

THE
THEOSOPHICAL
REVIEW

VOL. XL

JUNE, 1907

No. 238

ON THE WATCH-TOWER

FRENCH Protestantism is taking Theosophy seriously. *Le Témoignage* is apparently the most important organ of the largest

Protestant body in Paris (L'Église de la Confession d'Augsbourg) numbering some twenty churches.

French
Protestantism and
Theosophy

In its issue of April 19th it prints a summary of an important official address (Conférence Pastorale Générale) delivered by M. le Pasteur Chazel, at La Maison Consistoriale de l'Oratoire, of which we append the following translation:

The importance and actuality of the subject will escape no one. Theosophy, in fact, is recruiting an ever-increasing number of adherents, and the day is within sight when we shall have to count seriously with it.

The Theosophical Society was founded by a Russian, Mme. H. P. Blavatsky. Numerous Branches of this Society were organised rapidly in every country of the world. At Paris there is a large and very active membership.

The object aimed at by Mme. Blavatsky, and, after her death, by Mrs. Annie Besant, was a reaction against the materialism which was professed in the second half of the nineteenth century, and has caused so much ruin in the world. "Science without religion or religion without science" was the

fashionable formula. Theosophy has desired to reconcile these two contradictions, to throw a bridge across the division of science and religion, by spreading in the world a knowledge of Aryan psychology, and by bringing about the synthesis, the fusion of all religions, of all philosophies, or rather by taking in all religions and philosophies the elements suitable to form an "esoteric philosophy."

This doctrine has its basis in the immediate revelations of "Initiates." These Initiates are great souls who have renounced the blessed life they enjoyed in heaven to descend into incarnation among men. It is for love of those in misery that these great souls have abandoned heaven for earth. The Buddha, Confucius, Jesus, Laotzü are numbered by Theosophists among these great beings, these Initiates. That is to say, in their view, the Divine revelation is not limited to a precise moment in history, but that it continues and will continue until the world has attained its highest stage of perfection, that is to say until it is entirely refunded into God.

The essential principles of Theosophy may be reduced to three great truths: the Spiritual Unity of all beings or Fraternity; the Law of Causation—called Karma in India; and Evolution effected by successive Reincarnations.

By the law of Spiritual Unity it is to be understood that we are equal at the beginning and at the end; the Divine fragment, which is the germ whence our souls are developed, is a portion of God; we are more than brethren, we are all facets of one and the same gem, parts of the same whole. Whoever works for others, works for Self; whoever, thinking himself separate from others, works for self, labours for nought, for separating oneself from the body of humanity is devoting oneself to isolation, to destruction; the branch that is separated from the tree withers and dies.

Karma is the law of retribution, of which the Apostle Paul, according to Theosophists, meant to give the formula: "That which a man sows, he shall reap."

It is, however, evident that perfect knowledge and conduct cannot be achieved in the course of a single earthly existence. Karma then would not be sufficient to explain life if it were not closely associated with the law of Reincarnation which attributes to the same being a number of successive existences in the course of which he will be able, if he so will, to reach perfection.

* * *

THIS is a very fair summary of some of the more popular conceptions brought forward by the present Theosophical Movement; and though many of us would present our exposition of them in more carefully chosen terms and phrases, we cannot but thank M. Chazel for his fairness. The criticisms that he offered

The Main
Objection of M.
Chazel

are mainly directed against the psychic side of our researches, of which the following picture presents itself to him :

In the first place Theosophists invent history, in the sense that instead of confining themselves to the consultation of documents furnished by history, they evoke the great souls¹ and obtain from them revelations of the greatest phantasy. This evocation of spirits leads them quite naturally into spiritistic aberrations of a very dangerous nature, into what may be termed metaphysical hallucinations, which have to do more with the domain of pathology than anything else.

Briefly, all theosophic lucubrations of this kind have no other object than to answer the agonising questions which man asks concerning the hereafter.

The dangers we know only too well ; but there is need of daring in order to win to knowledge. We believe in the possibility of knowledge, and we already well know the risks but they need not dismay us, if only we stand upright. M. Chazel, however, is more than agnostic on this point ; he has the courage to put forward a universal negative when he declares :

Now there is no occult science of the invisible ; there is only the faith of the child and of the sage in Jesus Christ.

That is the old cry : There is no Gnosis, only Faith. That is : The reconciliation of Science and Religion is impossible !

* * *

THE lecturer then proceeded to tell us why he comes to this conclusion. The test he applies is purely material, showing that he here follows well in the steps of that

The False Basis Protestantism which threw back to popular Judaism and, while in complete ignorance of the Gnosis, at the same time forgot much of the spiritual teaching of the Master. M. Chazel continued :

As to the practical result of all these esoteric doctrines, it is easy to notice them in the case of the Hindus : no science, no history, no clear insight of nature, nothing but dreams, no social organisation,—what is the good of it all ? Moreover, India finds herself at the mercy of the first conqueror.

The lecturer had doubtless to be dependent on the books on Theosophy in French, and as yet we have little written on the great Western traditions of the Wisdom in that language.

¹ This is news to most of us.—G. R. S. M.

What, however, M. Chazel and many another critic do not understand, is that there are many in the Theosophical Society who are eager to learn from the experience of the past, and to take care that Theosophy in its present manifestation shall become the most practical thing in life, so practical that it shall reform all things.

