha, the full sequence of his previous births was seen by him... and any one who attains to the state of Jhana can thus retrospectively trace the life of his being."

The contention with which I put forward these extracts will not be defeated by any one who replies that such an immortality fails to satisfy the aspirations of his mind. The question is whether Buddhism teaches that "there is after death no surviving soul of any man, that the dissolution of the body ends all."

* Dr. Kellog.

Buddhism teaches the exact reverse of this, and all the elaborate criticism on its other teaching, which hostile writers build up in the primary mis-statements of its position in regard to this important tenet, falls to the ground for any one who understands how the matter really stands.

II.

It is necessary at every step in the investigation of Buddhist doctrine to remember that this was put forward at the period of its development, not as a re-statement of the whole case concerning God and man, but as a development, a purification, or an expansion of the then existing principles of Brahminical philosophy. As Dr. Oldenburg justly remarks: "No one can understand the course which Indian thought has taken without keeping in view the picture with its lights and shadows of this order of philosophers, as the Greeks named the Brahminical caste... for Buddhism also... this priestly class... was the necessary form in which the innermost essence... of the Indian people has embodied itself." And a little later on we read: "On this very foundation, centuries after the Brahminical thinkers had laid it, were the doctrine and the Church built which were named after the name of Buddha." Thus no greater mistake can be made than to suppose that Buddhism leaves out of its calculations any given metaphysical idea, merely because it does not explicitly expound this in any translated texts that we are acquainted with so far. Indeed, if we possessed accurate translations of every line of Buddhist Scripture ever written, we should certainly be still without any formal Buddhist authority for a great mass of philosophical conceptions that we should none the less be bound to assume as underlying the Buddhist doctrine.

That the prevalent belief of the people among whom Buddha lived pointed clearly to the survival of the soul after death, is lived pointedly. In the survival of the soul after death, is lived the ancient, the Asiatic, and the Indian thought has taken without keeping in view the picture with its lights and shadows of this order of philosophers, as the Greeks named the Brahminical caste... for Buddhism also... this priestly class... was the necessary form in which the innermost essence... of the Indian people has embodied itself."

The contention with which I put forward these extracts will not be defeated by any one who replies that such an immortality fails to satisfy the aspirations of his mind. The question is whether Buddhism teaches that "there is after death no surviving soul of any man, that the dissolution of the body ends all."

* "Buddha: his Life, his Doctrine, his Order," translated by W. Hoey.

The contention with which I put forward these extracts will not be defeated by any one who replies that such an immortality fails to satisfy the aspirations of his mind. The question is whether Buddhism teaches that "there is after death no surviving soul of any man, that the dissolution of the body ends all."

* "Buddha: his Life, his Doctrine, his Order," translated by W. Hoey.
as saying:—"How think you, Assalayana—a man who is a murderer, a thief, a libertine, a liar, a slanderer, violent or frivolous in speech, covetous, malevolent, given to false doctrine—will such a one, if he be a Kshatriya or a Vessa, or a Buddha, be born after death, when the body is dissolved, into some unhappy state of misery and woe, but not if he be a Brahman?" Assalayana replies that the Buddha is in this respect exactly on a par with the others. Gotama then proceeds to the contrary case, when Assalayana declares that those who do the contrary of all these evil things are equally re-born into some happy state in heaven, whether they are Brahmins or whether they are not (Hibbert Lectures, p. 59).

How can a man be "re-born into a happy state in heaven," if we are to hold the great soul theory as swept away? The plain truth of the case is that in all he says Buddha takes for granted the survival of the soul after death,—as a fundamental familiar doctrine, or even fact of consciousness, which no spiritual student could want to debate about. The creed of the Buddhists is thus established on a view of the soul's survival after death that is elaborate, vivid and far-reaching. No form of religious persuasion in the world is more deeply coloured than Buddhism by an intimate realisation of the idea that the destinies of man are concerned with a far larger sphere of existence than can be supplied by his physical body. It is just because of the overwhelming importance assigned by Buddha and his cultivated followers to real existence as contra-distinguished from existence on the physical plane of nature as an incarnate being, that the incarnate existence itself is spoken of sometimes with contempt or indifference, whenever Buddha is found to disparage existence. In any of the numerous passages that have been taken to imply that he recommended annihilation as a goal to pursue, it will always be perceived by any one who reads his words with an understanding open to the interpretation thus supplied, that he is merely disparaging physical existence in the perishable body, or even existence in the earlier conditions of relatively immaterial life, which, though less so than the physical life, are still transitory conditions of being as compared with the sublime developments beyond these, towards which the internal resources of the highly spiritualised man enable him to reach upward.

One other simple caution will enable us to enter with confidence on the examination of such translated texts as are available for the purpose of the present argument. Most of his doctrinal discourses are addressed by Buddha to his monks,—"the brethren," the disciples who had adopted an exclusively religious life, the object of which was to secure the highest spiritual achievement after death, not merely a state of prolonged happiness in heaven, terminating in a return to physical existence and a rebirth on earth. In all such discourses the teacher takes for granted the desire on the part of those he is addressing to escape the trammels of physical life and the transitory conditions of all existence short of Nirvana.

But one remarkable passage in the Maha-Paranibbana Sutta, as translated by Dr. Rhys Davids (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XI, page 16) records a short address he delivers to certain "householders"—followers of his teaching, but persons who were not engaged in the supreme attempt to compass Arhatship. And here there is no ambiguous language to mislead the simple understanding of too literal readers. The passage is as follows:

"Then the Blessed One addressed the Patalagamā disciples, and said:—'Fivefold, oh householders! is the loss of the wrong-doer through his want of rectitude. In the first place the wrong-doer devoid of rectitude falls into great poverty through sloth; in the next place his evil repute gets noise abroad; thirdly, whatever society he enters, whether of Brahmins, nobles, heads of houses, or Samaṇas, he enters shily and confused; fourthly, he is full of anxiety when he dies; and lastly, on the dissolution of the body after death, he is reborn into some unhappy state of suffering or woe. This, oh householders! is the fivefold loss of the evil doer.'

"Fivefold, oh householders! is the gain of the well-doer through his practice of rectitude. In the first place the well-doer, strong in rectitude, acquires great wealth through his industry; in the next place, good reports of him are spread abroad; thirdly, whatever society he enters, whether of nobles, Brahmins, heads of houses, or members of the order, he enters confident and self possessed; fourthly, he dies without anxiety; and lastly, on the dissolution of the body after death, he is reborn into some happy state in heaven. This, oh householders! is the fivefold gain of the well-doer.'" One cannot easily understand the state of mind of a writer who, himself putting forward such a passage as this as part of the teaching of Buddha, yet contrives to imagine that the teachings of Buddha do away with the great soul theory, and rest on the blink nihilism of the assumption that when any given man dies there is a final end of him.

The mistake has apparently arisen from the inability of many European writers to put a proper interpretation on Buddha's sayings regarding transitory and permanent states of being. First of all, periods of time of very great duration are nevertheless spoken of by Buddha as transitory. A good illustration of this may be found in the Maha-Sudarsana Sutta, describing, according to Dr. Rhys Davids' translation, "The Great King of Glory." This personage was a marvellous monarch of some fabulous period in the past—the account of his life given in the Sutta being highly allegorical—who was the recipient of wonderful gifts at the hands of the gods, and who lived for periods of time described in the passage I am about to quote. Buddha is supposed to be speaking and telling the story to his disciple Ananda:—

"For eight and forty thousand years, Ananda, the Great King of Glory lived the happy life of a prince; for eight and forty thousand years he was Viceroy and heir apparent; for eight and forty thousand years he ruled the kingdom; and for eight and forty thousand years he lived as a layman the noble life in the Palace of Righteousness. And then, when full of noble thoughts, he died; he entered after the dissolution of the body the noble world of Brahma... I at that time was the Great King of Glory. Mine were the four and eighty thousand cities, etc., etc. . . . . See, Ananda, how all
these things are now past, are ended, are vanished away. Thus
impermanent, Ananda, are component things; thus transitory, An-
anda, are component things; thus untrustworthy, Ananda, are
component things; inasmuch, Ananda, is it meet to be weary of,
is it meet to be estranged from, is it meet to be quite set free, from
the bondage of all component things.” (Sacred Books of the East,
Vol. XI, p. 288.)

In passing, to guard against a natural misconception, it may be
pointed out that the Great King of Glory’s entry into the world of
Brahma at his death is not equivalent to the union with Brahma,
attainment of Nirvana at which the Buddhist ascetic aims. The
King is supposed to have been an almost faultlessly good man, whose
virtues are described in glowing terms, but still he lived as a
worldly king of glory, though filled with beautiful thoughts and
aspirations. His great happiness on earth was succeeded in due
time by a happiness of corresponding amplitude and duration in
heaven, but he had not finally shaken off the fetters of
existence—that is to say, physical existence on earth—and
was ultimately, reborn. Of what avail therefore were his 192,000
years of happy life with a period of heaven to match them?
From the point of view of Buddhist philosophy that is not a suffi-
ciently long reward to be the goal of such efforts as are prescribed
for the ascetic.

On the other hand it must be remembered that by the same
philosophy no states of being—not even the state of the Nirvana—
can be immutable. Every conceivable state of being must be subject
to change in the progress of eternity. Passages will be found in
Buddhist writings recognising that idea, and in their turn will be
misunderstood sometimes in this way. European creeds have
acquainted many people to regard the heavenly life as eternal, and
even to imagine—therefore to assume—that any one who denies eternity
as an attribute of the life after death is denying the life after
death altogether. That which is final in Nirvana, according to Bud-
dha’s teaching, is exemption from rebirth on earth as an incarnate
human being; that is the “utter passing away” of which Buddha
speaks as happening in the case of one who has attained the Nir-
vanic development: and in regard to the nature of the changes
which await him in the ultimate future—in which such periods as
the 192,000 years spoken of above would be as a drop in the
ocean—the public discourses of the great teacher are naturally
silent. A philosopher who recognizes the true significance of the
word eternity is not likely to fall into the mistake of assuming that
the finite understanding of incarnate men on one planet among the
innumerable host of planets in the universe would be in a position
to grapple usefully with problems lying beyond its reach. The
doctrine to be taught is the doctrine of final escape from the
fetters of physical existence and rebirth on that one planet. The
rest to be learned must concern—not the inhabitants of that
planet but—the Nirvanic.

It would be futile to dispute over the verbal significance of
English translations of Buddhist texts as bearing on the points
before us, in face of the overwhelming fact that the Catechism, which

states the case as we have shown, is endorsed by the principal
Buddhist authority of the Southern Church, the more materialistic
of the two great schools of Buddhist thought. There is something
ludicrous in the vanity of scholars who profess to know better
than the foremost representatives of Buddhism what Buddhism is.
The texts on which they proceed in forming their hypotheses are
open to the inspection of the Oriental as well as the Western students
of Pali and Sanscrit, and the born Orientalists are not restricted
to a verbal interpretation of these, as they have the clue, not only to
the dictionary meanings of words, but to their figurative and
metaphysical connotations. However, by the light of much that
has been made public of late in regard to the inner spirit of
Buddhist teaching, the bare texts themselves—even in English,
even as they stand translated by scholars impressed with the
notion that their tendency is Nihilistic—are luminous with spiritual
meaning, often of a very exalted kind. All the
passages in Buddha’s teaching, which are blindly quoted in
support of the theory that he taught the annihilation of each
human entity at death, are merely aimed at getting people to
realise that the higher life of the true ego is not clogged for ever
with the sordid and insignificant details of each physical existence.
These are shaken off according to Buddhist doctrine in real exis-
tence; unless, indeed, by the saturation of the soul with low-minded
instincts it is bound down to a recollection of them even after death.
On this branch of the subject, however, the orthodox Ceylon Cate-
chism is naturally silent: for no teaching concerning the relatively
spiritual—the immediate super-physical adventures of the soul after
death—would be permitted by Buddhist priests in a manual inten-
ded for the populace. All readers of the most elementary Buddhist
books must be aware that Buddha taught one view of things to the
laity, and much more that was never made public to his monks.
The modern representatives of his system tenaciously adhere to
the same rule. Much indeed that pertains to the more elaborate
doctrine can now found out on inquiry by uninitiated stu-
dents, but for a school catechism obviously the simplest exoteric
view of the teaching would be put forward. For the simple popu-
lace the warning or temptation of the future life on earth is treated
as a sufficient inducement to good conduct. All reference thereto
is far less obvious in the more elaborate views of future life, and
published outside the enclosure in which the higher doctrine was taught, has always
been veiled in more or less ambiguous language.

For it is not put forward by Buddha as the primary purpose of
his teaching that men should be tempted to lead good lives by the
hope of attaining heavenly bliss. On the other hand the theory
that the rewards of good life will accrue in heaven, instead of
being denied by Buddhism, is treated always as an utter matter
of course. Everybody already knew that Buddha was not re-
stateing a code of religious truth from the A. B. C. of the matter,
but calling the attention of men ripe to contemplate so stupendous
a conception to the transitory character even of the heavenly
state which follows in the normal course the good man’s life on
earth. It might be prodigiously prolonged, still it was transitory;
and the force of his instruction was almost all directed to the
stimulation of zeal for that higher emancipation from the necessity
for any return to such earth life as we are familiar with, which it
was his special care to show might conduct men to Nirvana. None
the less do his utterances sometimes include casual references to
the recognized truth concerning heaven.

The Dhammapada, translated by Prof. Max Müller in Vol. X. of
the Sacred Books of the East, is not merely one of the canonical books
of the Buddhist Scripture, but is specially Buddha's own teaching.
The translator even says, referring to certain commentaries by
Buddhaghosha:—"In explaining the verses of the Dhammapada
the commentator gives for every or nearly every verse a parable
to illustrate its meaning which is likewise believed to have been
uttered by Buddha in his intercourse with his disciples, or in relating
to the multitude that came to hear him."
Certainly then we may take the Dhammapada, if anything, to be Buddhist doc-
trine, and here are some fragments:

"The evil-doer mourns in this world and he mourns in the next; he
mourns in both. He mourns and suffers when he sees the evil
of his own work.

"The virtuous man delights in this world and he delights in the
next; he delights in both. He delights and rejoices when he sees
the purity of his own work.

"The evil-doer suffers in this world and he suffers in the next; he
suffers in both. He suffers when he thinks of the evil he has
done; he suffers more when going on the evil path.

"The virtuous man is happy in this world and he is happy in the
next; he is happy in both. He is happy when he thinks of the good
he has done; he is still more happy when going on the good path."

And again a little later on:—

"Some people are born again; evil-doers go to hell; righteous
people go to heaven; those who are free from all earthly desires
attain Nirvana."

How a man who has dug up these clear and explicit aphorisms
from the original mine of the Pali manuscripts can write of the
faith to which they appertain as Professor Max Müller writes of
Buddhism, is a puzzle not easy to solve. If the argument had
been that these verses do not tell us very much about the
conditions of spiritual life that constitute heaven and hell, that might
have been a valid objection; though such a criticism would
overlook the fact that such passages were evidently addressed in
all cases to the multitude, and were only intended to be broad
statements of the simplest truths—while the subtle spiritual
teaching which Buddha was specially anxious to convey was
addressed to the advanced disciples. But to argue in face of
unequivocal declarations,—repeated with the amplitude of Oriental
style—about the spiritual future in store for good men and for
bad, that Buddhism did not recognise after-states for the soul,
but treated the death of the physical body as the end of all
things, is certainly to cling to an opinion in spite of considerations
that should overturn it, on the principle tant pis pour les faits.

A. P. Sinnett.

(To be continued.)
was resting on the railing of the verandah. Then, to our great amazement, he jumped from his chair as if he had been bitten by a viper; ran down the steps, examined nervously every corner in the little front garden, looked under the verandah and on the roof, and finally returned to the terrace looking very pale and as if he had seen a ghost.

"What is the matter?" exclaimed Marya Nikolaevne, much alarmed, and raising herself from the arm-chair.

Instead of replying, Piotre Petrovitch went on silently with his search. He examined once more the ground under the steps, then looked away into the forest, and finally began moving about the chairs, and looking under them.

"Will you tell me what you are looking for?" at last repeated our hostess, impatiently.

"May be it is a joke, ladies and gentlemen," whispered the sceptic in a very hoarse voice, nervously wiping his brow, which trickled with perspiration.

"What is a joke?"

"Did you see no one?" he asked.

We looked at each other quite taken aback, and answered in one voice: 'No one at all!'

"But I saw some one...and—a hand also," he said in the same-tremulous tones.

"What, or whose hand? What are you saying?"

"A hand...and undeniably a woman's hand...white, half transparent...crossed with blue veins. It seemed to me as if some one had approached me from the front garden here, had seized me above the elbow, just in this place, and having pressed my arm thrice had tried to drag me down from the verandah into the garden."

While saying all this, Piotre Petrovitch was breathing heavily and his pallor was as ghastly as ever.

"Why, you must have dreamt this!"

"I do not know...I am not at all sure it was a dream or even a vision. I had plenty of time to examine the hand thoroughly well, as it never quitted my arm for several seconds. nor did it withdraw from the grasp, but seemed to melt away on my sleeve."

"Now you will be more cautious, perhaps, about denying the Indian cock-and-bull stories! It is the astral form of 'Radha Bai' who pulled your arm, to hint that you should not be slandering people!"

Indeed, Piotre Petrovitch looked so much as if he had got into some inextricable trap, that we were all smiling at his discomfiture. But he heeded us not, but kept silent and gloomy, now and then examining suspiciously the right sleeve of his coat, at the place where he had seen the mysterious hand. Very soon he could endure it no longer; and, leaving his arm-chair once more, went again into the little garden, where, with something like his habitual animation, he began telling us the story over again. We all followed, laughing merrily at the sceptic.

Meanwhile the atmosphere had thickened and was now full of electricity. A large black thunder-cloud was overhanging our heads, dark and threatening, from which a flash of forked lightning suddenly sprang and fell on the house we had just left. We were startled and amazed; for right before our eyes the huge chimney on the roof fell to pieces and disappeared, bricks and mortar rolling with a thundering noise from the top of the house down on our terrace. More terrible still, the pillar on which Piotre Petrovitch had leaned while sitting in his arm-chair suddenly bent and gave way with a sinister creaking sound, and the whole large and heavy roof collapsed and fell down with an awful crash on our verandah.

All this took place in less time than it takes to describe the event. We were struck dumb with horror and amazement!

"The hand, her hand...I say! That hand was pulling me away from the verandah, you know?" he repeated again and again to each of us, with a face white with terror, and widely opened eyes.

We were too deeply appalled to make any remark; we simply looked at him in silence.

UNPUBLISHED WRITINGS OF ELIPHAS LEVI.

(Fourth Series)

IDRA SUTRA.

The Nine Lights.

The first Light is the crown or supreme power. Its shadow is despotism or the absolutism of power.

The second Light is eternal wisdom. Its shadow is blind faith. The third Light is active intelligence. Its shadow is the dogma that claims to be immutable, but is fatally progressive.

The fourth Light is spiritual beauty. Its shadow is blind faith, the harsh and unsymmetrical image of dead superstition.

The fifth Light is eternal justice. Its shadow is divine vengeance.

The sixth Light is infinite mercy. Its shadow is unwilling sacrifice.

The seventh Light is the eternal victory of good. Its shadow is voluntary abnegation and surrender.

The eighth Light is the eternity of good. Its shadow is eternal hell.

The ninth Light is the fecundity of good. Its shadow is celibacy and sterility.

Here the black numbers come to an end, for ten is the number of creation, and creation cannot be negative. Celibacy and sterility produce nothing.

Celibacy has always been the dream of mysticism, even in Judaism, which formally condemns sterility.

Asceticism indeed is incompatible with family duties. The wandering prophets had no wives. The family is the world and mysticism is the desert. The family is real life and mysticism is the life of dream. The family necessitates cleanliness and order, mysticism enjoins abnegation and voluntary surrender. Mysticism
is religious sentiment exaggerated to madness. Thus it should be tempered and regulated by sacerdotal authority. The mystics are children whose schoolmasters are the priests.

We speak here of the orthodox and obedient mystics who avoid vertigo and madness—thanks to the leading-strings of obedience. Disobedient mystics are madmen, who may become dangerous, and whom it may be necessary to place in confinement.

**The Microprosopoe considered as Androgyne.**

This is what we have learned.

Then Rabbi Schimeon said: These figures and all these mysteries of the Logos ought to be revealed to those only who are able to maintain their own equilibrium, placing their feet one in each scale of the balance.

They should not be told to those who have not entered the vault of the great trials, but only to those who have gone in and who have come out again.

For it were better for those who enter and do not come out that they had never been born!

**Commentary.**

Here we see clearly that the occult doctrine of Moses, professed by Rabbi Schimeon, proceeds from the sanctuaries of Egypt. There indeed the neophyte had to submit to great trials before admission to initiation.

These trials took place in immense subterranean crypts whence those who had given way to fear never came out alive. The adept who came forth victorious received the key of all the religious mysteries, and the first revelation that was whispered in his ear as he passed by was contained in this formula:

**Osiris is a Black God.**

That is to say: the god adored by the profane is but the shadow of the true God.

We endow him with the anger of man, that he may become a terror to men. For if we do not place before men a master who is like themselves, the idea of divinity will so far surpass their feeble intelligence that it will completely escape them, and they will fall into the abysses of atheism.

We will not follow Rabbi Schimeon into his descriptions of the divine androgyne contained in the prototype which is the black ancient or the god of shadow.

These are fictions in monstrous anatomy that recall the strange fancies of Oriental mythologies. No doubt a grand thought is at the basis of all these dreams, but their expression is too far removed from our habits and morals to present any reality to our minds. Let it be enough to say that the Rabbi represents the typical pairs, that of the Microprosopoe and Nature the spouse, that of Adam Kadmon and his Eve, eternally fruitful: he gives allegorical descriptions of the different parts of their body, explains their mutual passion, and thus transforms immensity into an enormous nuptial bed with neither coverlet nor curtains.

---
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Of Justice, according to the test of Rabbi Schimeon.

Woman does not possess strength and justice in herself; she must receive them from man.

She aspires towards them with an unspeakable thirst, but she cannot receive them until she is obedient.

When she governs she brings forth nothing but revolt and violence.

For this reason woman became man's mistress by leading him into sin.

She became a mother in the incontinence of her desires, and brought forth Cain.

Then she said: God and I have made a man and that man is my property.

She was not ready for true maternity, for the serpent had infected her with his jealousy and his anger. The birth of the cruel and pitiless Cain was a violent and terrible birth which exhausted all the energies of the woman.

Then she became softened and weak in order to bring forth the mild Abel.

The two contrary generations could not agree together; the strong without restraint was forced to absorb the weak without defence; and this is what happened. Then the god of shadow woke up, and he snatched from Cain's belly the brother whom Cain had devoured.

But neither Cain nor Abel were found just enough to subsist before him.

He threw Abel into the limbo of life, and he cast Cain into the great ocean of tears.

There they still seek one another in order to fight, and they produce, each in turn, spirits of violence and of weakness.

Happy are the souls that descend in a direct line from the great Adam! For the children of useless Abel are no better than those of criminal Cain; they are unjust and sinful!

True justice is made up of goodness and strength; it is neither violent nor weak.

Happy! are you who understand these words—the words of the spirit which join the left to the right, and which make the things above to agree with those below.

Happy are you, masters of masters, reapers of the sacred field, who contemplate and recognize the Lord, gazing on him face to face, and who, by your union with the eternal Logos, make yourselves worthy of immortality in the world to come.

It is of you that it is written: From to-day shalt thou know that the Lord reigns at once in the height of heaven and in the depth of earth.

The Lord reigns over all, the ancient of days—God! or in other words, the unique, the one alone.

May his name be blessed now and for evermore.
Last words on the Supreme Man.

Rabbi Schimeon said: In looking downwards we see the things of above; and in observing the things above we see those that are below.

The ten fingers of our hands remind us of the ten crowns of science, the sacred numbers and their equilibrium, five on one side and five on the other.

It is the same with the toes of our feet; what is above is like what is below.

The superior forms govern the inferior ones; the above is as the below; the woman is analogous to the man. Contraries govern contraries; extremes touch, and the different forms adhere to one another and act upon one another.

Man and woman united form the perfect body of humanity. They need one another; they act and react on one another. The life that animates them is the same.

All that is outside this mutual and universal life of the great body is darkness and error. Do not approach the spirits that are beyond the pale of the great communion as if they were able to teach you anything, for from them you would receive nothing but stains. The wandering spirits are like heads cut off that are always thirsty, but the water they drink escapes with their blood and does not quench their thirst.

If all this is so, you will say, the very angels form a part of the great body of the synagogue?

How can you doubt it? Otherwise they would have no part either in holiness nor in life. For the synagogue of the wise is the body of humanity, and the body of humanity is the body of God. Is not the angel of the Lord, in the prophecy of Daniel, called Gabriel? But what is the meaning of Gabriel, if not the man par excellence, the man of God or the man-God?

We learn from the tradition that foul spirits are able to clothe themselves with the beauties of the human form, because they have not entered into the harmony of the perfect body. They are vagabond and fly about throughout the world and cannot become fixed in any form. Everywhere they feel themselves repelled, because they have in them the indocility of Cain; they are driven outside the camp whose brilliant tents are the stars.

They never become fixed in truth; sometimes they try to rise above, then they sink below; but whether below or above they always remain unclean.

The impure spirits that come from Abel, being milder, may approach the great body and even apparently become attached to it. But they are like superfluous members: they are fastened to the body, but they do not belong to it.

All these spirits are like abortions or severed members, revolving in the void.

Whether above or below they listen to all they have power to hear, but they never understand anything as those do who have paid attention to this subject.
having seen the daughters of men that they were beautiful, leaned too far forward to gaze at them and fell into the abyss. Then they engendered impure spirits and demons, and it was then that there were giants on the earth. Their fall, contrary to the order of nature, and consequently not foreseen by the supreme ordainer of things, explains the repentance or the regret of God, when it is said that the Lord repented him of having made man. And the text adds, "on earth," for the divine plan remained without alteration in heaven. The man of heaven had not sinned.

But the falling angel had broken the equilibrium of the earth, and God had been as if forced to do what he had not desired. For it is the equilibrium of man that makes the equilibrium of nature in this world; and if man was not, then there would no longer be a world. For man is the receptacle of the divine thought that creates and preserves the world; man is the reason of the earth's existence. All that has existed before him was the preparatory work of his birth; and the whole creation without him would have been but an abortion.

Thus in his vision the prophet saw the angels set up a throne in heaven, and on the throne was seated a figure like the image of a man. And Daniel says he saw, moving with the clouds of heaven, as it were, a son of man, who came and slowly ascended towards the Ancient of Days. And he came near him, and was made to approach before the face of the Lord.

Conclusion.

Hitherto our words have been mysterious. They hide an elevated sense which escapes the capacity of the greater number. Happy is he who knows how to understand them, and who explains them without being deceived. For these words have been given for the masters alone, and for the reapers of the holy field; for those who have entered the place of trial and who have come out of it. It is written: The ways of the Lord are straight, and the just walk in them without stopping, but the transgressors of the law always find some stone of stumbling therein.

Having said all these things, Rabbi Schimeon wept, and raising his voice he said: If any of you, O my brothers, are to reveal to the profane the things we have said, may God take them back again to himself and conceal them within his glory!

For it were better that we ourselves should leave the world than to reveal to the children of the world the most sublime mysteries of heaven. I have revealed them to you alone in the presence of the Ancient of Ancients, and I have done it neither for my own glory nor for that of my father's house, nor to fill with pride my brothers who are here assembled. But only to hinder them from wandering in the ways of great wisdom, that they may present themselves without shame at the gate of the palace, and that they may not be effaced like a badly written letter in the pages of the book of life.

This is what we have learned:
THE ANIMAL MAGNETISM OF TO-DAY.

PAMPHLETS have from time to time appeared, dealing with certain phases of hypnotism as practised by the physicians of the French School. Some of them have been noticed in the Thesosophist. We have now received a work* which embraces the whole subject, and epitomises the results of the patient investigations carried on at the Salpêtrière Hospital for nervous disorders by the medical staff during the past nine years. This volume, though not directly emanating from the pen of Professor Charcot, was compiled by two of his most assiduous collaborators.

The ancient magnetizers, to whom be all the honour they have so richly deserved by their boldness as discoverers and their dogged perseverance in the face of a virulent antagonism on the part of the scientific and religious bodies of their day, erred, if we may say so, in playing too much to the gallery; they strove to take by storm the public mind, and overthrow the accepted scientific beliefs by highly coloured dramatic effects savouring of the miraculous. Also, in their researches the same tendency might be observed. They tried to obtain wonders, and they succeeded in doing so. But in their feverish haste to establish the new doctrine they never stopped to inquire what was the rationale, what the relation of their phenomena with others already understood, or how to bridge over the gulf between the fully established beliefs of the age and the newly discovered marvels. Scientific bodies err, if at all, on the side of extreme caution, and are prone to be somewhat dogmatic. They expect a bridge of boats to be laid from their own terra firma to the promised land, so that they may cross step by step and run no risk of plunging into waters of unknown depth; and also that they may have a safe and dignified retreat, if on closer inspection they discover it to be a treacherous quicksand or a shadowy mirage. These old masters have their followers in the present day, and we do not in any way wish to disparage their labours.

The difference in the method pursued by Professor Charcot and his colleagues consists in the fact that they have sought to obtain first of all the simplest and most elementary psychic phenomena, and to test every step in their investigations by separate experiments, specially devised for the purpose of proving the bona fide of the subject and the reality of his hallucination, of eliminating the possibility of unconscious suggestion, of establishing relations with similar phenomena of disease or health in the domain of physiology and psychology, and of noting the modifications which can be brought about by altering the conditions of the experiments. Above all, they never dogmatise. The reader may peruse the book before us from cover to cover without finding a single law laid down, a single hypothesis advanced, which is not led up to by the most approved inductive processes. The ground has been cut from under the feet of all those very superior persons who declare that magnetism is all tomfoolery, practised solely by wily rogues for purposes of gain, and believed in only by superstitious num-skulls.

One of our principal reasons for assigning so high a value to this book is that it enunciates new and reliable methods for the study of the physiology of the brain and nervous system in health and disease; and furthermore that it brings within the pale of physical experiment those vexed questions of the psychology of mind in its three-fold aspect of emotion, volition and intellectual imagery, which have been worn to shreds by the bottomless logic of the schools, and may be said to have been carried as far as the former premises would admit by Bain, Mill, Spencer and other psychologists. The metaphysical methods, which were formerly for the most part the only ones available, have thus, to some extent, been exchanged for physical ones, which can be varied almost indefinitely by the ingenuity of the investigator, and so make clear the relative bearings of the several component elements.

To sum up in the words of the authors: "The work of the Salpetrière School has been the starting point of a new scientific movement, which is still going on."

The earlier chapters deal with the history of animal magnetism and its advancement step by step under the guidance of Mesmer, Puysegur, Périsot, Félix, Du Potet, and others, with the full reports of the French Academy, and the enigmatic letter of Cardinal Macchi. The hypnotism of Braid and his followers is next dealt with, as marking a new epoch. Then by an easy gradation we are led on to the commencement of the labours of the Salpetrière and the hypnotism of hysterics. This little history of the movement has been worked up with great care and extensive reference, and it is in our opinion the best that has appeared. But it is somewhat beside the subject of the present paper, which is intended rather to convey some idea of the methods adopted, and of the results of the inquiry up to date.

In the experiments of Professor Charcot and his colleagues the subjects have been for the most part hysterics, for the simple reason that in this phase of hypnotism the symptoms are more fully developed and better defined. It has been called the greater hypnotism to distinguish it from the lesser hypnotism of non-hysterics. The method is said to be "the production of physical symptoms, giving to some extent an anatomical demonstration of particular states of the nervous system."

"From the point of view of its production," it is said, "hypnotic sleep does not greatly differ from natural sleep, of which it is in fact a different form; for all the causes which bring on fatigue are capable of producing hypnotism in suitable subjects,—as M. Richet says, 'All means are good, if only they are applied to a predisposed organism.'" It may be induced by sensory stimuli of two opposite characters, strong and brusque, or weak and prolonged. As instances of the former may be mentioned, a bright light—which in the subjects of the severe form of hysteria occasions sudden catalepsy,—also a loud noise,—such as that of a tom-tom, a Chinese gong, a shrill whistle, or the vibration of a diapason,—which has a similar effect. With subjects previously entranced a relatively slight noise,
such as the rustle of a piece of paper or the ring of a wine glass, suffices to produce catalepsy. If, instead of being violent, the stimulus is moderate, it must be prolonged to produce hypnotic sleep, but it does almost invariably produce it. The subject may be put to sleep by Braid's process, which consists in fixing his eyes for a few moments on a slightly luminous or completely dark object, held by preference slightly above and near the eyes, so as to cause them to squint upwards and inwards. After a little while the eyes become humiid and brilliant, with fixed gaze and dilated pupil. If the object is removed the subject remains in catalepsy. If it is not removed he quickly falls backwards with a moan, and a little foam appears on his lips. This is lethargy. "It can also be produced by simple friction and various other methods, such as the stimulation of taste, smell, or touch, by pressure on the hypnogenic zones, or by the slow and feeble stimuli of passes, with or without contact, the action of warmth and magnetization. These diverse stimuli have different effects on different subjects, and their combination may render the effect more efficacious or more rapid. A stimulus can entrance without being felt; for consciousness is not necessary for the success of the experiment." Hypnotisation by suggestion is practically identical with that produced by physical stimulus, but in this case the stimulus is subjective. To exemplify this by an instance:—"A patient, either when awake or during a former sleep, has been given the suggestion of an electric lamp standing alight in a corner of the room. She is awake and talks quietly. But if she is told to look in the corner where the imaginary lamp stands, she falls instantly into catalepsy, as if she had received an electric ray full in the face. The hallucination, that is to say the (mental) image of the luminous impression, has produced the same effect as the real impression, because it is the recall of it." The suggestion of sleep probably acts on the same principle.

The chief condition of success is habit. In the first trial nearly everything fails, but after several everything succeeds. This process of breaking in a patient has been called hypnotic education. The determination of a subject not to be entranced has no effect. It is easily overcome by the will of the operator. But if the subject has got the idea that on a certain day she will not be hypnotisable, all the methods in the world will be employed in vain. There are, however, some people who have never been hypnotised who can resist.

The respiratory movements in lethargy are slow and deep, in catalepsy slight, shallow, very slow and separated by a long interval. The application of a magnet over the region of the stomach causes profound modifications in the breathing and circulation in lethargy, but not in catalepsy.

The psychic manifestations closely resemble those of dreams. Sensation varies between the two opposite poles of hyperesthesia and anæsthesia. In lethargy all the senses are extinct except sometimes hearing, which generally persists during natural sleep. In somnambulism the senses are extraordinarily exalted. Patients can feel the cold air, caused by the operator blowing, from a distance of several yards. The field of vision and acuteness of sight are about doubled. Smell is developed enormously. A subject can find by scent the fragments of a card, previously given him to feel, then torn up and hidden. Hearing too is very acute.

The state of the memory in somnambulism has been much studied. It may be said to present the same hyper-excitability as the other organs of sense. A distinction has been made between the memory after the awakening and that of the hypnotic sleep. The hypnotic subject when awakened does not as a rule remember anything that has occurred during the time he was entranced; but, on being again hypnotised, such an expansion of memory occurs, as to include all the facts of his sleep, his life when awake, and his former sleeps. Similarly a man on awakening from natural sleep may know that he has dreamed, but not be able to recall a single incident of the dream. M. Richet says, in connection with somnambulistic memory:—"I put V. to sleep: I recite some verses to her: then I awaken her. She has no recollection. I put her to sleep again, and she remembers them perfectly." The same author attests the fact that somnambules recall with a luxury of detail scenes in which they have taken part and places they have visited long ago. M., one of his somnambules, sings the air of the second act of the opera L' Africaine when she is asleep, but cannot remember a note of it when awake.

"The exaltation of memory during somnambulism," say the authors, "though it does not give absolute proof to the theory that nothing is lost in the memory, shows at any rate that the memory of preservation is much greater than is generally imagined in comparison with the memory of reproduction, or recollection. It is evident that in a great number of cases, where we believe the memory is completely blotted out, it is nothing of the kind. The trace is always there, but what is lacking is the power to evoke it; and it is highly probable that if we were subjected to hypnotism, or the action of suitable excitants, memories to all appearance dead might be revived." Several instances are also cited of long forgotten facts, names and persons being recalled in dream. The comparison between natural and artificial sleep is extended to the phenomena of awakening. In the case of dreams recollection more or less vividly persists for a few seconds, then becomes effaced. In the case of hypnosis this forgetfulness is even more marked. The subject, who by suggestion has been made to perform the most complicated acts, to witness the most dramatic scenes, who has passed through the whole gamut of emotion—love and hate, joy and sorrow, generosity and avarice, who it may be has even fallen and sustained serious injuries—that subject on returning to his natural consciousness cannot reconstitute a single one of the scenes in which he has played his part as a witness or an actor. But this loss is not complete, for often a word or two is sufficient to bring back a whole scene. However, it must be borne in mind that this word or two, coming from the operator to his subject, partakes more or less of the nature of a suggestion.

The intellectual condition of hypnosis is difficult to define. It is impossible to gauge degrees of judgment and reason with the same
exactitude as those of the special senses. But in a general way it may be said that the intelligence of hypnotics is developed equally with their sensibility.

Lethargy, carrying on the analogy with natural sleep, represents profound and dreamless slumber. The psychic state may be said to be void, but the patient may be made to receive a few elementary suggestions: but, in the words of the authors, "it is possible that lethargy only suspends the power of re-action, and behind the inert mask a portion of the thinking faculty is still awake." In the two other phases, catalepsy and somnambulism, the sleep is much less profound, the intelligence of the subject comes into play, and the state of dream commences.

"The dominant characteristic of catalepsy is automatism... It may be said that the cataleptic has no personality of his own; that there is no cataleptic ego. Certain dreams, which we pass through without reflexion and without resistance, afford a partial analogy.

"But the case of the somnambule is very different. He is no automaton, but a personality with his own likes and dislikes.... There is undoubtedly a somnambulic ego. The state of the intellect is like that of certain dreams, in which the sleeper takes an active part, gives proof of judgment and the critical faculty, and sometimes even of spirit and the exercise of will. Besides there are somnambules who have spontaneous dreams, their rapport with the operator ceasing at such times."

An interesting case of M. Richet's shows how reason and hallucination may co-exist. Amputation of the arm was performed by suggestion: the patient uttered cries of pain on seeing the blood. But almost immediately she realised that it was a fiction, and laughed through her tears. The hallucination really existed: she saw the gaping wound and the flowing blood; but her reason was not completely paralysed, having strength enough remaining to resist the false impression imposed upon her.