The most pleasant remark we have to make is that the lecturer and the subsequent speakers acknowledged generously that the members of our Society were really striving to get at the truth, for the report of the meeting says :

We would only remark on the respect and sympathy with which the lecturer spoke of Theosophy and its adherents, who, from many points of view, deserve the most legitimate praises. M. Chazel was even able to impress upon his audience a lively feeling of finding himself in the presence of a manifestation of a very real and very intense spiritual life.

This was brought out by other speakers, especially by M. le Pasteur J. Monnier, an intimate friend of our colleagues the Blechs, who apparently knew how to distinguish between Theosophy and Spiritism.

* * *

WE should like to associate ourselves strongly with the following appeal of Miss Kate Spink, who has laboured so untiringly in all that concerns the two volumes of *Transactions*

The *Transactions* of the first two Congresses of the Federated European Sections. It would be a very great pity that the further publication of these valuable issues should fail from lack of funds. Every Lodge library should possess a copy; they are admirable to lend, especially to outsiders, for they are an excellent object-lesson to give people a wider view of what we may call catholic Theosophy. Miss Spink writes :

I should like to call attention to the fact, which seems to have been generally forgotten, namely, that the continued existence of the *Transactions* depends entirely on the financial support given by members of the Society. Unless during the next few months the sales of this volume show that members are taking a greater interest in the publication than they have hitherto done it will have to be discontinued. The Publishers should at any rate feel that they can count on the support of the Lodges—were every Lodge library to purchase a copy it would go far towards making the undertaking a success.

PERHAPS our readers may think that one of the editors is somewhat too keen on ancient MSS. This may be so. We all have our hobbies, however, and one of the hobbies of one of the watch "On the Watch-Tower" is to spy out all indications of fresh sources that may throw light on what the old faiths really were when they were still in touch with their original inspiration. It is a harmless hobby at any rate, and it may be that some day it may be thought, even by the most extreme phenomenologists in the Theosophical Society, not to have been unuseful. We are indebted to *The Standard* of April 2nd for the following :

On the Track of
Ancient Christian
MSS.

It is just possible that a very interesting discovery of ancient manuscripts will presently be made, says the *Calcutta Englishman*. As one result of the Amir's visit to Calcutta attention has been directed towards a small community of Christians from Armenia who had been living in Kabul for very many generations. These people in the time of the late Amir Abdur Rahman had dwindled down to ten families. They were, for reasons unknown, banished to Peshawar, and brought down with them a collection of manuscripts said to be of immense antiquity. Indeed they are so old that none of the families possessing them are able to read them. It appears that the priesthood had died out amongst these Christians in Kabul, and the community was too remote to be able to get priests from elsewhere. Hence the neglect of the sacred writings. In the traditional history of Armenia reference is made to an "Afghan" country where the early Christians found a refuge from persecution. It has been hitherto thought that by "Afghan" country was meant the mountainous regions of Georgia, but it would be strange indeed if it were now discovered that it was in Kabul, supposed for so many years to be the very centre of fanaticism, that the flame of the Christian faith was kept alive when it was being ruthlessly trampled out elsewhere. In any case an examination by experts of the manuscripts now said to be in Peshawar should yield some valuable results. The families themselves are unaware of the history of the first settlement in Kabul, except that it dates back to the very earliest times.

* * *

THE exceedingly able article of our colleague, Mr. A. M. Glass, in our last issue, in which he lucidly discussed the most recent views of Professor Thomson on the systematic structure of the atom, made our readers acquainted with the technical difficulties that have to be

Atomic Astrology

overcome by the specialist before he is in a position to speak with any certainty on the *modus* of the endless possibilities which the new methods of the finer analysis of matter are daily opening up. It must not, however, be supposed that Professor Thomson's article has finally proved anything; but it should be taken rather as indicative of a wave of reaction against too elaborate speculation. In a review of Sir Oliver Lodge's last book (*Electrons; or, the Nature and Properties of Negative Electricity*), *The Athenæum*, of March 2nd, contains the following paragraph, which is of interest in the above connection:

The author discusses the three modes of electric conduction, which he calls, *more suo*, the bird-seed, the bullet, and the fire-bucket methods, and which he assigns to conduction in liquids, rarefied gases, and solids respectively, and here he is on fairly solid ground. But when he touches upon the movement or vibration of the electric units within the atom, he gets into what he characteristically calls atomic astronomy, and his views become much more theoretical. Thus he lets us see that his opinion is in favour of the view that electrical inertia must depend in some fashion on speed; that no inertia and no mass exist except the electrical—or, what is the same thing, that matter consists entirely of electrons—and that it is impossible for charged matter to move with greater speed than that of light. Yet in all this he plainly states that he is giving what is merely a speculative opinion or conjecture from the facts hitherto ascertained, and he resists all tendency to pontifical assertion or to declare his own speculations to be of faith. With regard to the structure of the atom, as to which much has been said in this journal (see especially Nos. 4039 and 4041), he gives, without avowing partiality for any one of them, the five views of the matter which he declares to be current, and refuses to discuss Prof. J. J. Thomson's floating-magnet analogy at length, because he thinks it knocked on the head by its author's pronouncement, in the midsummer of last year, that the hydrogen atom contains only one active electron, and that all other elements contain a number of electrons comparable to their atomic weight, reckoned on the basis that $H=1$. It seems a little doubtful to the present writer whether Prof. Thomson's article in *The Philosophical Magazine* of June, 1906, really bears this construction; but none can deny that this paper has tended, in Sir Oliver Lodge's words, "to reduce the whole subject to a state of exaggerated uncertainty."