Sometimes the somnambules resist orders. They may also lie. M. Pitres relates that he had suggested to a woman in somnambulism to assassinate one of her neighbours. The deed accomplished, he made her appear (still in somnambulism) before a Magistrate. She declared that she had no knowledge of the crime, and it was only after a long dialogue and overwhelming proof, that she ended by confessing that she had stabbed her neighbour: even then there was a certain reticence about her confession.

"These facts prove that the somnambule is far from being, as some authors have pretended, an unconscious automaton without judgment, reason, or intelligence of his own. On the contrary memory is perfect, intelligence wide awake, and imagination excited."

A distinction is made between two forms of somnambulism, called respectively indifferent and elective. The most common method for inducing secondary somnambulism is friction over the cranium. Suppose this is made with some inanimate object, such as a paper-knife, the former variety ensues. The patient is calm, and can be approached and touched by any one without making the least movement of defence. Any one can produce the contractures proper to the somnambulic state, which can indeed be brought about by one person and resolved by another. Thus patients are not dependent on any individual influence: any one can give them suggestions. But the case of elective somnambulism is quite different. When the operator has made pressure with his hand on the head, or has breathed on it, the subject is, as it were, drawn to him. So soon as he withdraws, the subject manifests disquietude and uneasiness and follows him about, meaning and finding no comfort except in close proximity with him. All contact by outsiders produces symptoms of pain. Elective somnambulism is produced when the subject is put to sleep by means of passes, as is done by the magnetizers, or by suggestion. Curiously enough, if the subject is told to put himself to sleep on a certain day at a specified hour, that sleep will be elective, though the operator is absent (Beaunis). Lastly, when the patient is in indifferent somnambulism, it suffices for any one to touch his bare skin with the hand to develop electivity in his own interest. There are, however, two kinds of electivity—artificial and natural; the former term is applied to that which is induced after repeated experimentation by any operator, the latter to the greater sensibility of a patient to the action of a certain one of the operators who induce sleep or suggest. There is some analogy to this in the normal state in instinctive likes and dislikes of individuals: but these are exaggerated in the somnambule. M. Richer made an ingenious experiment in electivity. "A patient was plunged into the somnambulic state by mechanical friction on the head with some object. Two of the persons present took each one of her hands. Soon the patient began to press the hand of each of the operators and was unwilling to abandon it. The conditions of special attraction existed equally at the same time for the two; thus the patient found herself as it were divided in halves; and each half offered resistance to the operator to whom the opposite half belonged, when he wanted to seize the hand which was not his." The operator who enjoys the preference of a subject can transfer it to another. The new operator glides his hand over that of the first and gradually gets hold of the hand of the patient, who after a sharp shock manifests electivity for him.

Suggestion is closely analogous to dream. It is possible both to occasion and to modify dreams, as M. Muyry's experiments show (Sommeil et Revee (sleep and dreams)). He asked some one to apply stimulants to his organs of sense as soon as he fell asleep; then to awaken him as soon as sufficient time had elapsed to allow of his dreaming. The dreams provoked by sensorial stimulation differed in no respect from those of hypnotic suggestion. Eau de Cologne caused him to dream that he was in a perfumer's shop. The idea of scent aroused ideas of the East: he dreamed that he was in Cairo in the shop of Jean Farina. On another occasion his neck was pinched: he dreamed that a blister was being applied; and that awakened the recollection of the doctor who attended him in infancy. The domain of suggestion is immense, and there is not a single fact of our mental life that cannot be artificially
reproduced and exaggerated by this means. It plays an extraordinary part in psychology, which is a great gainer by thus introducing direct experiment into its researches. The definition given of this term, which is so frequently met with in any work on hypnotism, is that it is an operation which produces some effect on a subject in passing through his intelligence. “All suggestion consists essentially in acting on a person by an idea; every effect suggested is the resultant of a phenomenon of ideation; but we must add that the idea is but an outward sign (épiphénomène); taken alone it is only indicative of some physiological process, which is alone capable of producing a material effect. The following illustration will make clear the distinction between a physical stimulus and a suggestion:—If you press the arm-tendons of a patient in lethargy, contracture ensues. That is purely physical, and the patient's mind plays no part in the experiment. But if, on the other hand, without touching the patient, you say, ‘Your arm is bending, it is becoming hard, you cannot straighten it,’ the contracture which comes on immediately is the result of a psychic action. The injunction of the experimenter only produces its effect by passing through the intelligence of the person operated on. It is the idea of contracture, which insinuated into the spirit of the hypnotic produces contracture. That is suggestion.

“We might divide the study of hypnosis into two parts according to the different methods of procedure: the first comprising the hypnotic phenomena produced by physical stimuli, or sensation...the second comprising those produced by ideas, that is to say, by suggestion. These two modes are parallel, and it would be difficult to say which is the most extended.

“Suggestion does not act with equal intensity on everybody. Tell a person who is in sound health, awake and self-possessed, that he is hungry; he answers that you are mistaken. Try to suggest to him a visual hallucination, affirming that he has a book between his hands; he declares that he cannot see it...only then the idea of the phenomenon is produced in him, not the phenomenon itself. In short, suggestion no more influences a sound person than opening his eyes throws him in catalepsy.

“For suggestion to succeed, the subject must have naturally fallen, or have been artificially thrown into a state of morbid receptivity; but it is difficult to determine accurately the conditions of suggestibility. However, we may mention two. The first is the mental inertia of the subject;...the consciousness is completely empty; an idea is suggested, and remains supreme over the slumbering consciousness. This state of monism is completely realised in cataleptics. The second is psychic hyperexcitability, the cause of the aptitude for suggestion...the question is however a difficult one to solve, and for the present it is best left open.”

The general conclusion arrived at, in support of which a number of experiments are quoted, is that:—“Suggestion consists in introducing, cultivating and enforcing in the spirit of the subject an idea...the idea is resolved into images, the images into recalled sensations: it consists in the psychic renewal of a peripheral stimulus, which the subject has already experienced. Hence we can understand its power: the idea properly speaking is only an appearance; but behind it is concealed the energy developed by an anterior physical stimulus.” It is also said: “Each suggestion includes three things: first an impression which the subject is made to feel, and which is, as the case may be, a sensation of sight, of hearing (verbal suggestion), of touch, or of the other senses. This initial impression may be called the suggestive impression: its effect is to awaken in the brain of the hypnotic a second impression, which may be called the state suggested—as, for example, an hallucinatory image. Now how can the first impression, which is directly produced by the experimenter, give rise to the second, which is internal and not directly within the reach of the experimenter? From the standpoint of psychology the answer is to be found in the Association of Ideas. Suggestion in its positive aspect is nothing else than the throwing into action of a mental association pre-existing in the spirit of the hypnotic. For example we say to a patient, ‘Look, you have a bird in your apron;’ and no sooner are these simple words pronounced, than she sees the bird, feels it with her fingers, and sometimes even hears it sing.” All these ideas of bird being associated together in the mind by habit.

Furthermore: “In place of speech we engage the attention of the patient, and when her gaze has become settled and obediently follows all our movements, we imitate with the hand the motion of an object which flies. Soon the subject cries, ‘Oh! what a pretty bird!’ How has a simple gesture produced so singular an effect? Again by the association of ideas. But this case differs from the preceding in being only an association of resemblance.”

The authors admit that the hypothesis of Association of Ideas in the mind of the subject only partially covers the facts of suggestion, even when stretched to include resemblances. There are still obscure points to be cleared up. Thus: “When we charge the brain of an entranced patient with some strange idea, such as, ‘on awakening you will rob Mr. So-and-so of his handkerchief,’ and on awakening the patient accomplishes the theft commanded, can we believe that in such a sequence there is nothing more than an image associated with an act? In point of fact the patient has appropriated and assimilated the idea of the experimenter. She does not passively execute a strange order; but the order has passed in her consciousness from passive to active. We can go so far as to say that the patient has the will to steal. This state is complex and obscure: hitherto no one has explained it...If suggestions impelling to action offer enigmas,...how much more do suggestions that inhibit?...The facts of paralysis by suggestion completely upset classical psychology. The experimenter who produces them so easily knows neither what he produces nor how he does it. Take the example of a systematic anæsthesia (paralysis of sensation). We say to the subject, ‘On awakening you will not see Mr. X. who is there before us: he will have completely disappeared.’ No sooner said than done: the patient on awakening sees every one around her except Mr. X.: when she speaks she does not answer his questions: if he places his hand on her shoulder she does not
feels the contact: if he gets in her way she walks straight on and is terrified at being stopped by an invisible obstacle. Here the laws of association which do such good service in solving psychological problems abandon us completely. Apparently they do not account for all the facts of consciousness.

Motor paralyses can similarly be produced by a word. "Possibly this class of paralytic effects comes under a general law which the most advanced psychologists have not yet completely succeeded in formulating, and which would find its analogy in Inhibition.* On this hypothesis we might admit provisionally that in order to paralyse a subject the experimenter arouses in him a mental impression, which exercises on one of his sensory or motor functions an inhibition conveyed by suggestion. At the same time we must bear in mind that inhibition is a term which explains nothing; so we must not let it keep us from seeking a more reliable explanation."

For the sake of convenience the following facts of suggestion are classed categorically:

1. Hallucinatory images: under which are classed all the facts of the Intelligence—sensation, association of images, memory, reason and imagination.

2. Suggested acts: including sentiment, emotion, passion, voluntary activity, and the phenomena, as yet but little known, which form the psychology of movement.

3. Paralyses by suggestion: the phenomena of psychic inhibition, of which the study has hardly commenced.

"It is a striking fact," say the authors, "that most of the patients who have served as subjects for hallucination possess in a high degree, when fully awake, the gift of representing objects to themselves under a sensible form. M. Liebault has made this a sign of hypnotizable individuals. Apparently the persons who possess the gift of visualisation, to use the expression of Galton, lend themselves better than others to visual hallucination. When we ask one of our subjects to figure to himself an absent person, he soon declares that he sees this person as clearly as if he were before his eyes. This vivacity of representation is often encountered in hysterics. It explains how hysterics, when they come together, on exchanging confidences or communicating their impressions, may mutually hallucinate each other......When hypnotizable hysterics have served as subjects to the same operator for several days, they often fall into a state of permanent obsession, they are possessed, so to speak, both during the day whilst they are awake, and during the night in their dreams. They are the subjects of spontaneous hallucinations of various kinds, the form of the experimenter always playing the leading part."

* This term is used by physiologists to indicate a power inherent in certain nerve-centres of restraining the action of certain organs—e. g., the heart:—if inhibitory centres, or their afferent or efferent nerves, are powerfully stimulated, they inhibit action altogether. The pneumogastric is an example of an inhibitory nerve in its connexion with the heart. On the one hand a mechanical stimulus of an exposed nerve, and on the other a sudden fright or other mental emotion may cause inhibition.
only act if they are focussed upon the point of hallucination; and in the case of a short-sighted patient they had to be altered to allow for this natural defect of vision. If a prism is placed in front of one eye the imaginary portrait is seen duplicated, as would be the case with a real object, the patients being absolutely ignorant of the properties of a prism, and also of the fact that the glass is a prism. Several hypotheses are given to account for these and a large number of similar facts, the one favoured by the authors being that of the point of rediscovery, in favor of which they adduce some weighty arguments, one of the most convincing being, that a photograph of the plain white card may be substituted for the card used when the portrait was suggested, and on being, shown to the patient, even two years after the original experiment (as was done in one case), has the effect of awaking the hallucinatory image.

Further on we learn some curious phenomena of polarity: "A positive image gives a representation of an object as it is, with its colour and the relative light and shade of the different parts preserved. In the negative image all is reversed: the shadows become lights and the lights shadows; moreover the original colour is replaced by the complementary colour. The production of consecutive images is a normal phenomenon, which constantly, but in varying degrees, accompanies external vision. Hallucinatory vision is subject to the same conditions. Every hallucination which lasts a certain time, leaves in its place when it disappears a consecutive image, just as in the case of ordinary retinal sensation. This was first demonstrated by M. Richer." A curious fact to note is that complementary sensations, analogous to those of visual polarity, occur in the phenomena of taste, motion and emotion. As is well known in the case of any unilateral hallucination, any ophthalmogene—a common magnet is the one generally used at the Salpêtrière—has the effect of causing a transfer of the hallucination from one side of the body to the other; the patient experiencing a slight shock at the moment when the transfer takes place. But "when the hallucination is bilateral, the result is different. It is then not transfer, but what we (M.M. Binet and Férol) have called polarisation. The following experiments will make this clear. "We give a patient in somnambulism the common hallucination of a bird poised on her finger. Whilst she is caressing the imaginary bird, she is awoken, and a magnet is brought near her head. After a few minutes she stops short, raises her eyes and looks about in astonishment. The bird which was on her finger has disappeared. She looks all over the ward, and at last finds it, for we hear her say, 'So you thought you would leave me, little bird.' After a few moments the bird disappears anew; but almost immediately reappears. The patient complains from time to time of pain in the head at a point corresponding to what has been described in this book, as the visual centre (some distance above and slightly posterior to the ear)." The magnet exercises the same effect in suspending real perception. For example, one of our patients being reawakened was shown a Chinese gong and striker. At the sight of the instrument the

patient took fright. A blow was struck on the gong, and she instantaneously fell into catalepsy. After this preparatory experiment she was reawakened and asked to look attentively at the gong; meanwhile a small magnet was brought near her head (without her knowledge). After a minute she declared that she no longer saw the instrument. It had completely disappeared from her sight. Then the gong was struck with redoubled force, but in spite of the loudness of the sound the patient was not thrown into catalepsy. She only looked from side to side with an air of slight astonishment. This experiment can also be performed with a subjective gong suggested in the usual way. In the case of a coloured figure the magnet causes the patient to see the complementary colour. Thus a red cross becomes green, whether it be real or suggested, yellow becomes violet, &c.

We have barely touched upon some of the principal subjects treated in the book before us in their connexion with hypnotism and psychology. There is a much greater number that we have been unable even to mention. These fragments are merely intended to convey some idea of the character of the scientific methods employed in the investigation of such subjects. Through hypnotism whole mines of hitherto undiscovered wealth may eventually be unearthed. The pioneers have brought the science to a point at which the attention of the philosopher, the scientist, and the educated public cannot but be directed to it.

MM. Binet and Férol's book is certainly the classic of the subject it deals with; and whilst the general tenor is sufficiently scientific to keep the reader's attention on the alert and convince him that he is not reading fairy tales, there is a sufficient spice of anecdote—in some cases of the ludicrous—in the experiments detailed to season the science. "Le Magnétisme Animal" is one of the publications of the International Scientific Series, which was started some time ago for the purpose of popularising science and bringing within the cognizance of the world outside the schools and coteries of savants the new directions and the more important new ideas and discoveries of science. Every book in this series is published in French, German, Italian and English, and is thus brought within the reach of most educated people. The English translation of the work we have been discussing is advertised to appear shortly.

N. C.
KAIVALYANAVANITA
OF SRI THANDAVARAYA SWAMIGAL

Introduction.

A DORED be the feet of the only Lord, who, solely as Jiva-Sakshi, dwelleth, like the ákśis, in the hearts (both) of those that are possessed of lust after gold, dominion, and women, and of those that are not,—and who (as Iswara-Sakshi) occupieth that good region, more exalted than the seven regions that are superior to any (other) region whatever.

I bow down to the spotless Bódha Swarípa, which standeth forth as Brahma, Vishnu, and the excellent Iswara,—who are (respectively) the causes of the operations of creation, conservation and transformation; and (also) as countless (other) maháthíś, and which for ever appeareth as the perfect Emancipated One, and as the Sun of the sea of bliss.

I daily worship the lotus-feet of Him through whose grace I—having realized that I am the all-pervading Brahma, and that the whole differentiated universe is an illusion—became myself, like the ákśis in the (solid) wall, of the nature of Swarípa.

I adore Iswara, who appeareth as my master, in order to show,—by making through my (own) intelligence my manaś, buddhi, senses and all (my) bodies like the mist before the sun, that my 'Thou' and thine 'I' are one, and thus to establish (perfect) unity.

1. The literal meaning of this word is “The Fresh Butter of Eternal Bliss.” It is a compound of the two Sanscrit words, káralaya, meaning perfect isolation and hence eternal bliss; and manamuti, fresh butter. See the explanation given by the author in paragraph 6.

2. i.e., non-dual.

3. Witness of Jiva. The use of the word solely implies that He is unaffected by the actions, &c., of Jiva; He is merely a looker-on.

4. i.e., just as the ákśis interpenetrate both pure and impure objects without distinction.

5. The Turiññade state.

6. These are the seven gnanabhánhí, or regions of wisdom, explained in Part 2 of this work. (Vide stanzas 149 to 151.)

7. The Commentator states that this may refer to the seven regions of ignorance enumerated in stanzas 147 and 148 of Part II, or to the dëvahánika states (swarga lókon), or to the several exotic religious systems.

8. The form of the Infinite Intelligence; or Pragnánam.

9. Rudra.

10. Forms or shapes; gods.

11. The simile implies that matter offers no resistance to Átman or spirit.

12. Brahm¯ám; the absolute self.

13. The organ of perception; mind.

14. The organ of reflection.

15. There are three bodies, namely, the gross, the subtle or astral, and the causal bodies; hence the plural.

16. ‘Thou’ who art of my nature and ‘I’ who am of thy nature. It is by the three upádhi that the distinctions of ‘I,’ ‘Thou,’ exist, while in reference to the absolute Átman there is no distinction at all. Compare “just as there is no jewel other than gold, so, by Me, there is nothing here other than myself. As distinct shapes are given to gold and then named differently, so we speak distributively of ourselves.”—Svarupapuṇana Desikar.

1. This qualifying word excludes those who pretend, by outward garb, &c., to be sages, and thus dupe men, but who really wallow in the mire of sensuality.

2. In contradistinction to teachers of rituals, &c., who cannot dispel the misery of conditional existence. In a work called Sidánaksáram, the Master says to his pupil, “Do not, O disciple! take for truth that the buffoons, who, like hired men (getting wages for work done) and like tradesmen (selling one thing for another) assume the title of Gurus (of which they are unworthy, as they perform works and initiate people in order to extort wealth from them). There are no words to praise, nor is the mind capable of reaching, the true Guru who, fixing his benign gaze on the pupil, makes him remain (unchanged and independent) like Time.”

3. i.e., enjoying sensual pleasures, which are fleeting in their nature.

4. The Tirupattí Hills, sacred to Vishnu, who is also called Nárayana, which name the author’s Guru bore in his earth-life.

5. Accomplishments. The neophyte must possess these in a fair degree before entering the occult path. Without them no one can attain to adeptship.

6. The pupil must have an intellectual comprehension of the fact that everything which seems to have a separate existence from Brahman is merely phenomenal change; in other words, he must have a right knowledge of the real and unreal. The study of occult literature endows him with this accomplishment.

7. This does not mean that the neophyte should be thoroughly passive. The injunction is against acting merely under the impulse of desire. One must do one’s duty, but not as a means to the attainment of a personal end. This Sádhaná the chela will naturally gain when he thoroughly realizes the first one; for when the illusive character of the external world is understood, he ceases to crave for worldly objects, and acts with a perfect indifference to the enjoyment of the fruit of his actions, either here or hereafter. “My right is only to the act; it ends with the performance of the act, and never extends to the result,” says Krishna in the Bhagavad Gita.
attainment of the six (qualifications) beginning with Sama; 1 (4) Aspiration for emancipation (from conditional existence),

2. The six (qualifications) are: Sama, Dama, Upārati, Titiksha, Samādhāna and Suddhā. Sama is chastising (or obtaining complete mastery over) the internal organs; 3 Dama is chastising (or obtaining complete mastery over) the external organs; 4 Upārati is the renunciation of the cares and occupations (vānaśār) of one’s home; 5 Titiksha is the endurance of the assailing (sensations of) pleasure, pain, and so on. 6

3. The sages call this Samādhanā, namely, the making it a pastime to bring the mind to reflect on the substance of what is heard (from the Master); Suddhā is lovingly clinging to the true spiritual Guru and Shastra. 7 These are the meanings of the terms of the most excellent six kinds (of qualifications) beginning with Sama.

4. There are none on earth who can accomplish anything without a Śādānā. Hence knowledge will accrue (only) to such as have obtained these four (Śādānās). It will not enter the mind of one who is (but) a novice in discrimination; if (it) enters, he is a person that has become purified through a crore of past incarnations.

5. He is the eligible one (who possesses these four-fold Śādānās) (Such a person,)—assailed by the three fires caused by the organs (both internal and external), by Dōra, 8 in the cosmos, and by the five elements and elemental formations, 9 and languishing like the worm unable to bear the Sun’s heat,—ardently wished to dive into the waters of Wisdom.

6. He who—like the hart which, having been caught in the hunter’s nets, runs away as soon as it disentangles itself—had fled from the three Śānas of wife, children and wealth, that come (by Karma), now proceeding—not with an empty hand— and coming in sight of the true Preceptor of spiritual wisdom, paid rightful reverence to (him).

7. Having paid reverence to (the Guru), he stood up, and weeping thus complained: “I have pined away, O Lord! through the afflictions of (this) illusive life; O readily-complying Master! you must protect me by cutting to pieces the (five) desire-fostering kosas, 10 that are at variance with (spiritual life), so that my mind may indeed be refreshed.” (Thus) did he speak.

8. As the mother tortoise, fish and bird (act) towards their young ones, so the Master, willing in his mind, fixing (his) gaze on, and touching (the pupil), 11 placed (him) before (his) holy presence and said, “There is a means of preventing thy rebirth. I will tell (thee). If thou dost follow what (I) say, the succession of births will cease.”

9. When (the chela) had heard the words, “The succession of births will cease,” not only was his heart strengthened, but even his body was refreshed, as if he had bathed in a spacious tank; 12

1. These are enumerated in the following stanza.

2. i.e. the mind, which is at the bottom of all evil.

3. i.e. the organs of action. Even though the mind is curved, the organs of action will involuntarily perform such actions as they have been accustomed to do. Hence this qualification is also mentioned. One would suppose that these organs must be subdued before proceeding to chastise the mind; but as the mental plane is superior to the physical plane, and as mental actions are of greater durability than the physical, Sama—that is the purification of the mind—is placed first.

4. Keeping the mind unruffled under the severest domestic afflictions; that is, mental equilibrium must be preserved, and the aspirant must have the power of contemplating objects without being in the least disturbed in the performance of the great task he has set himself. This is also interpreted to comprehend the renunciation of all merely formal religion.

5. The cessation of desire, and a constant readiness to part with everything in the world; typically illustrated by the absence of resentment of wrong. This is perhaps the occult signification of the precept of Christ, “I say unto you that ye resist not evil; whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also”: It has been well said: “People are induced to be friendly or inimical to a man according to his Karma; therefore he should not consider those as his friends and these his foes.”

6. In other words the chela must have faith or confidence in the Master and Shastras. A word of explanation is necessary here, as this is apt to be misunderstood. Genuine belief being essentially an experimental science, no blind faith is necessary. It is not therefore absolute surrender of one’s reason that is advocated here. What is meant is that the pupil should recognize that his efforts in the direction of occult studies and investigations will not be fruitless, as the truths propounded by the great science have been experimentally investigated by the Master, and that he must be ready to give up his prejudices and preconceptions when found to be incompatible with reason. As we proceed we shall find that the Master orders the chela over and over again to verify his teachings in Samādhi and report to him.

7. Persevering practice, or training.
and, with tears of joy, as if his abounding happiness (itself) were flowing out from him, he fell once more at the (Master's) feet (resembling) the open (lotus) flower, and then stood up and spoke in the following strain:—

10. "Even though I the devotee am unable to act up to what (you) say, you, O Lord, can certainly reclaim me by your grace. You have said ‘There is a means to prevent thy rebirth'; I beseech you, show me what it is and thereby rescue (me)."

11. Then (the Master) knew that (the aspirant) was a man of such a mind and as the hornet buzzes before the maggot within the compact earth-nest (to transform it to its own likeness), the Master, beginning (to explain the means) commenced to chant (his) instruction, crying the Jīva within the body of the chela, so that he might attain to Ātmā-Swārūpa.

12. "Come now, my Son! He who has forgotten himself, (alternately) dying and re-incarnating, will wander about whirling round and round in the never-ending gyration of the wheel of time, like dry leaves caught by a never-ceasing whirlwind, until he knows that his Self—capable of being investigated by intelligence—is the absolute Self."

13. "If (he) perceives his Self and the Lord that is his Self's substratum, then that Lord becomes his Self and becomes Brahman, and (he) gets rid of conditioned existence. If thou knowest thyself, ruin will not befall thee. I have said this because thou hast asked me."

14. "Have you spoken (thus), O Sir! deeming me an idiot? Is there any man on earth who does not know himself? Why then do all men die and re-incarnating, will wander about dreaming? Youcaille safe to tell the truth to me who have confided in you."

15. (The Master) replied: "Whosoever comprehends that such a thing is body and such a one is the Dweller of the body is the person that has understood himself as himself."

16. After the Master had thus spoken, (the pupil) asked, "Who is the Dweller of the body apart from this gross body?" Now when the Master heard this he was grieved and smiled (at the same time).

16. "Thou hast said, 'Who is the Dweller of the body other than the body? I do not see (him).' Pray, tell (me), who he is

1. Activities of the internal organs: viz.—manas, buddhi, chitam and ahankaravim.

2. The hornet buzzes to remind the maggot of its presence. The latter has the form of the hornet always present before its mind, and this intent meditation eventfully transforms it into the likeness of its master, the hornet.

3. The form of ātma or self.

4. The round of births comes to an end when one knows oneself.

5. The passage may also be rendered, "he becomes that Lord and becomes Brahman, and thus gets rid of births."

6. Commentator understands "his Self" before the words "becomes Brahman."

7. For instance I know that I am the son or daughter of so and so, father or mother of so and so, &c.

8. That is, know the true nature of the physical body and the Ātma or spirit.

9. That is, as the absolute self.

10. Because of his ignorance.

11. Because he was eligible, owing to his having renounced all worldly pleasures, &c.

10. Dreamless, undisturbed sleep.

11. The waking state.

12. During dreamy slumber.

14. "Have you spoken (thus), O Sir! deeming me an idiot? Is there any man on earth who does not know himself? Why then do all men die and re-incarnating, will wander about dreaming? Youcaille safe to tell the truth to me who have confided in you."

16. "Thou hast said, 'Who is the Dweller of the body other than the body? I do not see (him).' Pray, tell (me), who he is

1. Activities of the internal organs: viz. — manas, buddhi, chitam and ahankaravim.

2. The hornet buzzes to remind the maggot of its presence. The latter has the form of the hornet always present before its mind, and this intent meditation eventfully transforms it into the likeness of its master, the hornet. The form of ātma or self. The round of births comes to an end when one knows oneself. The passage may also be rendered, "he becomes that Lord and becomes Brahman, and thus gets rid of births."

6. Commentator understands "his Self" before the words "becomes Brahman."

7. For instance I know that I am the son or daughter of so and so, father or mother of so and so, &c.

8. That is, know the true nature of the physical body and the Ātma or spirit.

9. That is, as the absolute self.

10. Because of his ignorance.

11. Because he was eligible, owing to his having renounced all worldly pleasures, &c.
22. "If asked how it is, (I answer) : All Jivas, having no beginning,\(^1\) will rest in Atman as in universal Sushupti.\(^2\) It is called Kalatattwa. By Iswara's introvision, the old original nature passing away, three gunas manifest themselves.

23. "They are named: the first, pure Satva, of a dazzling white; the second Rajas, of red, and the third, impure Tamas, of black. Though these triple gunas, described as purity (Satva), ignorance (Rajas) and gloom (Tamas) exist as three equal forces, yet one guna among them will (usually) preponderate. Though these triple gunas, described as purity (Satva), ignorance (Rajas) and gloom (Tamas) exist as three equal forces, yet one guna among them will (usually) preponderate.

24. "This is one method (of explaining evolution). They explain (evolution) in another way (also); namely, that the above-said Ayyaktam itself becomes Mahatattwa, the said Mahatattwa becomes Ahankaram; and the seed\(^4\) Ahankaram becomes the already explained triple gunas.

25. "In these gunas, the chaya\(^5\) of chit which is like the akas\(^6\) will appear. The first guna, which is the purest of the triple gunas is Maya. The chaya of Brahman (in) this guna is (called) Antaryami.\(^7\) He who is not touched by any of the gunas of Maya is Iswara, the causative eficencia.\(^8\)

26. "To Iswara, this is Sushupti, this indeed is Karana Sarira\(^9\) and ananda kosa. (Now I proceed to the second guna). The Rajaguna is avidya; the chayas of chit in all the lustreless avidyas are the myriads of Jivas. The name then of Jiva capable of transformation is Prapa.

27. "To Jivas clinging to ignorance (avidya) this only is ananda kosa, Sushupti (state) and Karana Sarira. In what has thus far been said, we have dealt with Mula arupa\(^10\), owing its origin to the two illusive entire gunas. Now hear (me) explain the way of the praiseworthy Sukshma arupa.\(^11\)

T. M. Sundaram Pillai.

(To be continued.)

---

1. For the Logos has no beginning.
2. The Unmanifested: known also as Mula-prakriti.
3. Cosmic sleep or inactivity. As it is the cause of all manifestations.
4. Bimbam, or the reflected image.
5. Shapeless as the akas is.
6. Called also Iswara, Ayyakrita and "The Creator."
8. The causal body.
9. The illusion of the subtle body; how the subtle body originated.

---

1887.

MIND AND BODY.

Modern Science and Esoteric Psychology.

Mind and matter must each have its philosophy to itself."—Jean Taylor.

The morality which flows from scientific materialism may be comprehended within the few words 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' All noble thoughts are but vain dreams, the effusions of automatons with two arms, running about on two legs, which being finally decomposed into chemical atoms combine themselves anew, resembling the dance of lunatics in a mad-house."—Prof. Rudolph Wagner.

"The [basic] truths of religion are rarely attacked by superficial thinkers."—Henry Thomas Buckle.

INDEPENDINGLY of the question as to the scientific validity of the arguments adduced to disprove the doctrine of a future life, we are confronted with the consideration of the effect any general revulsion of feeling on this topic must exercise on the sanctions to morality. Even if we regard materialistic theories in their relation to the possible aggregate of human happiness alone, their utter incompetency to satisfy the aspirations of mankind in general is only too apparent. For the gradual extinction of the belief in a future existence is a blow for which none of the altruistic systems can compensate. Altruism is only conceivably admirable when it results in the individual happiness of the units of which the social organism is made up. The unreality of the positivist is a mere abstraction; consequently the question confronts us, whether any exalted standard of happiness and content is attainable without a widespread conviction of the reality of a future existence—of a metaphysical as well as of a physical evolution. As to the influence on public morality of any system—Positivism, Secularism, etc.—coupled with materialist propaganda, it is difficult to conceive of a difference of opinion among practical men with minds unwarped by theory. The results must be pernicious.* The new dispensation of the Positivistic School possesses no sanction for morality except that of an empty abstraction—a mere word—hopelessly incapable of reaching the masses. Positivism, apart from other objections, is at this stage of human evolution Utopian—a flimsy fabric of utilitarian morality reared on foundations of sand. Far better to leave the masses under the sway of the old, if fantastic, creeds than to initiate the 'game of grab' by enunciating a doctrine of despair. The evil genius of human passion ought to be kept in his bottle; otherwise, as in the story of the Fisherman in the Arabian Nights, he will stream forth in clouds of smoke—the smoke of the petroleuse and anarchist. It is one thing for a philosopher to thunder forth a negative credo from his professorial chair; it is another when the struggling proletariat learns that a miserable existence on this earth is its all, and that death is an eternal sleep. It is one thing for the iconoclast to attach a preface to the tenth edition of some successful work;

* M. de Voltaire (Article "Atheism," Philosophical Dictionary) himself remarks this danger. On the principles of Determinism, it is self-evident. A celebrated modern sceptic—M. Renan—also informs us in his "Souvenirs" that the morality which remained to him on the adoption of negative principles, was as automatic as the action of a fowl, which, when deprived of its brain, "still continues under suitable stimulus to scratch its nose."
another for the man of business, the plodding toiler, the rank and file of society in short, to cultivate an unselfish* and lofty ideal under the saturnine influence of the nightmare of pessimistic scepticism. The plea that, whatever be the result, science only seeks to unveil the truth, is valueless. Half the negationists who flaunt their pitiful creed in the face of the European public are far more anxious to obtain a public reputation than to chaperone truth. Besides, the number of "truths" which according to such logic demand revelation would probably result in the destruction of the social fabric. It is equally a "truth" that melinite is a most deadly explosive! Why then disclose the secret of its manufacture, proper handling, etc., and confide it to the tender care of the socialists? Why "compass the execrable end" of confining a certain class of "truths" to a small circle? "It may mitigate against the general good," we are told, "by placing a weapon in the hands of those who are not worthy of trust." But, if one "truth" is to be withheld owing to its vicious tendency, the same argument applies to the policy of Materialist Propaganda, if these latter react injuriously on the public good. Legions of "truths" are necessarily withheld from children. And even according to the admission of a professed materialist:—"As yet human society is only a lunatic in a straight waistcoat, which, in acute maniacal paroxysms, it periodically succeeds in rending, with dire results familiar to every student or spectator of the blackened and blood-stained pages of history."† And yet it is this society which is to pursue an utterly unselfish ideal in the certainty of an ultimate annihilation for all its units! But the most conclusive argument is the following.

To that uncrowned king of philosophers Immanuel Kant the existence of the soul, though not demonstrable by the speculative, was a postulate of the practical reason. He could go so far as to predict the phenomenal proof of its existence* and of that of a world of spiritual beings immediately impinging on our present plane of consciousness. The tendency of modern speculation is to regard both these assertions as illusory. Our most eminent European psychologists merely echo the pronouncements of almost every department of science as to the impossibility of the survival of individual consciousness after the disintegration of the physical organism. Even the universe itself is branded as a gigantic failure. "It is miserable throughout," says Von Hartmann, the pessimist, following in the steps of Schopenhauer, "...an unfathomable folly, if its unique aim, self-consciousness, had existed without it." But we are entitled to ask these philosophers whether they have acquainted themselves intimately enough with Nature's secret meaning in her deeds, to justify them in arraigning her at the bar of public opinion on the charge of being mistaken or incapable. Their slander on the wisdom of the unconscious is its own refutation. I, for one, find it impossible to conceive of so radical an unsoundness in the nature of things—though at the same time it seems clear that the charges of the pessimists, including the momentous question of the origin of evil, can be answered by no system except that generally known as Theosophy. And the very necessity (to most) of thought, which compels man to realize that Absolute Wisdom must have set in motion the panorama of cosmic evolution, is itself a confirmation of the esoteric doctrine which alone affords a complete solution of the problems presented to the

---

* Excellent advice to men struggling under temptation indeed! "You are mere automata, improve yourselves." The first conception excludes the latter. There is, according to materialism, no modifying ego possible; to admit such a fact would be to admit a soul. But contradictions never cease. Human automatism is scarcely the doctrine for our school-rooms, banks, penitentiaries, etc.

† How well Buckle depicts the attitude of a true science toward an exterico creed, when he says:—"As long as the institution [State Church] performs its functions, we are content to let it stand. . . . We would not, we dare not, tamper with the great religious trust, other independent of it—truths which are inherent in the man, raise him above the instinct of the hour, and infuse into him more lofty aspirations—true, revealing to him his own immortality, are the measure and the aspirations of a future life." (History of Civilization, Vol. III, p. 255.) Noble words these, proceeding from the mouth of a professed sceptic.

‡ National Reformer, Jan. 9, 1887.

§ We are to regard the body as a physical machine which goes by itself according to a physical law—that is to say, is automatic. An automaton is a thing which goes by itself when it is wound up, and we go by ourselves when we have had food. . . . . . . . .

It (the body) is not merely a machine, because consciousness goes with it.† Lectures and Essays, Vol. II. Article "Body and Mind," by Professor W. R. Cliford.

---

1887.] MIND AND BODY. 421 where the moral excellence of the individual determines his degree of progression? Why, if they are truly zealous—and far be it from me to contest the point in a large percentage of cases—in the cause of human advancement, do they not reserve their negative conclusions for the sanctity of the study, instead of throwing cold water on the efforts of those who strive to battle courageously against the temptations of daily life? Materialism is purely iconoclastic. All modern Western speculation is vitiated by the same absolute incapacity to reconstruct. Give it an axe, and it will hew down system after system of philosophy, but when it tries to rear a fabric of its own on the ruins of the past a grim fascio is the result.

To that uncrowned king of philosophers Immanuel Kant the existence of the soul, though not demonstrable by the speculative, was a postulate of the practical reason. He could go so far as to predict the phenomenal proof of its existence* and of that of a world of spiritual beings immediately impinging on our present plane of consciousness. The tendency of modern speculation is to regard both these assertions as illusory. Our most eminent European psychologists merely echo the pronouncements of almost every department of science as to the impossibility of the survival of individual consciousness after the disintegration of the physical organism. Even the universe itself is branded as a gigantic failure. "It is miserable throughout," says Von Hartmann, the pessimist, following in the steps of Schopenhauer, "...an unfathomable folly, if its unique aim, self-consciousness, had existed without it." But we are entitled to ask these philosophers whether they have acquainted themselves intimately enough with Nature's secret meaning in her deeds, to justify them in arraigning her at the bar of public opinion on the charge of being mistaken or incapable. Their slander on the wisdom of the unconscious is its own refutation. I, for one, find it impossible to conceive of so radical an unsoundness in the nature of things—though at the same time it seems clear that the charges of the pessimists, including the momentous question of the origin of evil, can be answered by no system except that generally known as Theosophy. And the very necessity (to most) of thought, which compels man to realize that Absolute Wisdom must have set in motion the panorama of cosmic evolution, is itself a confirmation of the esoteric doctrine which alone affords a complete solution of the problems presented to the

---

* This, however, can only apply to the astral body—the casket of the real Psycho.