* * *

M. EDOUARD NAVILLE, in charge of the Egypt Exploration Fund excavations at Deir el Bahari, has had a rare "find." He

A Subterranean
Sanctuary at Thebes

suggests that it is a "sanctuary"—whatever that may mean precisely. We would ourselves venture, with all respect to M. Naville, a little further, and suggest that we have in this subterranean shrine a true *adytum*, the nature of which is so well brought out in the narrative portion of "The Perfect Sermon" of the Trismegistic literature. We take M. Naville's account from *The Times*, of April 9th.

The temple of the XIth Dynasty, discovered three years ago, has a peculiar form which at present is unique. It consists of a rock-platform to which access is given by a ramp. In the middle is a square mass of building which originally had a casing of white limestone; it probably is the basement of a pyramid, towering above a columned hall, for there are rows of columns on all sides. But the temple extends a great deal further back, towards the lofty rocks forming a majestic circle at the end of the valley of Deir el Bahari. The clearing of this part has been the work of the last weeks of 1906, and of this campaign.

We first met with an open court lined on both sides with a single colonnade; further we found remains of a hypostyle hall not yet completely excavated, but where we can trace already seventy-two columns of the so-called protodoric style, and bearing the name of Neb-hepet-Ra Mentuhetep.

In the open court which we reached last year we stopped at the entrance of a sloping passage extending down below the pavement, and the door of which was obstructed by heaps of enormous stones and rubbish. We left the clearing of it for this year. We entered it a fortnight ago. It is a well cut rock tunnel, which goes down quite straight for 150 mètres (about 500ft.). On more than half of its length it is vaulted; two sandstone blocks leaning against each other at the top, and cut in the form of an arch, rest on the rock and on walls of dry stones erected on both sides. Except at the entrance, where there was a pile of stones, the passage was free. Between the two walls there was a path sufficiently wide for a man to go down.

At the end of the tunnel there is a room of granite made of big blocks extremely well joined, like the chambers in the pyramids. The door was blocked by a stone. One might have expected that this chamber was a tomb, but it seems clear that it had a different purpose. The greatest part of it is occupied by a great alabaster shrine, made of large blocks of that beautiful stone. Except a cornice and a moulding, it has no sculpture or ornament of any kind. The ceiling is made of an enormous monolithic red granite slab, over which comes again alabaster.

This shrine was empty except for a few well cut black granite stones, which were part of a casing inserted between the shrine and the walls of the chamber. In my opinion this shrine was a sanctuary; it was the abode of the *ka*, as the Egyptians called the double or the image of the King, which

was represented by a statue now destroyed. In front of the shrine there was a heap of broken wooden figures, fragments of furniture, and a quantity of cloth in which must have been wrapped offerings, or perhaps mummified animals, also a few small pieces of bones said to be human. But there was no trace of a wooden or stone coffin, no definite evidence of a burial. That is the reason why I consider this shrine as a sanctuary. This agrees with a decree found on a large stele at the entrance of the passage, in which a successor of Mentuhetep, of the following dynasty, orders that for what he calls "the cave of Mentuhetep" should be provided every day food and drink, and whenever a bull should be slaughtered in the great temple of Amon, roast meat should be brought to that cave. These offerings are those of a god or of the King adored as such ; they are not funerary.

It must have been a place where priests had frequently to descend, since an arch was made over the passage evidently after the chamber and shrine had been finished. There would have been no reason for arching a passage leading to a closed funereal chamber.

The shrine, which is 3 mètres 50 long, 2m. 25 wide, and 2m. 50 high, is striking by its fine architecture, and the beautiful material out of which it is made. It would be extremely difficult to remove it to a museum. It would be an expensive work, also somewhat dangerous. Besides, in a large hall it would by no means produce the same effect as it does in its subterranean granite chamber. It will remain for the present in its deep hiding place. The passage will be closed by a door, so that people specially interested in Egyptian architecture may reach it ; for it is not advisable for tourists to go in, nor would they much enjoy it.

As it is, it has added a new feature to the temple of the XIth Dynasty, which has been so rich in unexpected architectural discoveries. The platform, the pyramid issuing out of a colonnade, the hypostyle hall, the subterranean sanctuary, form a whole of a nature quite unique among Egyptian temples.

IN THE BEGINNINGS

MANY creatures arose with double faces and double breasts, offspring of oxen with human faces, and again there sprang up children of men with oxen's heads ; creatures, too, in which were mixed some parts from men and some of the nature of women, furnished with sterile members.—EMPEDOCLES.

THE LXIVTH CHAPTER OF THE "BOOK OF THE DEAD"

I.

I HAVE found in my study of the *Book of the Dead* that the headings of its Chapters as an invariable rule form one of the best keys to their general contents. A considerable number of these Chapters, however, bear the title of "Chapters of Coming-forth by Day"; that is to say, the Egyptian expression PR M ḤRU is usually so rendered into English, and the consequence of such a translation is that in the case of these Chapters there does not appear to be any very exact contact between Chapter and heading. We have, therefore, to reverse the process of decipherment, and seek in the Chapters for some clue to the interpretation of the heading. To illustrate this I have chosen the LXIVth Chapter—the oldest by common consent, the most important in ancient belief, of all the Chapters in this prehistoric Book; the most important, because it was believed to be equivalent to all the other Chapters of "Coming-forth by Day" rolled up into one single Chapter.