† How true it is, that, apart from its sphere of physical discovery, modern science is selfish. It has gratuitously deprives thousands of their spiritual Intuitions, and brought a message of despair to many a struggling heart. In my humble opinion the curse of Materialism has poisoned all her services. Well may every soul re-echo the words of a Master:—"Now, for us . . . no fact of these sciences is interesting except in the degree of its potentiality of moral results, and in the ratio of its usefulness to mankind. And what, in its profoundabinion can be more utterly indifferent to everyone and everything, or more bound to nothing but the selfish requisites for its own advancement than this materialistic science of fact? What have the laws of Faraday, Tyndall or others to do with philosophy in their abstract relations with human nature, viewed as an intelligent whole? What care they for man as an isolated atom of this great and harmonious whole?" Occult World, page 89.
consideration of the philosophical optimist. On the other hand any system which excludes the conception of immortality from its domain, and ruthlessly points to the worm's maw as the final consummation of man and his glorious faculties, the goal of his sorrow-strewn pilgrimage, creates of the 'unconscious' a fiendish phantom, a monster more accursed and detestable than the vilest magician of the interplanetary spheres. But to return to the subject under discussion. Without doubt the theory of evolution, as formulated by Darwin, Haeckel and Spencer, has hitherto enormously strengthened the hands of the Materialists. Theology, unable satisfactorily to reconcile evolution with immortality, has strenuously avoided discussion on the subject, wherever practicable, taking refuge in the miracles of the Founder of Christianity. In a similar manner the ostrich, when pursued by the horseman in the desert, buries its head in the sand, apparently in the hope that by shutting its eyes to external facts it can destroy their objective validity—a species of very advanced idealism! In this way it has come to pass during recent years that in many quarters, especially on the Continent, the assault on orthodoxy has resolved itself into an organized attempt to disprove the possibility of a conscious existence for man after death. It is at this point that a strong divergence of view must necessarily ensue among liberal thinkers. The problem in one aspect is, to show at what link in the hierarchy of ascending organisms the 'immortal principle' reappears and mind acquires the potentiality of existing as an entity apart from brain. Between the monere and the man we find a vast chasm bridged by innumerable organic types, in each of which sensation and mentality correspond with the development of a specific nervous basis. It appears then, at first sight, an impeachment of the orderly development of higher types from lower to pitchfork a spiritual entity into an organism, when a simpler explanation of mental phenomena is possible. What Deus ex machina invests man with a soul in contra-distinction to the representatives of the animal world—say the Materialists—'when his intellectual superiority is, as we see, attributable to the relative perfection of his cerebral convolutions?' Now all this, as far as it concerns the parallelism of nervous complication and mental growth, is a philosophical statement as put forward by materialists, and as such requires an equally candid answer. It is to be deplored that no complete answer has hitherto been attempted to works such as Dr. Louis Büchner's "Force and Matter," Lewes' "Problems of Life and Mind," and similar pronunciamentos from the side of science. The majority of the arguments of materialists' writers are ignored by Christian apologists, and absolutely unheeded in general by spiritualists, who, having once satisfied themselves of the survival of the astral remnant, leave the scientists to go their own way and find converts where they may. And it is equally true that perhaps on no other question than that of psychology in general is so much nonsense talked and so many absurd opinions bolstered up on the alleged intuitions of the individual theorist. The present paper, while trespassing into the realms of the super-sensuous and violating in appearance the

maxim of Kant, "that to attempt to transcend the limits of the subjective is vain and hopeless," is however less amenable to criticism than the generality of similar attempts, owing to the fact that it is professedly based on the teachings of esoteric science, and constitutes an attempt on the one hand to reconcile the shallow psychology of the West with the indications thrown out by the Masters as to the grand process of the evolution of mind. A few prefatory remarks, however, are necessary to submit to sceptics the purely tentative character of the essay.

The theory which I am about to advance in its outlines as a possible solution of this vexed question may or may not in its present form be competent to explain the array of miscellaneous phenomena grouped under the head of comparative psychology. The writer can only express his regret that the popular materialistic and monistic hypotheses as to the nature of the relations between mind and body are equally open to objection. A true psychology must embrace and absorb into its substance every phenomenon of conscious experience. The validity of objective phenomena cannot, as some appear to think, be impeached on account of the inability of some special theory—however plausible on other grounds—to find accommodation for its unwelcome visitors. The undulatory theory of light would have to be abandoned in toto, as Tyndall tells us, were only one fact adduced which it could not explain. No negative theory of psychology can, owing to the very nature of things, fulfil this condition—its elasticity will necessarily prove unequal to the strain. As was well recognized by Dr. H. C. Count Gonemys in a recent number of the Theosophist, "I am aware that sound scientific research must always start from the known to the unknown, but I would add moreover that we must not vitiate our experimentally acquired knowledge to make it tally with pre-conceived ideas. In my humble opinion appearances of the phantom of the dead,...the living materializations of spectres...apports of material objects, collective appearances and the unanimous testimony of seers, ought to form for every experimenter the true foundation for psychic theories." On the question of
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* I may here cite a passage of my own which appeared in the "National Reformer," Jan. 23, 1887, "I pointed out in what manner it was possible to transcend the phenomena of our present perception. The noumenon [here = super-sensuous] is without doubt wholly inaccessible to any person tied down to the ordinary five senses. But to the fuller consciousness of the 'Transcendental self' another universe opens—a far wider 'assembling of the noumenon' is possible...The case of Eastern adepts, and their attainment of absolute knowledge of the mysteries of the Universe, is not the least important aspect of the subject." It scientists might well study the chapter on Induction in Mr. Mill's "System of Logic." They continually violate their own principles whenever unpleasent facts present themselves. Materialists who define thought as a 'brain-function' can safely go without a less of consistency believe in a post-mortem existence in another astral body, of which thought is equally a function. See for this a curious passage in Capt. W. B. McTaggart's "Popular Exposition of the Hylo-idealistic Philosophy," p. 43. The writer, a Mason, admits the possibility of an etheral body, but demands evidence. Yet this same gentleman would, in all probability, vehemently rebut the idea that spiritualism might rest on a basis of fact. And yet d'Anville was forced by the same evidence to admit an astral survival. What shall we say of the men who demand evidence in one breath, and in another decline even to examine or consider it when presented?
Both the extremes of Realism and Idealism are unthinkable—the one projecting our subjectivity into space, the other being incompatible with the facts of experience. For it is evident that if there is nothing in existence but the perceiving ego which creates 'objects'—the spectra of its own subjectivity—we are confronted with the following difficulties: (a) What then determines the order of our sensations, as they occur independently of our mental processes—will and thought? (b) Why does each 'object' and the external world in its collectivity appear the same, or nearly so, to every percipient? (c) If mind creates objectivity, we have no more proof of the existence of any other minds beside our own than of that of external objects. (d) Science has proved that some cosmic process antedated by æons the earliest dawn of terrestrial consciousness. These and similar arguments may be said to have finally upset the philosophy of absolute Idealism. There is, as Herbert Spencer enunciates in his doctrine of transfigured Realism (objective Idealism), no escape from the conviction that there is a permanence of an unknown objective reality independent of perception. The reciprocity of subject and object creates the Maya of the sense-object or 'external' world. Consciousness is thus the creator of phenomena, though not of ultimate objectivity. "Phenomenon is unthinkable without noumenon." Or, as Fiske says ("Cosmic Philosophy," Vol. I, p. 80-7): "We may admit with Hume that we know nothing directly save modifications of consciousness. Changes of consciousness are indeed the materials out of which our knowledge is entirely built. But there can be no changes in our consciousness unless there exists something which is changed, and something which causes the change. There can be no impressions unless there exists something which is impressed and a something which impresses.

—inertia—is inexplicable on that hypothesis. (2) We only know force as moving matter—it is a mere word to express a certain change. Matter and force, according to atomic science, are but phenomenal—differentiated aspects of the same transcendental unity.

* Berkley traced it to the will of God, Fichte to the self-determined action of the mind. Both are unsatisfactory.

† This argument would seem indubitably to establish the permanence of the objective stimuli which excite consciousness. It is valid, however, against subjective, not objective Idealism.

‡ As Fichte himself says: "This conclusion is rigorous if the bases of consciousness be rigorously accepted. If nothing exists except my thoughts, then no other mind can exist beyond my thought of it. The ground we have for believing in the existence of other minds is not a whit stronger than the ground for believing in the existence of other bodys."

§ That is to say the relation of the percipient to the noumenon [substance, Ding an sich] creating the illusion of the sensible universe. The phenomena can only exist by and through mind (on our plane). Says Mr. J. S. Mill, "We have no conception of either subject or object, either Mind or Matter, except as something to which we refer our sensations and whatever other feelings we are conscious of. The very existence of them both, so far as cognizable by us, consists only in the relation they respectively bear to our states of feeling. Their relation to each other is only the relation between these two relations. The immediate corollaries are not the pair "object—subject", but the two pairs "object sensation objectively considered—subject sensation subjectively considered."

...Take away from the argument all the terms which relate to real existence, and the argument becomes nonsense... Abolish subject and object, and the states of consciousness vanish also. Abolish the noumenon, and the phenomenon is by the same act annihilated.

We are thus confronted with a purely Kantian Idealism. The objective exists, but it is unknowable; — the phenomenal world is the subjective ideation of the individual.

Apply this formula to esoteric philosophy. Matter, we are told, exists in seven states — six being differentiated aspects of primal undifferentiated matter (in its Laya state.) The matter of our present plane of consciousness — first state matter — exists in the most grossly differentiated condition. But as the phenomena of any plane of existence are but subjective creations of the mind, all the six states of matter can only have a relative and phenomenal existence in the consciousness of percipient beings. If, therefore, we term the unknown objectivity underlying phenomena *cosmic substance* — as opposed to *matter*, which is a synthetic expression for *phenomenal experience* — we reach the following theorem. Cosmic substance, existing in its variously differentiated states, is the basis whence spring the objective stimuli which the equally varied grades of perceptive consciousness translate into phenomena. Thus, while the experience of each plane of existence is necessarily only the aggregate of the mental states of the individual ego — a phenomenon of purely subjective ideation — the objective has nevertheless a necessary though unknowable existence. The fusion of subject and object on the six planes of their differentiation results in the six grades of *phenomenal experience*, or the six "states of Matter." The six aspects of Cosmic Substance, the noumenon of these latter, which as phenomenal are necessarily non-existent *per se*, are absolutely beyond cognition, if cognition be only of the phenomenal.

What however is the attitude of the ordinary thinker towards the great problems of Life and Mind? He will proceed on the usual scientific data, and will utterly repudiate the reasoning of the mystic who seeks refuge from the assaults of materialism by flying into the arms of Idealism — and with perfect justice. Strongly as he may dissent from the vulgar realism which pictures to itself an independent external world — a mode of thought arising from a complete neglect of the subjective for the objective standpoint in the contemplation of Nature — the most resolute Hegelian, when face to face with the phenomena of mental evolution, occupies the same position as the advanced materialist. By no process of retreat into the mysticism of an absolute idealism can the asserter of a future existence evade this course of inquiry. Whether we regard matter as the creation of mind, or mind as the function of matter, it is solely a question of phenomena. "It is just as true that the percipient is a product of matter as that matter is a mere conception of the percipient," says Schopenhauer. Postulating "matter" as the unknown *x* of the equation,* the supposed antagonism between Materialism and Idealism — as to a common platform for the discussion of this weighty question — resolves itself into a verbal quibble. We can therefore now proceed to a discussion of the main point at issue. Physiological research has established beyond reasonable question the fact that every thought, sensation, or emotion, has its physical correlate in a molecular change in the substance of the brain — in short, that every psychosis has its corresponding neurosis. It is true that some of these physical processes are so exceedingly subtle and obscure as to elude all direct experimental verification, but the increased secretion of phosphates and nervous exhaustion consequent on prolonged abstract meditation fully warrant the inference that they are present even there. We have, therefore, to consider the relation, if any, between the two sets of phenomena, and in so doing shall only have occasion to dwell upon the three great hypotheses of modern speculation. Owing to the not unmmerited discredit into which it has now fallen, it will be unnecessary to consider the explanation of Leibnitz (known as that of the pre-established harmonies) though it is supported by Lotze and apparently by Fichte — who, by the way, terms the soul a *process*, not an entity. We shall therefore only deal with the following three views regarding Thought:

I. The Materialistic theory: — that the neuroses (physical processes) *cause* the psychoses (states of consciousness).

II. The Monistic theory: — that there is no *causal* relation between the two sets of phenomena; mental and physical changes, though apparently diverse, being merely "the subjective and objective faces of the same thing" (Spencer).

III. The Spiritualistic theory [belief in a soul]: — that the psychoses *cause* the neuroses.

(To be continued.)

E. D. Fawcett.

* As Herbert Spencer puts it in his "First Principles" the phenomena of the so-called "external world, while per se subjective, are nevertheless the SYMPTOMS of real objective processes in the world of Noumena. Hence throughout this argument they will be so considered.
ONE of the hardest things in Theosophy is to overcome desire.

We can all see the wisdom of overcoming unworthy desires, but there seem to be so many things that are desirable, that are really worth striving for, that, in fact, we must obtain, and it seems paradoxical to be told that we should desire nothing.

To be sure, desire is the root of all misery. Unhappiness is caused by the failure to obtain that which we desire; and the degree of unhappiness is proportioned, not to the worthiness of the object, but to the intensity of our desire. This is easy to understand.

But in spite of all that is said about the transitoriness of this world, we all feel that it is real, and that true happiness, however imperfect it may be, is attainable here. This happiness is obtained through the fulfillment of worthy desires.

It is certainly reasonable and right that we should feel happy when we have succeeded in some laudable undertaking; and it is not likely that we should have succeeded if we had not desired to do well. Then why should we not desire?

There is certainly a great difference between the two kinds of desire; but there is one element that is common to all desires, and that is, a feverish longing, a mental excitement, a state of spiritual unrest. Whenever we desire anything, from the lowest to the highest, we are likely to have more or less of this feeling; and this state of mind is a hindrance to our progress on the Path. A further reason is that the higher our desire is the more unlikely it is that it will be completely realized; and disappointment is sure to follow. Too often is the disciple made despondent by the failure to attain immediately to all that seems desirable in the occult. It often happens that our intense eagerness to solve some problem dawns on our minds. Hence, we are told that if we wish to gain true knowledge we should desire not. The Hindu chela Nilakan was told that anxiety and selfishness were great hindrances to memory: that anxiety was a harsh barrier, and that selfishness was "a fiery darkness" which would "burn up the memory's matrix."

But if certain things are worthy of being done, and others are what we should do, how are we to accomplish these unless we have a desire to that end? Is it not necessary that we should have certain desires, at least until we have advanced far beyond our present position?

It has been said that action is the resultant of a motive or desire, and the opportunity of gratifying that desire.

This is true for the masses, and may be general enough for a treatise on political economy; but it does not recognize free will, except that the will may choose between motives.

The more closely we analyze the actions of ourselves and others, the more we see that mankind is actuated by motives and not by will. This may be manlike, but is it god-like?
NOTES ON THE BHAGAVAD GITA.*

(Continued from page 370.)

III.

In this lecture I shall consider the premises I have laid down with special reference to the various passages in which they seem to be indicated in this book.

It will be remembered that I started with the very first cause, which I called Parabrahmam. Any positive definition of this principle is of course impossible, and a negative definition is all that can be attempted from the very nature of the case. It is generally believed, at any rate by a certain class of philosophers, that Krishna himself is Parabrahmam—that he is the personal God who is Parabrahmam—but the words used by Krishna in speaking of Parabrahmam, and the way in which he deals with the subject, clearly show that he draws a distinction between himself and Parabrahmam.

No doubt he is a manifestation of Parabrahmam, as every Logos is. He calls himself Pratyagatma, and Pratyagatma is Parabrahmam in the sense in which that proposition is laid down by the Advaita. This statement is at the bottom of all Advaita philosophy, but is very often misunderstood. When Advaitas say “Aham eva Parabrahmam,” they do not mean to say that this ahankara (egotism) is Parabrahmam, but that the only true self in the cosmos, which is the Logos or Pratyagatma, is a manifestation of Parabrahmam.

It will be noticed that when Krishna is speaking of himself he never uses the word Parabrahmam, but always Pratyagatma, and it is from this standpoint that we constantly find him speaking. Whenever he speaks of Pratyagatma he speaks of himself, and whenever he speaks of Parabrahmam, he speaks of it as being something different from himself.

I will now go through all the passages in which reference is made to Parabrahmam in this book. The first passage to which I shall call your attention is chapter viii, verse 3—

“[The eternal (spirit) is the Supreme Brahma. Its condition is Pratyagatma is called Adhyatma. Action which leads to incarnate existence is denoted by Karma.”]

Here the only words used to denote Parabrahmam are Aksharam and Brahma. These are the words he generally uses. You will notice that he does not in any place call it Esvara or Maheswara; he does not even allude to it often as Atma. Even the term Paramatma he applies to himself, and not to Parabrahmam. I believe that the reason for this is that the word Atma, strictly speaking, means the same thing as self, that idea of self being in no way connected with Parabrahmam. This idea of self first comes into existence with the Logos, and not before; hence Parabrahmam ought not to be called Paramatma or any kind of Atma. In one place only Krishna, speaking of Parabrahmam, says that it is his Atma. Except in that case he nowhere uses the word Atma or Paramatma in speaking of Parabrahmam. Strictly speaking Parabrahmam is the very foundation of the higher self. Paramatma is however a term also applied to Parabrahmam as distinguished from Pratyagatma. When thus applied it is used in a strictly technical sense. Whenever the term Pratyagatma is used, you will find Paramatma used as expressing something distinct from it.

It must not be supposed that either the ego, or any idea of self, can be associated with, or be considered as inherent in Parabrahmam. Perhaps it may be said that the idea of self is latent in Parabrahmam, as everything is latent in it; and, if on that account you connect the idea of self with Parabrahmam, you will be quite justified in applying the term Paramatma to Parabrahmam. But to avoid confusion it is much better to use our words in a clear sense, and to give to each a distinct connotation about which there can be no dispute. Turn now to chapter viii, verse 11:

“I will briefly explain to thee that place (padam), which those who know the Vedas describe as indestructible (ahkaram), which the ascetics, who are free from desire, enter, and which is the desired destination of those who observe Brahmacharyam.”

Here we find another word used by Krishna when speaking of Parabrahmam. He calls it his padam—the abode of bliss, or Nirvana. When he calls Parabrahmam his padam or abode, he does not mean vaikuntha loka or any other kind of loka; he speaks of it as his abode, because it is in the bosom of Parabrahmam that the Logos resides. He refers to Parabrahmam as the abode of bliss, wherein resides eternally the Logos, manifested or unmanifested. Again turn to chapter viii, verse 21:

“That which is stated to be unmanifested and immutable is spoken of as the highest condition to be reached. That place from which there is no return for those who reach it is my supreme abode.”

Here the same kind of language is used, and the reference is to Parabrahmam. When any soul is absorbed into the Logos, or reaches the Logos, it may be said to have reached Parabrahmam,

* Reports of four extemporary discourses, delivered by Mr. T. Subba Row, F. T. S., and T., before the delegates attending the Convention of the Theosophical Society, at Adyar, Madras, December 27th to 31st, 1886.
which is the centre of the Logos; and as the Logos resides in the bosom of Parabrahman, when the soul reaches the Logos it reaches Parabrahman also.

Here you will notice that he again speaks of Parabrahman as his abode.

Turn now to chapter ix, verses 4, 5 and 6:

"The whole of this Universe is pervaded by me in my Unmanifested form (Avyaktamooriti). I am thus the support of all the manifested existences, but I am not supported by them." Look at my condition when manifested as Eswara (Logos); these phenomenal manifestations are not within me. My Atma (however) is the foundation and the origin of manifested beings, though it does not exist in combination with them. Conceive that all the manifested beings are within me, just as the atmosphere spreading everywhere is always in space.