As this is probably the oldest Chapter, so it is of them all the most bruised and battered by the hands of time and the copyist. I shall, therefore, in the first place say something about the work of production of the translation I am giving with this paper.

I have taken it mainly from the Papyrus of Nebseni (B.M. 9900, sheet 24), which is that chosen by Professor Budge as his example of the long version, for publication in his "Text of the Theban Recension"; the short version in the same collection is that of NU. (B.M. 10477, sheet 18.) Both these transcriptions I have compared with the original papyri, and in addition made a transcription for myself of the short version, as given by Nebseni on sheet 23.

This has given me three separate hieroglyphic texts, and formed my first line of research; the second line was found in the collection from foreign papyri published in 1873 by Paul Guieyese of the LXIVth Chapter. This collection consists of copies of the Chapter taken from the following papyri: Louvre 3092 and 3079; the Turin papyrus, and a papyrus in the Bibliothèque Nationale; he also made notes of variant readings from Louvre 3248 and 3145, a papyrus at Basle, and an unnamed papyrus.

By far the most important, however, are the two versions as given by Nebseni. They are believed to be in his own handwriting, written, not as by one paid to reproduce, but with some effort and desire to understand what was written.

The Chapter, as I have intimated, is continually found in two versions, whose main differences are almost always similar. The one is merely a traditional shortened form of the other; and in translating I have not confined myself to the long version only, but wherever the two run parallel I have used what appeared to me to be the best form of any individual sentence in whichsoever it might be found. In one instance, and in one instance only, I have taken a sentence out from one part of the Chapter where it was an evident anachronism resulting from some ancient slip of the pen, and have replaced it in its proper context. Beyond this I have chosen those variants that appealed to me as giving the clearest rendering; always noting in the margin the papyrus from which any variant rendering has been taken.

During the work of comparison between the various texts I was struck with the idea that the work of Nebseni showed signs of some attempt to straighten out words and sentences, and so free his text to some extent from the corruptions of the ages; but, strange to say, the attempt seems to be only half-hearted. The question therefore arises: Why, when he was about it, did he not do it thoroughly?

It is evident that he was an educated man, as the following quotation from Prof. Budge's description of the papyrus will show:

"It is probably the oldest known papyrus inscribed with the Theban Recension of the *Book of the Dead*, . . . about B.C. 1600. . . . The whole papyrus is most carefully written, and is, it would seem, the work of Nebseni himself.

"As an authority for the text of the Theban Recension it takes very high rank, and the Chapters which M. Naville selected from it for his edition of the *Book of the Dead* form one-third of the entire number which he has printed. . . . Nebseni was by profession a scribe, and he held various offices connected with the architect and surveyor's department attached to the Temple of Ptah at Memphis, and he was in the immediate service of 'the Lord of the two Lands,' his King."

It is commonly held that these Chapters were, at the date of the Theban Recension, to a great extent forgotten,—that is to say, as to their meaning,—that in fact they were merely revered for their age, and in superstition. To me this conception of them appears to be untenable; we have certainly in our own days a by no means unknown example of the mystery-tradition, whereof, for the vast majority of its followers, the deeper meaning is acknowledged to be lost. But that by no means suggests that all meaning is lost; indeed, from many points of view there are meanings plain and evident, and from no point of view can the tradition in question be called nonsense or rubbish. Now it is evident from an incident, mentioned also by Prof. Budge in his preface to the *Book of the Dead*, that down to the latest times, long after the practical disappearance of the Book from the rites of burial, MS. editions could readily be found, when they were wanted, even of the very earliest texts, which had apparently ceased to exist long before the incident in question; that is, the discovery of a coffin made about the end of the second century of our era and containing texts of the Heliopolitan or oldest Recension known to us.

It seems to me therefore quite possible that Nebseni may have known the true form of the Chapter in question; but if so, why did he not give it in his writing? Perhaps we may find a possible explanation in the known methods of mystical organisations both ancient and modern.

So carefully were the secrets of the Mysteries guarded in ancient Egypt that I suppose no source of definite information has descended to us. All is guess, patchwork and speculation.

We may also guess that the Jews had their esoteric teaching

and hidden mysteries; but their secrets have been well kept. Of Eleusis also how much do we really know?

The methods of the Keepers of the Mysteries have been much the same in all ages. To give an example of the conclusions arrived at by one writer on these matters. Dr. Westcott in his commentary on the *Sepher Yetzirah* (Chap. iv.) says:

“The true attribution is, however, not anywhere printed. . . . The Seven Heavens and the Seven Earths are printed with errors, and I believe intentional mistakes, in many occult ancient books. Private Hermetic MSS. alone have the correct names and spelling.”

In fact, to sum up this digression, which is more of appearance than reality, for it will be found to work into the general chain of argument; it is not easy, Egyptologically, to realise that the ancient mystic lore of Egypt was officially recognised up till *circa* 500 A.D.; and how much longer it may have been preserved and handed on in unofficial secrecy, but still in the best of all senses (the spiritual sense) intact, is now probably past the power of man to discover. It is also generally believed that in those days to betray, or even risk the betrayal of the Mysteries to the profane meant suffering the penalty meet for the offence.

There is no need to enter into any discussion to show that the *Book of the Dead* was, so far as its contents go, an integral part of the Mysteries; I believe that is generally conceded. It is also conceded that those Mysteries were religious mysteries; in short, that they exemplified and taught each successive generation of initiates the esoteric religion and wisdom of Egypt.