In my last lecture I tried to explain the mysterious connection between Parabrahman and Mulaprakriti. Parabrahman is never differentiated. What is differentiated is Mulaprakriti, which is sometimes called Avyaktam, and in other places Kutastham, which means simply the undifferentiated element. Nevertheless Parabrahman seems to be the one foundation for all physical phenomena, or for all phenomena that are generally referred to Mulaprakriti. After all, any material object is nothing more than a bundle of attributes to me. Either on account of an innate propensity within us or as a matter of inference, we always suppose that there is a non-ego, which has this bundle of attributes superimposed upon it, and which is the basis of all these attributes. Were it not for this essence, there could be no physical body. But these attributes do not spring from Parabrahman itself, but from Mulaprakriti, which is its veil, just as according to the kabbalists Shekinah is the veil of Enosh and the garb of Jehovah. Mulaprakriti is the veil of Parabrahman. It is not Parabrahman itself, but merely its appearance. It is purely phenomenal. It is no doubt far more persistent than any other kind of objective existence. Being the first mode or manifestation of the only absolute and unconditioned reality, it seems to be the basis of all subsequent manifestations. Speaking of this aspect of Parabrahman, Krishna says that the whole cosmos is pervaded by it, which is his Avyakta form.

Thus he speaks of Parabrahman as his Avyaktamoorti, because Parabrahman is unknowable, and only becomes knowable when manifesting itself as the Logos or Eswara. Here he is trying to indicate that Parabrahman is the Avyaktamoorti of the Logos, as it is the Atma of the Logos, which is everywhere present, since it is the Atma of the universe, and which appears differentiated, when manifested in the shape of the various Logos working in the cosmos, though in itself it is undifferentiated—and which, though the basis of all phenomenal manifestations, does not partake of the vibhakarana of those phenomenal manifestations.

Refer now to chapter xiii verses 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17.*

Here again, in speaking of Parabrahman in verses 15, 16 and 17, Krishna is laying down a proposition which I have already explained at length. I need not now go minutely into the meaning of these verses, for you can very easily ascertain them from the commentaries.

Turn to chapter xiv, verse 27:

"I am the image or the seat of the immortal and indestructible Brahmam, of eternal law and of undisturbed happiness."

Here Krishna is referring to himself as a manifestation or image of Parabrahman. He says he is the Pratishta of Parabrahman; he does not call himself Parabrahman, but only its image or manifestation.

The only other passage in which Krishna refers to the same subject is chapter xv, verse 6:

"That is my supreme abode (dhaman), which neither sun, nor moon, nor fire illumines. Those who enter it do not return."

There again he speaks of padam and refers to Parabrahman as his abode. I believe that these are all the statements that refer to Parabrahman in this book, and they are sufficient to indicate its position pretty clearly, and to show the nature of its connection with the Logos. I shall now proceed to point out the passages in which reference is made to the Logos itself.

Strictly speaking the whole of this book may be called the book of the philosophy of the Logos. There is hardly a page which does not directly or indirectly refer to it. There are however a few important and significant passages, to which it is desirable that I should refer you, so that you may see whether what I have said about the nature and functions of the Logos, and its connection with humanity and the human soul, is supported by the teachings of this book. Let us turn to chapter iv, and examine the meaning of verses 5 to 11:

"O Arjuna, I and thou have passed through many births. I know all of them, but thou dost not know, O harasser of foes."

"Even I, who am unborn, imperishable, the Lord of all beings, controlling my own nature, take birth through the instrumentality of my maya.

"O Dhara, wherever there is a designer of dharma or righteousness and spread of adharma or unrighteousness, I create myself."

"I take birth in every yuga, to protect the good, to destroy evil-doers, and to re-establish dharma."

"O Arjuna, he who understands truly my divine birth and action, abandoning his body, reaches me, and does not come to birth again."

"Many, who are free from passion, fear and anger, devoted to me and full of me, purified by spiritual wisdom, have attained my condition."

This passage refers, of course, not only to the Logos in the abstract, but also to Krishna's own incarnations. It will be noticed that he speaks here as if his Logos had already associated itself with several personalities, or human individualities, in former yugas; and he says that he remembers all that took place in connection with those incarnations. Of course, since there could be no karmabandham, as far as he was concerned, his Logos, when it associated itself with a human soul, would not lose its own independence of action, as a soul confined by the bonds of matter. And because his intellect and wisdom were in no way clouded by this association with a human soul, he says he can recollect all his previous incarnations, while Arjuna, not yet

---

*This and some of the other quotations have been omitted on account of their length.—Ed.
having fully received the light of the Logos, is not in a position to understand all that took place in connection with his former births. He says that it is his object to look after the welfare of humanity, and that whenever a special incarnation is necessary, he unites himself with the soul of a particular individual; and that he appears in various forms for the purpose of establishing dharma, and of rectifying matters on the plane of human life, if adharma gets the ascendancy. From the words he uses there is reason to suppose that the number of his own incarnations has been very great, more so than our books are willing to admit. He apparently refers to human incarnations; if the janmanas or incarnations referred to are simply the recognised human incarnations of Vishnu, there would perhaps be only two incarnations before Krishna, Rama and Parashurama, for the Matsya, Koorma, Varaha and Narasinha Avatars were not, strictly speaking, human incarnations. Even Vamana was not born of human father or mother.

The mysteries of these incarnations lie deep in the inner sanctuaries of the ancient arcane science, and can only be understood by unveiling certain hidden truths. The human incarnations can however be understood by the remarks I have already made. It may be that this Logos, which has taken upon itself the care of humanity, has incarnated not merely in connection with the two individuals whose history we see narrated in the Ramayana and the Mahabharata, but also perhaps in connection with various individuals who have appeared in different parts of the world and at different times as great reformers and saviours of mankind.

Again, these janmanas might not only include all the special incarnations of which this Logos has undergone, but might also perhaps include all the incarnations of that individual, who in the course of his spiritual progress finally joined himself, or united his soul with the Logos, which has been figuring as the guardian angel, so to speak, of the best and the highest interests of humanity on this planet.

In this connection there is a great truth that I ought to bring to your notice. Whenever any particular individual reaches the highest state of spiritual culture, develops in himself all the virtues that alone entitle him to an union with the Logos, and finally unites his soul with the Logos, there is, as it were, a sort of reaction emanating from that Logos for the good of humanity. If I am permitted to use a simile, I may compare it to what may happen in the case of the sun when a comet falls upon it. If a comet falls upon the sun, there is necessarily an accession of heat and light. So, in the case of a human being who has developed an unselfish love for humanity in himself. He unites his highest qualities with the Logos, and, when the time of the final union comes, generates in it an impulse to incarnate for the good of humanity. Even when it does not actually incarnate, it sends down its influence for the good of mankind. This influence may be conceived as invisible spiritual grace that descends from heaven, and it is showered down upon humanity, as it were, whenever any great Mahatma unites his soul with the Logos. Every Mahatma who joins his soul with the Logos is thus a source of immense power for the good of humanity in after generations. It is said that the Mahatmas, living as they are apart from the world, are utterly useless so far as humanity is concerned when they are still living, and are still more so when they have reached Nirvana. This is an absurd proposition that has been put forward by certain writers who did not comprehend the true nature of Nirvana. The truth is as I have said; every purified soul joined with the Logos is capable of stimulating the energy of the Logos in a particular direction. I do not mean to say that in the case of every Mahatma there is necessarily any tendency to incarnate—the purpose of teaching dharma to mankind—in special cases this may happen; but in all cases there is an influence of the highest spiritual efficacy coming down from the Logos for the good of humanity, whether as an invisible essence, or in the shape of another human incarnation, as in the case of Krishna, or rather the Logos with reference to which we have been speaking of Krishna. It might be, that this Logos, that seems to have incarnated already on this planet among various nations for the good of humanity, was that into which the soul of a great Mahatma of a former kalpa was finally absorbed: that the impulse which was thus communicated to it has been acting, as it were, to make it incarnate and re-incarnate during the present kalpa for the good of mankind.

In this connection I must frankly tell you, that beyond the mystery I have indicated there is yet another mystery in connection with Krishna and all the incarnations mentioned in this book, and that mystery goes to the very root of all occult science. Rather than attempt to give an imperfect explanation, I think it much better to lose sight of this particular subject, and proceed to explain the teachings of this book, as if Krishna is not speaking from the standpoint of any particular Logos, but from that of the Logos in the abstract. So far as the general tenour of this book is concerned, it would suit any other Logos as well as that of Krishna, but there are a few scattered passages, that when explained will be found to possess a special significance with reference to this mystery which they do not possess now. An attempt will be made in the "Secret Doctrine" to indicate the nature of this mystery as far as possible, but it must not be imagined that the veil will be completely drawn, and that the whole mystery will be revealed. Only hints will be given by the help of which you will have to examine and understand the subject. This matter is however foreign to my subject; yet I have thought it better to bring the fact to your notice lest you should be misled. The whole philosophy of this book is the philosophy of the Logos. In general Christ or Buddha might have used the same words as those of Krishna; and what I have said about this mystery only refers to some particular passages that seem to touch upon the nature of Krishna's divine individuality. He himself seems to think there is a mystery, as you may see from the 9th verse.

In the tenth verse "Mathabharam" means the condition of the Logos. Krishna says there have been several Mahatmas who have become Evacurasas, or have united their souls completely with the Logos,
Turn now to chapter v, verses 14 and 15:

"The Lord of the world does not bring about or create karma, or the condition by which people attribute karma to themselves; nor does he make people feel the effects of their karma. It is the law of natural causation that works. He does not take upon himself the sin or the merit of any one. Real knowledge is smothered by delusion, and hence created beings are misled."

Here he says that Esvara does not create karma, nor does he create in individuals any desire to do karma. All karma, or impulse to do karma, emanates from Mulaprakriti and its nihilams, and not from the Logos, or the light that emanates from the Logos. You must look upon this light, or Fohat, as a kind of energy eternally beneficial in its nature, as stated in the "Idyll of the White Lotus." In itself it is not capable of generating any tendencies that lead to bandhams; but ahankams, and the desire to do karma, and all karma with its various consequences come into existence by reason of the upadhis which are but the manifestations of that one Mulaprakriti.

Strictly and logically speaking, you will have to attribute these results to both of these forces. Mulaprakriti will not act, and is incapable of producing any result, unless energised by the light of the Logos. Nevertheless, most of the results that pertain to karma and the continued existence of man as the responsible producer of karma are traceable to Mulaprakriti, and not to the light that vitalizes it. We may therefore suppose that this Mulaprakriti is the real or principal bandhakaranam, and this light is the one instrument by which we may attain to union with the Logos, which is the source of salvation. This light is the foundation of the better side of human nature, and of all those tendencies of action, which generally lead to liberation from the bonds of avidya.

Turn to chapter vii, verses 4 and 5:

"My Prakriti (Mulaprakriti) is divided into eight parts—earth, water, fire, wind, ether, mind, intuition and egotism. This Prakriti is called Ayaprapakriti.

"Understand my Paraprapakriti (Daiiviprakriti) as something distinct from this. This Daiiviprakriti is the one life by which the whole Universe is supported."

Krishna, in verse 5 distinguishes between this Daiiviprakriti and Prakriti. This Daiiviprakriti is, strictly speaking, the Mahakshitanum of the whole cosmos, the one energy, or the only force from which spring all force manifestations. He says you must look upon it as something different from the Prakriti of the Sankhyas. Turn now to chapter vii, verse 7:

"O Dhanamjaya, there is nothing superior to me, and all the hangings on me as a rope of gems on the string running through them."

Please notice that in verses 4 and 5 Krishna is referring to two kinds of Prakriti. Of course that Prakriti, which is differentiated into the eight elements enumerated in Sankhya philosophy, is the aryaktam of the Sankhyas—it is the Mulaprakriti, which must not be confounded with the Daiiviprakriti, which is the light of the Logos. Conceive Mulaprakriti as avidya, and Daiiviprakriti, the light of the Logos, as vidya. These words have other meanings also. In the Swatascavata Upanishad Esvara is described as the deity who controls both vidya and avidya.

Here Krishna seems to refer to all the qualities, or all the excellent qualities, manifested in every region of phenomenal existence, as springing from himself.

No doubt the other qualities also or rather their ideal forms originally spring from him, but they ought to be traced mainly to Mulaprakriti, and not to himself.

I will now refer you to verse 24 and the following verses of the same chapter:

"The ignorant, who do not know my supreme and indestructible and best nature, regard me as a manifestation of aryaktam. Veiled by my yogas maya, I am not visible to all. The deluded world does not comprehend me, who am unborn and imperishable.

"I know, O Arjuna, all beings, past, present, and future, but none knows me."

In these verses Krishna is controverting a doctrine that has unfortunately created a good deal of confusion. I have already told you that the Sankhyas have taken their aryaktam, or rather Parabrahman, veiled by Mulaprakriti, as Atma or the real self. Their opinion was that this aryaktam took on a kind of phenomenal differentiation on account of association with upadhi, and when this phenomenal differentiation took place, the aryaktam became the Atma of the individual. They have thus altogether lost sight of the Logos. Startling consequences followed from this doctrine. They thought that there being but one aryaktam, one soul, or one spirit, that existed in every upadhi, appearing differentiated, though not differentiated in reality, if somehow we could control the action of upadhi, and destroy the maya it had created, the result would be the complete extinction of man's self and a final layam in this aryaktam or Parabrahman. It is this doctrine that has spoilt the Advaita philosophy of this country, that has brought the Buddhism of Ceylon, Burma, and China to its present deplorable condition, and led so many Vedantic writers to say that Nirvana was in reality a condition of perfect layam or annihilation.

If those who say that Nirvana is annihilation are right, then, so far as the individuality of the soul is concerned, it is completely annihilated, and what exists ultimately is not the soul, or the individual however purified or exalted, but the one Parabrahman, which has all along been existing, and that Parabrahman itself is a sort of unknowable essence which has no idea of self, nor even an individual existence, but which is the one power, the one mysterious basis of the whole cosmos. In interpreting the Prama, the Sankhya made the ardhahatma really mean this aryaktam and nothing more. In some Upanishads this ardhahatma is described as that which, appearing differentiated, is the soul of man. When this differentiation, which is mainly due to the upadhi, is destroyed, there is a layam of Atma in Parabrahman. This is also the view of a considerable number of persons in India, who call themselves Adwaitis. It is also the view put forward as the correct Vedantic view. It was certainly the view of the ancient Sankhya philosophers, and is the view of all those Buddhists who consider Nirvana to be the layam of the soul in Parabrahman.
After reaching karana sarira there are two paths, both of which lead to Parabrahram. Karana sarira, you must know, is an upadhi; it is material, that to say, it is derived from Mulaprakriti, but there is also acting in it, as its light and energy, the light from the Logos, or Daiiprakriti, or Fohat. Now, as I have said, there are two paths. When you reach Karana sarira, you can either confine your attention to the upadhi, and, tracing its genealogy up to Mulaprakriti, arrive at Parabrahram at the next step, or you may lose sight of the upadhi, altogether, and fix your attention solely upon the energy, or light, or life, that is working within it. You may then try to trace its origin, travelling along the ray till you reach its source, which is the Logos, and from the standpoint of the Logos try to reach Parabrahram.

Of these two paths a considerable number of modern Vedantists, and all Sankhyas and all Buddhists—except those who are acquainted with the occult doctrine—have chosen the one that leads to Mulaprakriti, hoping thus to reach Parabrahram ultimately. But in the view taken by these philosophers the Logos and its light were completely lost sight of. Atma, in their opinion, is the differentiated appearance of this avyaktam and nothing more.

Now what is the result? The differentiated appearance ceases when the upadhi ceases to exist, and the thing that existed before exists afterwards, and that which is avyaktam, and beyond it there is Parabrahram. The individuality of man is completely annihilated. Further, in such a case it would be simply absurd to speak of Avatars, for they would then be impossible and out of the question. How is it possible for Mahatmas, or adepts, to help mankind in any possible way when once they have reached this stage? The Cingalese Buddhists have pushed this doctrine to its logical conclusion. According to them Buddha is extinguished, and every man who follows his doctrine will eventually lose the individuality of his Atma; therefore they say that the Tibetans are entirely mistaken in thinking that Buddha has been overshadowing, or can overshadow any mortals; since the time he reached Parinivana the soul of the man who was called Buddha has lost its individuality. Now I say that Krishna protests against the doctrine which leads to such consequences.

He says (verse 24) that such a view is wrong, and that those who hold it do not understand his real position as the Logos or Verbum. Moreover he tells us the reason why he is thus lost sight of. He says it is so because he is always veiled by his yoga maya. This yoga maya is his light. It is supposed that this light alone is visible, the centre from which it radiates remaining always invisible.

As may naturally be expected this light is always seen mixed up, or in conjunction, with the Emanations of Mulaprakriti. Hence Sankhyas have considered it to be an aspect of, or an Emanation from Mulaprakriti. A vyaktam was in their opinion the source, not only of matter, but of force also.

But according to Krishna this light is not to be traced to avyaktam, but to a different source altogether, which source is himself.
It is not so. Nature has a sort of machinery by which it is able to reduce all these bundles of experiences into a single self. Great as is this higher individuality of the human monad, there is an individuality over and above this and far greater than it is. The Logos has an individuality of its own. When the soul rises to the Logos, all that this latter takes from the soul is that portion of the soul’s individuality which is high and spiritual enough to live in the individuality of the Logos; just as the Karana Sarira makes a choice between the various experiences of a man, and only assimilates such portions thereof as belong to its own nature, the Logos, when it unitizes itself with the soul of a man, only takes from it that which is not repugnant to its nature.

But now see what changes take place in the consciousness of the human being himself. The moment this union takes place, the individual at once feels that he is himself the Logos, the monad formed from whose light has been going through all the experiences which he has now added to his individuality. In fact his own individuality is lost, and he becomes endowed with the original individuality of the Logos. From the standpoint of the Logos the case stands thus. The Logos throws out a kind of feeler, as it were, of its own light into various organisms. This light vibrates along a series of incarnations, and whenever it produces spiritual tendencies, resulting in experience that is capable of being added to the individuality of the Logos, the Logos assimilates that experience. Thus the individuality of the man becomes the individuality of the Logos, and the human being united to the Logos thinks that this is one of the innumerable spiritual individualities that he has assimilated and united in himself, that self being composed of the experiences which the Logos has accumulated, perhaps from the beginning of time. That individual will therefore never return to be born again on earth. Of course if the Logos feels that It is born, whenever a new individual makes his appearance having its light in him, then the individual who has become assimilated with the Logos may no doubt be said to have punarjanam. But the Logos does not suffer because its light is never contaminated by the Vikarams of Prakriti. Krishna points out that he is simply Upadrishtha, a witness, not personally interested in the result at all, except when a certain amount of spirituality is generated and the Mahatma is sufficiently purified to assimilate its soul with the Logos. To that time he says, “I have no personal concern, because I simply watch as a disinterested witness. Because my light appears in different organisms, I do not therefore suffer the pains and sorrows that a man may have to bear. My spiritual nature is in no way contaminated by the appearance of my light in various organisms.” One might just as well say that the sun is defiled or rendered impure, because its light shines in impure places. In like manner it cannot be true to say that the Logos suffers. Therefore it is not the real self that feels pleasure or pain, and when a man assimilates his soul with the Logos, he no longer suffers either the pains or pleasures of human life.

Again when I speak of the light of the Logos permeating this cosmos and vibrating in various incarnations, it does not necessarily follow that a being who has gone to the Logos is incarnated again. He has then a well defined spiritual individuality of his own, and though the Logos is Esvara, and its light is the Chaitanya of the universe, and though the Logos from time to time assimilates with its own spiritual nature the purified souls of various Mahatmas, and also overshadows certain individuals, still the Logos itself never suffers and has nothing like punarjanam in the proper sense of the word, and a man who is absorbed into it becomes an immortal, spiritual being, a real Esvara in the cosmos, never to be reborn, and never again to be subject to the pains and pleasures of human life.