There are certain things in this universe of change, of decay and renewal, which for all purposes, at least of everyday experience, may be said to remain unaltered and unalterable for countless generations of human existence. Such are the relative position of the fixed stars; such also is human nature, the joys, sorrows, passions, longings and needs of the human soul. Is there from age to age, so far as we can reckon historic periods, any essential variation in man's spiritual need? Does the Great Quest change? Is there ever a time when man is not the Reason, when God is not the End, when the Great Secret is to be found elsewhere than with the Mystic Centre?

Why is it that in our search for the One Religion we make our text-book all religions, and the religions of all time? Is it not because we have realised at least the probability that when they have given us their final secrets, those secrets will be but One Secret? Can we not even now give a name to that Secret by a form of words, however inadequately? Is it not the reintegration of man in God? Is it not the Mystery of the Master? Though we may not yet know that Mystery experimentally, surely we are not ignorant of the symbolism forming as it were the surface of the sphere to which the Mystery itself is Centre?

We have the mystery-traditions of many lands; we have the utterances of seer and prophet; we have the teachings of a grand procession of masters passing down through all the ages; so that, in fine, it is in all senses and on all planes true, that the real mystic of to-day is in very deed the child and heir of all those that have gone before.

Because in every age men have essayed the great experiment, in every age men have succeeded in accomplishing the great transmutation; and always, from the dim past on through the centuries, the furnace, the crucible, the materials, the stages and tests of the Great Work have remained the same; in matters small, indeed, have been the variations, that is to say, so far as the practice is concerned and the theory. All that ever alters to any material extent, is the verbal symbols and terms by which the experiment is described. Yet even in these it is hardly possible to go so far astray but that the student may recognise the sequence of events.

A fragment of the mysteries is therefore to the mystic still a fragment of the mysteries; and though it be very small and very broken, it should yet be possible to replace it correctly in its setting.

As an assistance, therefore, to a clear conception of the place in the mysteries of that fragment known as the LXIVth Chapter of the *Book of the Dead*, I will give some quotations from writers dealing with the same idea at various and widely differing times and places.

In order that the coincidence of subject may be the more apparent, I have refrained from any classification, and present

them in the order in which they presented themselves to me.

I. *Autobiography of Al-Ghazzali*, a Persian theologian, who ranks as a very learned doctor of the Mahommedân religion, circa 1200 A.D.,¹:

“The first condition for a Sûfi is to purge his heart entirely of all that is not God. The next key of the contemplative life consists in the humble prayers which escape from the fervent soul, and in the meditations on God in which the heart is swallowed up completely. . . . The intuitions and all that precede are, so to speak, only the threshold for those who enter. From the beginning revelations take place. . . . Then the transport rises from the perception of forms and figures to a degree which escapes all expression, and which no man may seek to give an account of without his words involving sin. . . . If you were to tell a man without experience . . . of such a phenomenon that there are people who at times swoon away so as to resemble dead men, and who yet perceive things that are hidden, he would deny it.”

II. India, 1896 (Vivekânanda):

“All the different steps in yoga are intended to bring us scientifically to the super-conscious state. . . . Then the Truth shines in its full effulgence, and we know ourselves . . . for what we truly are, free, immortal, omnipotent, loosed from the finite, . . . identical with the . . . Universal Soul.”

III. Germany, 1900 (*Memoirs of an Idealist*):

“I was alone upon the seashore . . .; I was impelled to kneel down, this time before the illimitable ocean, symbol of the Infinite. I felt that I prayed as I had never prayed before, and knew what prayer really is; to return from the solitude of individuation into the consciousness of unity with all that is, to kneel down as one that passes away, and to rise up as one imperishable.”

IV. Ceylon, 1902 (*An Eastern Exposition of the Gospel of Jesus according to St. John*, Shri Parânananda):

“When one in deep yoga recedes from sense perception and

¹ I., II. and III. are from the quotations in *The Varieties of Religious Experience* by W. James.

thought, the spirit suddenly manifests itself limitlessly in glory."

V. *The Chaldean Oracles*, date unknown (from the *Collectanea Hermetica*, W. Wynn Westcott, M.B., D.P.H.).

"If thou often invokest, thou shalt see all things growing dark; and then when no longer is visible unto thee the high-arched Vault of Heaven, when the Stars have lost their light and the lamp of the Moon is veiled, the Earth abideth not, and around thee darts the lightning flame. . . . From the cavities of the Earth leap forth the terrestrial dog-faced demons showing no true sign unto mortal man. . . .

"Also there is the vision of the fire-flashing Courser of Light, or also a Child . . .; then if thy meditation prolongeth itself, thou shalt unite all these symbols into the form of a Lion. . . .

"When thou shalt behold that holy and formless Fire shining flashingly through the depths of the universe; hear thou the Voice of Fire!"

VI. I *Kings*, xix. 8 :

"And he arose, and ate and drank; and he went in the strength of that food forty days and forty nights, to Horeb [*i.e.*, the Desolate Place], the mountain of God. And there he went into the cave, and lodged there; . . . and behold the Lord passed by; and a great and strong wind rent the mountain; . . . [but] the Lord was not in the wind. And after the wind an earthquake; . . . and after the earthquake a fire; . . . and after the fire a still small voice."

VII. England, 1662 (*The Holy Guide*, by John Heydon; quoted by A. E. Waite in his appendix of additional documents to *The Real History of the Rosicrucians*):

"There is a mountain situated in the midst of the *earth* or *centre* of the *world*, which is both *small* and *great*. It is soft, also above measure hard and strong.