It is only in this sense that you have to understand immortality. If unfortunately immortality is understood in the sense in which it is explained by the modern Vedantic writers and by the Cingalese Buddhists, it does not appear to be a very desirable object for man’s aspirations. If it be true, as these teach, that the individuality of man, instead of being ennobled and preserved and developed into a spiritual power, is destroyed and annihilated, then the word immortality becomes a meaningless term.

I think I have the complete authority of Krishna for saying that this theory is correct, and this I believe to be, though all may not agree with me on this point, a correct statement of the doctrine of Sankaracharya and Buddha.

Turn now to chapter ix, verse 11:—

“...the deluded, not knowing my supreme nature, despise me, the Lord (Esvara) of all beings, when dwelling in a human body.”

Here Krishna calls himself the real Esvara. Again in verse 13:—

“The Mahatmas devoted to Daiviprakriti, and knowing me as the imperishable cause of all beings, worship me with their minds concentrated on me.”

Here he refers to Daiviprakriti, between which and Multapra-riti he draws a clear distinction. By some however this Daiviprakriti is looked upon as a thing to be shunned, a force that must be controlled. It is on the other hand a beneficent energy, by taking advantage of which a man may reach its centre and its source.

See verse 18 of the same chapter:—

“I am the refuge, the protector, the Lord, the witness, the abode, the shelter, the friend, the source, the destruction, the place, the receptacle, the imperishable seed.”

All these epithets applied by Krishna to himself, show that he is speaking of himself in the same manner as Christ spoke of himself, or as every great teacher, who was supposed to have represented the Logos for the time being on this planet, spoke of himself. Another very significant passage is verse 22 of the same chapter:—

“I take interest in the welfare of those men, who worship me, and think of me alone, with their attention always fixed on me.”

I have told you that in the generality of cases Krishna, or the Logos, would simply be a disinterested witness, watching the career of the human monad, and not concerning itself with its interests. But, in cases where real spiritual progress is made, the way is prepared for a final connection with the Logos. It commences
in this manner; the Logos begins to take a greater interest in the welfare of the individual, and becomes his light and his guide, and watches over him, and protects him. This is the way in which the approach of the Logos to the human soul commences. This interest increases more and more, till, when the man reaches the highest spiritual development, the Logos enters into him, and then, instead of finding within himself merely the reflection of the Logos, he finds the Logos itself. Then the final union takes place, after which there is no more incarnation for the man. It is only in such a case that the Logos becomes more than a disinterested spectator.

I must here call your attention to verse 29 and the following verses at the end of this chapter:—

"I am the same to all beings: I have neither friend nor foe: those who worship Me with devotion are in Me, and I am in them."

Even if he whose conduct is wicked worships Me alone, he is to be regarded as a good man, for he is working in the right direction.

"O son of Kunti, he soon becomes a virtuous person, and obtains eternal peace; rest assured that my worshipper does not perish."

Those who are born in sin and are devoted to Me, whether women, or Vaishyas, or Sudras, reach my supreme abode."

"How much more holy Brahmins and devoted Rajahs, having come into this transient and miserable world, worship Me!

"Fix thy mind on Me, worship Me, bow down to Me: those who depend on Me, and are devoted to Me, reach Me."

Here Krishna shows, by the two propositions that he is laying down, that he is speaking from a thoroughly cosmopolitan standpoint. He says, "No one is my friend: no one is my enemy." He has already pointed out the best way of gaining his friendship. He does not assume that any particular man is his enemy or his friend. We know that, even in the case of rakshasas, Prakriti became the greatest of bhagavatras. Krishna is thoroughly impartial in dealing with mankind and in his spiritual ministration. He says it does not matter in the least to him what kind of araham a man may have, what kind of ritual or formula of faith he professes; and he further says, that he does not make any distinction between Sudras and Brahmins, between men and women, between higher and lower classes. His help is extended to all: there is but one way of reaching him; and that way may be utilized by anybody. In this respect he draws a distinction between the doctrines of the karmayogis and his own teaching. Some people say that certain privileged classes only are entitled to attain Nirvana. He says this is not the case. Moreover he must be taken to reject by implication the doctrine of certain Madhvas, who say that all souls can be divided into three divisions. They say that there is a certain class of people called Nityamaraktras, who are destined, whatever they may do, to go to bottomless perdition: another class of people called It Nityamaranarikas, who can never leave the plane of earth; and a third class, the Nityamuktas, who, whatever mischievous things they do, must be admitted into Vaikuntham. This doctrine is not sanctioned by Krishna. His doctrine further contains a protest against the manner in which certain writers have misrepresented the importance of Buddha Avatar. No doubt some of our Brahman writers admit that Buddha was an Avatar of Vishnu; but they say

it was an Avatar undertaken for mischievous purposes. He came here to teach people all sorts of absurd doctrines, in order to bring about their damnation. These people had to be punished; and he thought the best way to bring about their punishment was to make them mad by preaching false doctrines to them. This view, I am ashamed to say, is solemnly put forward in some of our books. How different this is from what Krishna teaches. He says:—"In my sight all men are the same; and if I draw any distinction at all, it is only when a man reaches a very high state of spiritual perfection and looks upon me as his guide and protector. Then, and then only, I cease to be a disinterested witness, and try to interest myself in his affairs. In every other case I am simply a disinterested witness." He takes no account of the fact that this man is a Brahman and that one a Buddhist or a Parsee; but he says that in his eyes all mankind stand on the same level, that what distinguishes one from another is spiritual light and life.

"He is who is sensible enough amongst men to know me, the unborn Lord of the world who has no beginning, is freed from all sins."

Now turn to the 3rd verse of the next chapter (chapter X):—

Here he calls himself the unborn: he had no beginning: he is the Eswara of the cosmos. It must not be supposed that the Logos perishes or is destroyed even at the time of cosmic pralaya. Of course it is open to question whether there is such a thing as cosmic pralaya. We can very well conceive a solar pralaya as probable, we can also conceive that there may be a time when activity ceases throughout the whole cosmos, but there is some difficulty in arguing by analogy from a definite and limited system to an indefinite and infinite one. At any rate, among occultists there is a belief that there will be such a cosmic pralaya, though it may not take place for a number of years that it is impossible for us even to imagine. But even though there may be a cosmic pralaya the Logos will not perish even when it takes place; otherwise at the recommencement of cosmic activity, the Logos will have to be born again, as the present Logos came into existence at the time when the present cosmic evolution commenced. In such a case, Krishna cannot call himself aja (unborn): he can only say this of himself, if the Logos does not perish at the time of cosmic pralaya, but sleeps in the bosom of Parabrahman, and starts into wakefulness when the next day of cosmic activity commences.

I have already said in speaking of this Logos, that it was quite possible that it was the Logos that appeared in the shape of the first Dhyan Chohan, or Planetary Spirit, when the evolution of man was recommenced after the last period of inactivity on this planet, as stated in Mr. Sinnett's book, "Esoteric Buddhism," and after having set the evolutionary current in motion, retired to the spiritual plane congenial to its own nature, and has been watching since over the interests of humanity, and now and then appearing in connection with a human individuality for the good of mankind. Or you may look upon the Logos represented by Krishna as one
belonging to the same class as the Logos which so appeared. In speaking of himself Krishna says, (chapter x, verse 6) :

"The seven great Rishis, the four preceding Manus, partaking of my nature, were born from my mind: from them sprang was (born) the human race and the world."

He speaks of the sapta rishis and of the Manus as his manasputras, or mind-born sons, which they would be if he was the so-called Prajapati, who appeared on this planet and commenced the work of evolution.

In all Puranas the Maharishis are said to be the mind-born sons of Prajapati or Brahma, who was the first manifested being on this planet, and who was called Swayambhuna, as he had neither father nor mother; he commenced the creation of man by forming, or bringing into existence by his own intellectual power, these Maharishis and these Manus. After this was accomplished Prajapati disappeared from the scene; as stated in Manu-Smriti, Swayambhuna thus disappeared after commencing the work of evolution. He has not, however, yet disconnected himself altogether from the group of humanity that has commenced to evolve on this planet, but is still the overshadowing Logos or the manifested Esvara, who does interest himself in the affairs of this planet and is in a position to incarnate as an Avatar for the good of its population.

There is a peculiarity in this passage to which I must call your attention. He speaks here of four Manus. Why does he speak of four? We are now in the seventh Manwantara—that of Vaivaswata. If he is speaking of the past Manus, he ought to speak of six, but he only mentions four. In some commentaries an attempt has been made to interpret this in a peculiar manner. The word "Chatwara" is separated from the word "Manavaha" and is made to refer to Sanaka, Sanandana, Sanatkumara and Sanatsujata, who were also included among the mind-born sons of Prajapati.

But this interpretation will lead to a most absurd conclusion, and make the sentence contradict itself. The persons alluded to in the text have a qualifying clause in the sentence. It is well known that Sanaka and the other three refused to create, though the other sons had consented to do so; therefore, in speaking of those persons from whom humanity has sprung into existence, it would be absurd to include these four also in the list. The passage must be interpreted without splitting the compound into two nouns. The number of Manus will be then four, and the statement would contradict the Puranic account, though it would be in harmony with the occult theory. You will recollect that Mr. Sinnett has stated that we are now in the fifth root race. Each root race is considered as the sahathii of a particular Manus. Now the fourth root race has passed, or in other words there have been four past Manus. There is another point to be considered in connection with this subject. It is stated in Manusmriti that the first Manus (Swayambhuna) created seven Manus. This seems to be the total number of Manus according to this Smriti. It is not alleged that there was, or would be another batch of Manus created, or to be created at some other time.

But the Puranic account makes the number of Manus fourteen. This is a subject, which, I believe, requires a considerable amount of attention at your hands; it is no doubt a very interesting one, and I request such of you as have the required time at your disposal, to try and find out how this confusion has arisen. The commentators try to get the number fourteen out of Manus. Of course an ingenious pandit can get anything out of anything, but if you will go into the matter deeply, it is quite possible we may be able to find out how the whole mistake has arisen, and if there is any mistake or not. Any further discussion of the subject at present is unnecessary.

Another interesting function of the Logos is indicated in the same chapter, verse 11:

"I, dwelling in them, out of my compassion for them, destroy the darkness born from ignorance by the shining light of spiritual Wisdom."

He here is said to be not only an instrument of salvation, but also the source of wisdom. As I have already said, the light that emanates from him has three phases, or three aspects. First it is the life, or the Mahachatanyam of the cosmos; that is one aspect of it; secondly, it is force, and in this aspect it is the Fohat of the Buddhist philosophy; lastly, it is wisdom, in the sense that it is the Chichakhti of the Hindu philosophers. All these three aspects are, as you may easily see, combined in our conception of the Gayatri. It is stated to be Chichakhti by Vasishtha; and its meaning justifies the statement. It is further represented as light, and in the sashadhyena that precedes the japam it is evoked as the life of the whole cosmos. If you will read carefully the "Idyll of the White Lotus," you will perhaps gain some further ideas about the functions of this light, and the help it is capable of giving to humanity.

I have now to call your attention to all those verses in chapter x that refer to his so-called vibhuti, or excellence.

He says "Ahum Atma" (I am self), because every self is but a manifestation of himself, or a reflection of the Logos, as I have already indicated. It is in that sense he is the Ahum (I) manifested everywhere in every upadhi. When he says this he is speaking from the standpoint of the Logos in the abstract, and not from that of any particular Logos. The description of this vibhuti conveys to our minds an important lesson. All that is good and great, sublime and noble in this phenomenal universe, or even in the other lokaas, proceeds from the Logos, and in some way or other the manifestation of its wisdom and power and vibhuti; and all that tends to spiritual degradation and to objective physical life emanates from prakriti. In fact there are two contending forces in the cosmos. Tho one is this prakriti whose genealogy we have already traced. The other is the Dvijnaprakriti, the light that comes down, reflection after reflection, to the plane of the lowest organisms. In all those religions in which the fight between the good and the bad impulses of this cosmos is spoken of, the real reference is always to this light, which is constantly attempting to raise men from the lowest level to the highest plane of spiritual life, and that other force, which has its place in Prakriti, and is con-
constantly leading the spirit into material existence. This conception seems to be the foundation of all those wars in heaven, and of all the fighting between good and bad principles in the cosmos, which we meet with in so many religious systems of philosophy. Krishna points out that everything that is considered great or good or noble should be considered as having in it his energy, wisdom and light. This is certainly true, because the Logos is the one source of energy, wisdom and spiritual enlightenment. When you realize what an important place this energy that emanates from the Logos plays in the evolution of the whole cosmos, and examine its powers with reference to the spiritual enlightenment which it is capable of generating, you will see that this description of his vibhuti is by no means an exaggerated account of Krishna’s importance in the cosmos.

Turn next to chapter xi.

The inferences I mean to draw from this chapter are these. First, that the Logos reflects the whole cosmos in itself, or, in other words, that the whole cosmos exists in the Logos as its germ. As I have already said, the world is the word made manifest, and the Logos is, in the mystical phraseology of our ancient writers, the pasyantti form of this word. This is the germ in which the whole plan of the solar system eternally exists. The image existing in the Logos becomes expanded and amplified when communicated to its light, and is manifested in matter when the light acts upon Mulaprakriti. No impulse, no energy, no form in the cosmos can ever come into existence without having its original conception in the field of Chit, which constitutes the demiurgic mind of the Logos.

The Logos, its light and Mulaprakriti constitute the real Tatwatraysam of the Visishtadwaitis, Mulaprakriti being their Achit, this light from the Logos their Chit, and the Logos being their Esvara.

I would here call your attention to the first Aṅgika of Mahabharata, where Patanjali speaks of the three forms manifested—Pasyantti, Madhyama and Vaikhari Vach. The way in which he classifies them is different.

In his opinion Pasyantti Vach, which corresponds to the Logos, is Chit; Vaikhari Vach, which is a symbol of the manifested cosmos, is Achit, and Madhyama Vach, which represents the light of the Logos, is Chidachit. You know that the word Chit may mean Chaitanya, or life; it may also mean consciousness. The Logos is simply Chidārāṇyam, it has no material form at all; the whole manifested cosmos is called achidārāṇyam, that is to say, it exists in fact. It exists in idea while it exists merely subjectively in the Logos; the Fohat, being the link between the two, is neither the one nor the other, it is neither Chit nor Achit. It is therefore called Chidārāṇyam. Thus, when Patanjali speaks of Madhyama Vach Chidachit, he refers to it as a link between the mental form (in the Logos) and the manifested form (in matter). The universe exists in idea in the Logos, it exists as a mysterious impression in the region of force, and it is finally transformed into the objectively manifested cosmos, when this force transfers its own image or impulse to cosmic matter. Hence this Logos is called Viswarupi—a term constantly applied to Vishnu, but only in this sense.

There is yet another way of looking at these entities with which you ought to familiarize yourselves. The whole cosmos, by which I mean all the innumerable solar systems, may be called the physical body of the one Parabrahman; the whole of this light or force may be called its sukshma sarira; the abstract Logos will then be the karana sarira, while the Atma will be Parabrahman itself.

But this classification must not be confused with that other classification which relates to the subdivisions of one only of these entities, the manifested solar system, the most objective of these entities, which I have called the sthula sarira of Parabrahman. This entity is in itself divisible into four planes of existence, that correspond to the four matrikas in Prana, as generally described. Again this light which is the sukshma sarira of Parabrahman must not be confounded with the astral light. The astral light is simply the sukshma form of Viswarupam; but so far as this light is concerned, all the manifested planes in the solar system are objective to it, and so it cannot be the astral light. I find it necessary to draw this distinction, because the two have been confounded in certain writings. What I have said will explain to some extent why the Logos is considered as having viswarupam.

Again, if the Logos is nothing more than Achidārāṇyam, how is it that Arjuna, with his spiritual intelligence, sees an objective image or form before him, which, however splendid and magnificent, is, strictly speaking, an external image of the world? What is seen by him is not the Logos itself but the viswarupa form of the Logos as manifested in its light—Dāvīprakriti. It is only as thus manifested that the Logos can become visible even to the highest spiritual intelligence of man.

There is yet another inference to be drawn from this chapter. Truly the form shown to Arjuna was fearful to look at, and all the terrible things about to manifest themselves on the objective plane are generally manifested long before they actually happen, in the plane of the Logos from which all impulses spring originally. Bhishma, Drona and Karna were still living at the time Krishna showed this form. But yet their deaths and the destruction of almost their whole army seemed to be foreshadowed in this appearance of the Logos. Its terrible form was but an indication of the terrible things that were going to happen. In itself the Logos has no form; clothed in its light it assumes a form which is, as it were, a symbol of the impulses operating, or about to operate, in the cosmos at the time of the manifestation.

(To be continued.)
CLASSIFICATION OF "PRINCIPLES."

In a most admirable lecture by Mr. T. Subba Row on the Bhagavad Gita, published in the February number of the Theosophist, the lecturer deals, incidentally as I believe, with the question of septenary "principles" in the Kosmos and Man. The division is rather criticized, and the grouping hitherto adopted and favoured in theosophical teachings is resolved into one of Four.

This criticism has already given rise to some misunderstanding, and it is argued by some that a slur is thrown on the original teachings. This apparent disagreement with one whose views are held as almost decisive on occult matters in our Society is certainly a dangerous handle to give to opponents who are ever on the alert to detect and blazon forth contradictions and inconsistencies in our philosophy. Hence I feel it my duty to show that there is in reality no inconsistency between Mr. Subba Row's views and our own in the question of the septenary division; and to show, (a) that the lecturer was perfectly well acquainted with the septenary division before he joined the Theosophical Society; (b) that he knew it was the teaching of old "Aryan philosophers who have associated seven occult powers with the seven principles" in the Macrocosm and the Microcosm (see the end of this article); and (c) that from the beginning he had objected—not to the classification but to the form in which it was expressed. Therefore, now, when he calls the division "unscientific and misleading," and adds that "this sevenfold classification is almost conspicuous by its absence in many (not all?) of our Hindu books," etc., and that it is better to adopt the time-honoured classification of four principles, Mr. Subba Row must mean only some special orthodox books, as it would be impossible for him to contradict himself in such a conspicuous way.

A few words of explanation, therefore, will not be altogether out of place. For the matter of being "conspicuous by its absence" in Hindu books, the said classification is as conspicuous by its absence in Buddhist books. This, for a reason transparently clear: it was always esoteric; and as such, rather inferred than openly taught. That it is "misleading" is also perfectly true; for the great feature of the day—materialism—has led the minds of our Western theosophists into the prevalent habit of viewing the seven principles as distinct and self-existing entities, instead of what they are—namely, *upadhis* and correlating states—three *upadhis*, basic groups, and four principles. As to being "unscientific," the term can be only attributed to a *lapetus lingue*, and in this relation let me quote what Mr. Subba Row wrote about a year before he joined the Theosophical Society in one of his ablest articles, "Brahmanism on the seven-fold principle in Man," the best review that ever appeared of the Fragments of Occult Truth—*since embodied in "Esoteric Buddhism."* Says the author:

"I have carefully examined it (the teaching) and find that the results arrived at (in the Buddhist doctrine) do not differ much from the conclusions of our Aryan philosophy, though our mode of stating the arguments may differ in form." Having enumerated, after this the "three primary causes" which bring the human being into existence—i.e., Parabrahman, Sakti and Prakriti—he explains: "Now, according to the Adepts of ancient Aryavarta, seven principles are evolved out of these three primary entities. Algebra teaches us that the number of combinations of things, taken one at a time, two at a time, three at a time, and so forth = 2^n - 1. Applying this formula to the present case, the number of entities evolved from different combinations of these three primary causes amount to 2^3 - 1 = 7. As a general rule, whenever seven entities are mentioned in the ancient occult sciences of India in any connection whatsoever, you must suppose that these seven entities come into existence from three primary entities; and that these three entities, again, are evolved out of a single entity or monad." (See "Five Years of Theosophy," p. 160.)