"It is *far off* and *near at hand*; but, by the Providence of God, it is invisible.

"This mountain, by the envy of the devil, is compassed about with very cruel beasts and ravenous birds, which make the way thither both difficult and dangerous; and, therefore, hither-

to, because the time is not yet come, the way thither could not be sought after by all, but only by the worthy man's self-labour and investigation.

"To this *mountain* you shall go in a *certain night*, when it comes most long and dark, and see that you *prepare* yourself by *prayer*. *Insist* upon the *way* that leads to the *mountain*, but ask not of any man where it lies; only follow your *guide*, who will *offer* himself to you, and will meet you in the way.

"This guide will bring you to the mountain at *midnight*, when all things are silent and dark.

"It is necessary that you arm yourself with a resolute heroic courage, lest you fear those things that will happen, and fall back.

"You need no sword or other bodily weapon, only call upon your God, *sincerely and heartily seeking Him*.

"When you have discovered the mountain, the first miracle that will appear is this—a most vehement and very great wind will *shake* the whole *mountain* and shatter the *rocks* to pieces. You will be encountered by lions, dragons, and other terrible wild beasts; but fear not any of these things. Be resolute and take heed that you return not, for your guide who brought you thither will not suffer any evil to befall you.

"As for the *treasure*, it is not yet discovered, but it is very near. After this wind will come an earthquake, which will overthrow those things which the wind had left. Be sure you fall not off. The *earthquake* being passed, there shall follow a *fire* that will consume the earthly rubbish and discover the treasure, but as yet you cannot see it.

"After all these things, and near daybreak, there shall be a great *calm*, and you shall see the *day-star* arise, and the darkness will disappear.

"You will *conceive* a great treasure; the chiefest thing and the most perfect is a certain exalted tincture, with which the world, if it served God and were worthy of such gifts, might be tinged and turned into *most pure gold*."

VIII. England, 1902. (*A Book of Mystery and Vision*, by A. E. Waite) :

Thou hast sought in the city and desert,
Thou hast sought in the height and deep,

And the goal to win is not found therein ;
 But a certain trance and sleep,
 'Twixt space and time, gives issue
 By a wonderful path and lone,
 Leading keen and straight to a mystical gate,
 And beyond that gate it is known.

It is known the end and the vision,
 Which is neither to east nor west,
 And the north cannot tell it, nor the sweet south spell it,
 But the end of the path is rest.

The high thoughts reel and waver,
 And sense in that realm untrod
 Light cinctures melted long since unbelted,
 But the end of the path is God !

There can be but few mystical students who will not recognise in all these quotations more or less direct references to one thing, and one thing only,—that great experiment wherein if a man shall succeed he shall attain his end as man. Many are the terms of description, but in all ages the path has been the same, the methods similar, and the end of the path is God.

To sum up: There is an ancient Path, and it is called "Aspiration after God"; this Path leads to a mysterious Gate, symbolically said to be flanked by two vast Pillars, between which lies the way, and also, so far as man, as man, is concerned, the end. An enemy stands on guard before the Gate; this is he who "shows no true image to mortal gaze." His forms are infinitely various; to the evil man aspiring to pass through this Gate he shows himself in forms of horror, to the good in forms so fair that often the attention is distracted and the true end, at least for the time being, lost. To conquer this foe is to succeed in the experiment so far that, as the LXIVth Chapter puts it, the Initiate finds himself in the "Chamber of those two Nurses, even the Twin Lions." This condition is usually symbolised by the term "Death." Once in this chamber all that can be done is to wait. "I am" must complete the work; and of that completion "no man may speak without his words involving sin."

While translating the LXIVth Chapter, it became more and more evident that this Chapter is a grand symbolic record of the final act of the mind in the conquest of its material limitations.

In spite of all corruptions, all difficulties of text and language, the various stages of the Great Experiment can still be traced, though in the Egyptian text there is no break, pause, or descriptive word to mark the different stages.

M. W. BLACKDEN.

(TO BE CONCLUDED)

THE MEANING OF MÂYÂ

I FEAR that a re-perusal of Mr. Orage's interesting article "In Defence of Agnosticism," has but left me with the conviction that he and I use the same words in different senses, and that no agreement is possible between us. In fact, Mr. Orage seems to have studied Nietzsche to such purpose that his only method of expressing his meaning is to clothe it in a paradox. Of course, I may be wrong, and he may only be "aphorising" (to use an expression of Coleridge's) in his playful Nietzschean way, and laughing at us in his sleeve all the while. But in case there may be other readers of this REVIEW who have been taken in as well as myself, may I ask him, as he has recently asked Mr. Sedlák, to condescend to our lack of imagination, and tell us, "as a pure and lucid thinker," exactly what he means.

For Mr. Orage does not always write in paradoxes. I have been reading lately with much pleasure and profit his charming booklet on Nietzsche, and could understand it quite easily. Here, then, is one of the hard sayings I should like explained. Mr. Orage tells us that the expression "Agnostic Theosophy," which I used as an intentional and expressive paradox, is in his view a "pleonasm"—*i.e.*, that the two words really mean, or should mean, the same thing. As one who dislikes tampering with the verbal currency (the process savours too much of the coiner's art for me), I should be grateful for an explanation. *Sophia* is a Greek word meaning "wisdom"—Theosophy is thus divine wisdom; *gnōsis* is another Greek word meaning "knowledge," or "the act of knowing"; *agnoia* or *agnōsis* similarly

means "ignorance," a state opposed to knowledge. Thus, when I spoke of "Agnostic Theosophy," I uttered an intentional paradox, *i.e.*, I used two words which were mutually contradictory, *or so I thought*. But Mr. Orage tells us that, so far from being mutually exclusive, one of them is really redundant—that *gnōsis* really means the same as *agnōia*, and what we call "Theosophy" is merely the ass of human ignorance masquerading in the lion's skin of Divine Wisdom, and that the sooner we make up our minds to this the better.

Now, as one who is not a Nietzschean, nor engaged in "rocking the educational hobby-horse," I find the above a hard saying, and the seven or eight pages in which its author expounds its meaning do not make it easier. There are many other hard sayings of Mr. Orage's, but I will take this first, and (even though he may be laughing in his sleeve all the while) ask him to elucidate it in the interests of myself and other babes in Theosophy.

Of course, from the standpoint of pure agnosticism (and I am not using the word in its "early Victorian"¹ but in its earlier Greek sense), there is no such thing as a knowledge of divine things, nothing, indeed, except a knowledge of our own ignorance, though a true Nietzschean might doubt even that. And had Mr. Orage confined himself to the general statement that the finite cannot comprehend the infinite, that man, *as man*, cannot understand God, most of us would have agreed with, and all would have understood him.

But Theosophy is not so much divine *knowledge*, as divine *wisdom*; *i.e.*, as I understand the word, it is the expression of certain truths about the Divine Nature, and the relationship of the human to the divine, which, *originally revealed* to man (and by the hypothesis they could have been obtained in no other way), are now found underlying all the great religions of the world. In their presentation of these truths, the various religions may differ in comprehensiveness and range, but they all may be summed up, as we have been reminded in a recent article, in the ultimate identity of the Human with the Divine. "Thou art That" is the final statement of them all.

¹ Why should Huxley be "early Victorian"? Is it because Mr. Orage himself is *late* Victorian?

And if this is Theosophy, it follows that a Theosophist is one who believes this; or words have no meaning. To call oneself a Theosophist, and yet confess to an agnosticism with regard to the essential meaning of Theosophy, is, to me, like calling black white or water dry. Mr. Orage may boggle at the word "revelation"; indeed, he has told us (I don't know on what authority) that Theosophy is *not* revelation, but if Theosophy means Divine Wisdom, the true Gnosis of things human and divine, I should be glad if he would tell us how to *physical-brain consciousness* a knowledge of this Wisdom could have been conveyed in any other way. Even granting that it is attainable in states of "open vision" or "ecstasy," *i.e.*, as inspiration, it would still be "revelation" from the standpoint of ordinary waking consciousness. And in what sense can "revelation," whether by seer, saint, or sage, be otherwise explained? For revelation *from without*, is but inspiration *from within*.

In this connection, it cannot be too often repeated that, as I ventured to say in my first article, transcendental physics and physiology and geographies of the astral plane, however interesting these may be, are no more Theosophy than physical science or physical geography. This indeed was the *onus* of the objection of the authors of *The Perfect Way* to Mr. Sinnett's *Esoteric Buddhism*, when it first appeared, and the objection has never been gainsaid. Nothing can be more absurd than to imagine that Madame Blavatsky introduced Theosophy to the Western world, or even to her own generation. All she professed to be (and the profession was always accompanied with laments of her own unworthiness) was the pupil of certain Eastern sages whom she called her Masters, and by whom she was commissioned to re-awaken in the minds of Western races a knowledge of facts relating to man's nature and destiny known to pupils of the Wisdom in all ages, but which for the world at large lay buried beneath a mass of superstitions and creeds. But even of these facts she was not the sole herald in her own day, but was the first to acknowledge that the same teaching, though mixed with much error, was working in the minds of Lawrence Oliphant and the authors of *The Perfect Way* and the more intelligent Spiritualists (it should never be forgotten that H. P. B. was at one time a

Spiritualist herself), just as it had in bygone ages been working in the minds of Pythagoras, Plato, Plotinus, the Alexandrian Church Fathers, Paracelsus and the Alchemists, Boehme, Baader, Swedenborg, Henry More, and many others.

It may seem strange to some of us, nor indeed do I intend, to place Madame Blavatsky in the same category with this august company, though it should be remembered that harder things were said of some of them, Paracelsus for example, in their lifetime than were said of H. P. B. in hers. And doubtless these too were human beings like the rest of us, though time and distance have hidden their faults and failings from our view. At any rate let it never be forgotten that the Theosophy which H. P. B. proclaimed as taught by her Eastern Masters was no new religion, but one which, though its historical birthplace was probably in the East, was yet the esoteric property of all the great religions of the world ; and that whatever else of interesting information she "revealed" regarding the constitution of man and the history of our planet, can only be viewed as of the nature of transcendental science, to be verified, like all other facts of science, by the proper faculties, physical, astral, or mental, as the case may be. Not that I wish to undervalue in the slightest degree the immense debt which we in the West owe to the dauntless courage, faithfulness, and industry of her whom we knew as H. P. B. Probably no more unique channel of esoteric knowledge than her amazing personality was ever vouchsafed to the modern world. But it was her constant assertion that she was the mouthpiece of her Teachers merely, and that all she proclaimed were facts that could be verified by the proper faculties in the proper way ; and her chief mission, to my mind her only mission, was not so much as a teacher of spiritual truths (there have been other teachers far more spiritual than she) but as the "revealer" of old, if forgotten, transcendental knowledge, and the faculties by which such knowledge could be regained.