This is quite correct, from the occult standpoint, and also kabbalistically, when one looks into the question of the seven and ten Sephiroths, and the seven and ten Rishis, Manus, etc. It shows that in sober truth there is not, nor can there be any fundamental disagreement between the esoteric philosophy of the Trans- and Dis-Iimalayan Adepts. The reader is referred, moreover, to the earlier pages of the above mentioned article, in which it is stated that "the knowledge of the occult powers of nature possessed by the inhabitants of the lost Atlantis was learnt by the ancient Adepts of India, and was appended by them to the esoteric doctrine taught by the residents of the sacred island (now the Gobi desert). The Tibetan Adepts, however, (their precursors of Central Asia) have not accepted the addition." (pp. 155-156.)

But this difference between the two doctrines does not include the septenary division, as it was universal after it had originated with the Atlanteans, who, as the Fourth Race, were of course an earlier race than the Fifth—the Aryan.

Thus, from the purely metaphysical standpoint, the remarks made on the Septenary Division in the "Bhagavad-Gita" Lecture hold good to-day, as they did five or six years ago in the article "Brahmanism on the seven-fold principle in Man," their apparent discrepancy notwithstanding. For purposes of purely theoretical esoterism, they are as valid in Buddhist as they are in Brahmanical philosophy. Therefore, when Mr. Subba Row proposes to hold to "the time-honoured classification of four principles" in a lecture on a Vedanta work—the Vedantic classification, however, dividing man into five "kosas" (sheaths) and the *Atma* (the six nominally, of course), he simply shows thereby that he desires to remain strictly within theoretical and metaphysical, and also orthodox computations of the same. This is how I understand his words, at any rate. For the Taraka Raj-Yoga classification is again three *upadhis*, the *Atma* being the fourth principle, and no *upadhi*, of course, as it is one with Parabrahm. This is again shown by himself in a little article called "Septenary Division in different Indian systems."†

† See Isis Unveiled, Vol. I, pp. 600, and the appendices by the Editor to the above quoted article in "Five Years of Theosophy."

† This is the division given to us by Mr. Subba Row. See "Five Years of Theosophy," p. 130, article signed T. S.

† Ibid, p. 186.
Why then should not "Buddhist" Esoterism, so-called, resort to such a division? It is perhaps "misleading"—that is admitted; but surely it cannot be called "unscientific." I will even permit myself to call that adjective a thoughtless expression, since it has been shown to be on the contrary very "scientific" by Mr. Subba Row himself; and quite mathematically so, as the above-quoted algebraic demonstration of the same proves it. I say that the division is due to nature herself pointing out its necessity in kosmos and man; just because the number seven is "a power, and a spiritual force" in its combination of three and four, of the triangle and the quarternary. It is no doubt far more convenient to adhere to the fourfold classification in a metaphysical and synthetical sense, just as I have adhered to the threefold classification—of body, soul and spirit—in *Isis Unveiled*, because had I then adopted the septenary division, as I have been compelled to do later on for purposes of strict analysis, no one would have understood it, and the multiplication of principles, instead of throwing light upon the subject, would have introduced endless confusion. But now the question has changed, and the position is different. We have unfortunately—for it was premature—opened a chink in the Chinese wall of esoterism, and we cannot now close it again, even if we would. I for one had to pay a heavy price for the indiscretion, but I will not shrink from the results.

I maintain then, that when once we pass from the plane of pure subjective reasoning on esoteric matters to that of practical demonstration in Occultism, wherein each principle and attribute of daily and especially of post-mortem life, the sevenfold classification is the right one. For it is simply a convenient division which prevents in no wise the recognition of but three groups—which Mr. Subba Row calls "four principles associated with four upadhis, and which are associated in their turns with four distinct states of consciousness."* This is the Bhagavad Gita classification, it appears; but not that of the Vedanta, nor—what the Raj-Yogis of the pre-Aryasongha schools and of the Mahayana system held to, and still hold beyond the Himalayas, and their system is almost identical with the *Taraka Raj-Yoga,—the difference between the latter and the Vedanta classification having been pointed out to us by Mr. Subba Row in his little article on the "Septenary Division in different Indian systems." The Taraka Raj-Yogis recognize only *three upadhis* in which *Atma* may work, which, in India, if I mistake not, are the *Jnagata*, or waking state of consciousness (corresponding to the *Sthulopadhi*); the *Soopna*, or dreaming state (in *Sukshmoopadhi*); and the *Sushupti*, or causal state, produced by, and through *Karanopadhi*, or what we call *Buddhi*. But then, in transcendental states of consciousness betw een the latter and the Vedanta classification having been pointed out to us by Mr. Subba Row in his little article on the "Septenary Division in different Indian systems" and which are associated in their turns with four distinct states of consciousness, either objective or subjective...a perfect state of unconsciousness, etc." (See "Five Years of Theosophy," pp. 200 and 201.) Of course those who do not hold to the old school of *Aryan and Arhat Adepts are in no way bound to adopt the septenary classification.

* Mr. Subba Row's argument that in the matter of the three divisions of the body "we may make any number of divisions, and may as well enumerate nerves, bones, blood and bones," is not valid, I think. Nerve-force—well and good, though it is one with the life-principle and proceeds from it: as to blood, bones, etc., these are objective material things, and one with, and inseparable from the human body; while all the other six principles are in their *seventh—the body—purely subjective principles, and therefore all denied by material science, which ignores them.

† In that most admirable article of his "Personal and Impersonal God"—one which has attracted much attention in the Theosophical circles, Mr. Subba Row says, "Just as a human being is composed of seven principles, differentiated in matter in the solar system exists in seven different conditions. These do not all come within the range of our present objective consciousness, but they can be perceived by the spiritual ego in man. Further, *propna*, or the capacity of perception, exists in seven different aspects, corresponding to the seven conditions of matter. Strictly speaking there are six states of differentiated *propna*, the seventh state being a condition of perfect unconsciousness (or absolute consciousness). By differentiated *propna* I mean the condition in which *propna* is split up into various states of consciousness. Thus we have six states of consciousness, etc., etc." (*Five Years of Theosophy," pp. 200 and 201.) This is precisely our Trans-Himalayan Doctrine.
There are six Forces in nature: this is in Buddhism as in Brahmanism, whether exoteric or esoteric, and the seventh—the all-Force, or the absolute Force, which is the synthesis of all. Nature again in her constructive activity strikes the key-note to this classification in more than one way. As stated in the third aphorism of "Sankhya karika" of Parkriri—"the root and substance of all things," she (Parkriri, or nature) is no production, but herself a producer of seven things, "which, produced by her, become all in their turn producers." Thus all the liquids in nature begin, when separated from their parent mass, by becoming a spheroid (a drop); and when the globule is formed, and it falls, herself a to be formed squares or cubes as plane figures. Look at the natural work of nature, so to speak, her artificial, or helped production—the prying into her occult work-shop by science. Behold the coloured rings of a soap-bubble, and those produced by polarized light. The rings obtained, whether in Newton's soap-bubble, or in the crystal through the polarizer, will exhibit invariably, six or seven rings—a black spot surrounded by six rings, or a circle with a plane cube inside, circumscribed with six distinct rings, the circle itself the seventh. The "Noremberg" polarizing apparatus throws into objectivity almost all our occult geometrical symbols, though physicists are none the wiser for it. (See Newton's and Tyndall's experiments).*

The number seven is at the very root of occult Cosmogony and Anthropogony. No symbol to express evolution from its starting to its completion points would be possible without it. For the circle produces the point; the point expands into a triangle, returning after two angles upon itself, and then forms the mystical Tetraktis—the plane cube; which three when passing into the manifested world of effects, differentiated nature, become geometrically and numerically $3 + 4 = 7$. The best kabbalists have been demonstrating this for ages ever since Pythagora, and down to the modern mathematicians and symbolologists, one of whom has succeeded in wenching for ever one of the seven occult keys, and has proven his victory by a volume of figures. Set any of our theosophists interested in the question to read the wonderful work called "The Hebrew Egyptian Mystery, the Source of Measures," and those of them who are good mathematicians will remain aghast before the revelations contained in it. For it shows indeed that occult source of the measure by which were built kosmos and man, and then by the latter the great Pyramid of Egypt, as all the towers, mounds, obelisks, cave-temples of India, and pyramids in Peru and Mexico, and all the archaic monuments; symbols in stone of Chaldean, both Americas, and even of the Eastern Islands—the living and solitary witness of a submerged prehistoric continent in the midst of the Pacific Ocean. It shows that the same figures and measures for

* Of Newark, in his work The Quadrature of the Circle, his "problem of the three revolving bodies" (N. Y. John Wiley and Son.)
taken off on to the edges of the cube. The cube unfolded becomes in superficial display a cross proper, or of the tau form, and the attachment of the circle to this last, gives the anasated cross of the Egyptians with its obvious meaning of the Origin of Measures.* Because this kind of measure was also made to co-ordinate with the idea of the origin of life, it was made to assume the type of the hermaphrodite, and in fact it is placed by representation to cover this part of the human person in the Hindu form...” [It is “the hermaphrodite Indra Indra, the nature goddess, the Isso of the Hebrews, and the Isis of the Egyptians,” as the author calls them in another place.] “...It is very observable, that while there are but six faces to a cube, the representation of the cross as the cube unfolded as to the cross bars displays one face of the cube as common to two bars, counted as belonging to either; then, while the faces originally represented are but six, the use of the two bars counts the square as four for the upright and three for the cross bar, making seven in all. Here we have the famous four, three and seven again, the four and three on the factor members of the Parker (quadrature and of the “three revolving bodies”) problem”... (pp. 50 and 51)

And they are the factor members in the building of the Universe and Man. Wittoba,—an aspect of Krishna and Vishnu—is therefore the “man crucified in space”, or the “cube unfolded”, as explained (See Moore’s Pantheon, for Wittoba). It is the oldest symbol in India, now nearly lost, as the real meaning of Vishvakarina and Vikarktana (the “sun shorn of his beams”) is also lost. It is the Egyptian anasated cross, and vice versa, and the latter—even the sistrum, with its cross bars—is simply the symbol of the Deity as man—however phallic it may have become later, after the submersion of Atlantis. The anasated cross $\mathcal{T}$ is of course, as Professor Seyfforth has shown—again the six with its head—the seventh. Seyfforth says: “It is the skull with the brains, the seat of the soul with the nerves extending to the spine, back, and eyes and ears. For the Tanis stone thus translates it repeatedly by anthropos (man); and we have the Coptic ank, (vita, life) properly anima, which corresponds with the Hebrew anosh, properly meaning anima. The Egyptian anki signifies “my soul.”

It means in its synthesis, the seven principles, the details coming later. Now the anasated cross, as given above, having been discovered on the backs of the gigantic statues found on the Easter Isles (mid-Pacific Ocean) which is a part of the submerged continent; this remnant being described as “thickly studded with cyclopean statues, remnants of the civilization of a dense and cultivated people;”—and Mr. Subba Row having told us what he had found in the old Hindu books, namely, that the ancient Adept of India had learned occult powers from the Atlanteans (vide supra)—the logical inference is that they had their septenary division from them, just as our Adepts from the “Sacred Island” had. This ought to settle the question.

And this Tau cross is ever septenary, under whatever form—it has many forms, though the main idea is always one. What are the Egyptian ozas (the eyes), the amulets called the “mystic eye,” but symbols of the same? There are the four eyes in the upper row and the three smaller ones in the lower. Or again, the ozas with the seven luths hanging from it, “the combined melody of which creates one man,” say the hieroglyphics. Or again, the hexagon formed of six triangles, whose apices converge to a point—thus $\mathcal{X}$ the symbol of the Universal creation, which Kenneth Mackenzie tells us “was worn as a ring by the Sovereign Princes of the Royal Secret”—which they never knew by the bye. If seven has sought to do with the mysteries of the universe and men, then indeed from the Vedas down to the Bible all the archaic Scriptures—the Puranas, the Avesta and all the fragments that have reached us—have no esoteric meaning, and must be regarded as the orientalists regard them—as a farago of childish tales.

It is quite true that the three upadhis of the Taraka Raj Yoga as Mr. Subba Row explains in his little article “The Septenary Division in Different Indian Systems”, “the best and the simplest”—but only in purely contemplative Yoga. And he adds: “Though there are seven principles in man there are but three distinct upadhis, in each of which his Atma may work independently of the rest. These three upadhis can be separated by the Adept without killing himself. He cannot separate the seven principles from each other without destroying his constitution” (“Five years of Theosophy,” p. 189). Most decidedly he cannot. But this again holds good only with regard to his lower three principles—the body and its (in life) inseparable prana and linga savira. The rest can be separated, as they constitute no vital, but rather a mental and spiritual necessity. As to the remark in the same article objecting to the fourth principle being “included in the third kosa, as the said principle is but a vehicle of will-power, which is but an energy of the mind.” I answer! Just so. But as the higher attributes of the fifth (Manas), go to make up the original triad, and it is just the terrestrial energies, feelings and volitions which remain in the Kama loka, what, is the vehicle, the astral form, to carry them about as bhoota until they fade out—which may take centuries to accomplish? Can the “false” personality, or the pisaka, whose ego is made up precisely of all those terrestrial passions and feelings, remain in Kama loka, and occasionally appear, without a substantial vehicle, however ethereal? Or are we to give up the seven principles, and the belief that there is such a thing as an astral body, and a bhoot, or spook?

*And, by adding to the cross proper $\mathcal{T}$ the symbol of the four cardinal points and infinity at the same time, thus $\mathcal{T}_p$, the arms pointing above, below, and right, and left, making six in the circle—the Archaeisign of the Yonma—it would make of it the Swastika, the “sacred sign” used by the order of “Ismael masons”, which they call the Universal Hermetic Cross, and do not understand its real wisdom, nor know its origin.

† Quoted in “Source of Measures.”
Most decidedly not. For Mr. Subba Row himself once more explains how, from the Hindu standpoint, the lower fifth, or Mansa can re-appear after death, remarking very justly, that it is absurd to call it a disembodied spirit. "Five Years of Theosophy," p. 174.)

As he says, "It is merely a power or force, retaining the impressions of the thoughts or ideas of the individual into whose composition it originally entered. It sometimes summons to its aid the Kamarupa power, and creates for itself some particular, etherial form."

Now that "which sometimes summons" Kamarupa, and the "power" of that name make already two principles, two "powers"—call them as you will. Then we have Atma and its vehicle—Buddhi—which make four. With the three which disappeared on earth this will be equivalent to seven. How can we, then, speak of modern Spiritualism, of its materializations and other phenomena, without resorting to the Septenary.

To quote our friend and much respected brother for the last time, since he says that "our (Aryan) philosophers have associated seven occult powers with the seven principles (in men and in the cosmos), which seven occult powers correspond in the microcosm with, or are counterpart parts of, occult powers in the macrocosm," quite an esoteric sentence—it does seem almost a pity, that words pronounced in an extemporaneous lecture, though such an able one, should have been published without revision.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

REVIEWS.

LECTURES BY GERALD MASSEY.

The first of these lectures shows that the historical Jesus or rather Jehoshua Ben Pandira lived between 180 B.C. and 70 B.C., and that he was not the person whose life is related in the Gospels, but that these are in reality another version of the Egyptian Myths. Mr. Massey says, "The Christian religion was not founded on a man, but on a divinity; that is, a mythical character. So far from being derived from the model man, the typical Christ was made up from the features of various gods, after a fashion somewhat like those "pictorial averages" portrayed by Mr. Galton, in which the traits of several persons are photographed and fused into a portrait of a dozen different persons, merged into one that is not anybody. And as fast as the composite Christ falls to pieces, each feature is claimed, each character is gathered up by the original owner, as with the grasp of gravitation.

"It is not I that deny the divinity of Jesus the Christ; I assert it! He never was, and never could be, anything other than a divinity; that is, a character non-human and entirely mythical, who had been the pagan divinity of various pagan myths, that had been pagan during thousands of years before our era." Mr. Massey gives a number of instances of correspondence between the narratives of the gospels and the legends of the old gods of the heathen.

* "Brahmanism on the Sevenfold Principle in Man."

4 Lectures by Gerald Massey: 1, The Historical (Jewish) Jesus and the Mythical (Egyptian) Christ. 2, Paul as a Gnostic opponent not the Apostle of the Christian Religion. 3, The Logia of the L. c., or the Pre-Christian Sayings ascribed to Jesus the Christ. 4, The Devil of Darkness or Evil in the Light of Evolution.

THE BLAZING STAR.*

The Blazing Star is the six-pointed star that is one of the emblems on the seal of the Theosophical Society, and it has many meanings, some of which are set forth in the book before us. Mr. Greene says that the "Ideal of what we ought to be, and are not, is symbolically pictured in

The Blazing Star... "Whoso beholds this Star acquires faith. Faith is conviction born from the consciousness of aspiration. Faith is the active principle of intellectual progress.

"The Blazing Star is the transfigured image of man—the ideal that removes farther and farther, making always higher and higher claims, until, at last, it becomes lost in infinity; and faith affirms that this same Blazing Star may be, perhaps, the shadowy, imperfect, and inadequate image of some unknown and invisible God."

The writer mentions the use of this symbol among various nations and shows that it is represented by the Freemasons by a junction of the square and compasses. His main theme is, however, the ethical aspect of the symbol as a type of life in conformity with the one Divine law.

"Man's duty to himself and to his fellow-man, under the rays of the Blazing Star, is three-fold: (1) the achievement of his own liberty; (2) the definitive establishment of relations of equality between himself and other men; and (3) the fusion of himself, in the solidarity of Brotherhood, with all human beings who, like himself, recognize the Blazing Star.

"Liberty is the power which every human being ought to possess of acting according to the dictates of his own private conscience, under the rays of that Blazing Star which is seen by him secretly, from the centre of his individual heart.

"Equality is the condition that obtains in every society where no special or artificial privilege is granted to any one, or to any set, of its members. Brotherhood is that strict solidarity between the members of a social body, which causes, under the rays of the Blazing Star, the welfare of each to be seen as involved in that of every other, and of all, and that of all in that of each."

It is the harmonious action and interaction of these three fundamental principles upon which the ideal human society, according to the writer, rests. And it is these three principles that are symbolized, he says, in the Blazing Star.

The Appendix gives a brief account of the Kabbala and the philosophy therein set forth, as regarded from the ethical point of view. According to Mr. Greene, the synthetic triad of the Sephiroths is Wisdom, Strength, and Beauty.

A second appendix is taken up with an examination of the facts of consciousness with special reference to the philosophy of Mr. Herbert Spencer.

Although, as it seems to us, the author touches on only one side of the great problem, his book will be read with interest and profit by all; for however much we may philosophize, the grand question is what we are and not merely what we think or believe.

The New Illumination.

This pamphlet, a paper read before the Hermetic Society, has for its subject, the spiritual renaissance that seems to many to be manifesting itself in the thought of the day. The writer has summarised the theories in support of which he writes under these seven heads:

1. That from a certain remote period there has been in course of development among the Western races of our planet a certain faculty, and in course of unfoldment a certain system of thought which only...
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STUDIES IN BUDDHISM.

(Continued from page 390.)

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