This much by way of parenthesis. And now let me ask Mr. Orage a further question. He has told us that he is an Agnostic and a Theosophist, and we are bound in courtesy to take him at his word. After all, that is a personal matter with which no one else has primarily any concern. But Mr. Orage has gone

much further than this. He has told us that not only is he himself a Theosophical Agnostic, but that Theosophy and Agnosticism are identical terms, that Agnosticism is the only reasonable attitude of mind for any thoughtful Theosophist. He has said that "the main business of the T.S. is to destroy beliefs"; that "it stands much more for doubt than belief"; that the T.S. "is more agnostic than even he is," and instances in proof its formulation of the doctrine of *Mâyâ*; that "it denies revelation and authority"; that the true "sign of Theosophic grace is an emptiness of intellectual conviction"; and that "out of the mouths of Theosophical psychologists we can prove that a belief in Reason is a blunder worse than a crime." Well—these are definite statements enough—and from an agnostic standpoint no doubt reasonable opinions enough, though Mr. Orage has already somewhat discounted their value by assuring us that all opinions are necessarily false.

But if this intolerable nonsense is Theosophy (I trust my "brotherly" warmth will be forgiven) what I want to know is where in any reputable Theosophical literature Mr. Orage will produce his authority for such statements. For this is no longer a personal matter, but one in which all honest and sober-minded Theosophists have great concern. Meanwhile, and until such authority is forthcoming—authority for the statement, of course, not authority for the fact—I should like to devote the rest of this paper to an examination of the extraordinary meaning which Mr. Orage attaches to the Sanskrit word *Mâyâ*, and which apparently, he thinks, justifies him in regarding Theosophy itself as agnostic.

It appears, then, that Mr. Orage regards *Mâyâ* (Illusion) as meaning "false"—*i.e.*, "untrue," and not merely "deceptive"; and that since "all manifestation is *Mâyâ*," all manifestation is virtually "untrue." But the whole paragraph is well worth quoting. He says: "Or what do we mean by saying that all manifestation is *Mâyâ*, if we do not mean that all manifestation is false? And if all that is manifest is false, imperfect, unstable, how should not all truths concerning it be imperfect and unstable, opinions merely! . . . Again, we are told that this is Kali Yuga, or the Dark Age of the Cosmos; that mankind is now at its nadir; that illusion was never so thick upon illusion as now.

[I thought the present Kali Yuga was supposed to end in 1897.—M. L.] Yet I am expected to believe the statements made during these darkest ages, I am expected to blow a bugle on behalf of truths discovered by I know not what miraculous means. Is it likely that our truths are really truths? In the darkness of our age is there light enough to see truth by? Remembering, too, our urgent need of belief, is it not more likely that we have swallowed anything for the sake of belief—anything but truth !”

On reading a paragraph like the above one ceases to wonder that Mr. Orage calls himself an Agnostic, though one is lost in amazement that he ever called himself a Theosophist. But one begins to see why he believes he may call himself both. The explanation seems to lie in the little word Māyā, and the meaning it has in Mr. Orage’s mind.

As this is a word of such immense importance in the Vedānta philosophy, and one which is so frequently misunderstood, indeed so hard to understand, by Western minds, it will be well to examine it more fully. And here let me say that I am no Sanskrit scholar, that I profess no acquaintance with Sanskrit literature except in translation, and that I write under correction of all Sanskrit scholars, whether in the Society or outside it. But what I say has the authority of Hindu Sanskrit scholars and Vedāntists, who are, or were, also Theosophists, of men like Bhagavān Dās, and the late T. Subba Row, as well as Orientalists like Profs. Max Müller, Rhys Davids and Sir William Jones, and I do not think its correctness will be disputed.

It seems to me, then, that Mr. Orage has much yet to learn of the nature and meaning of Māyā (Illusion), as used in the Advaita philosophy, if he imagines it to stand for that description of “the thing which is not” that we call “a lie.” As Mr. Orage’s whole argument, by which he identifies Theosophy with Agnosticism, depends upon this assumption, it obviously becomes very important. Māyā, then, as the Vedāntist philosophers use the word, appears to have been primarily associated with the first differentiation of undifferentiated Substance—when the Unmanifest put on Manifestation; or as Spinoza would say, when the Deity became, in objective Self-division, Infinite Extension and Infinite Thought. As such, Māyā or Manifesta-

tion was, in Vedântist terminology, equivalent to *Prakṛiti*, considered as the *Upādhi* of Parabrahman. In other words, it was the first step in the Evolution of the Kosmos, and so came in later thought to be regarded as a cosmic force, as not only the material but the agent of manifestation. "Illusion," indeed, but Divine, *yet this only from the standpoint, to us unthinkable, of the One Reality*—the first necessary step in the Self-limitation of the Infinite. For *this Mâyâ* is eternal from manvantara to manvantara, the Shadow of Deity Itself.

Unreality to the Alone Real, for all lower manifestations it is *The Only Reality*, for without it they could not have been. For this indeed is the true meaning of *Mâyâ*, on all planes of manifestation. Unreal, and in this sense Illusion, from a higher plane, it is the Supreme Reality *upon its own plane*, a Reality again by which all lower planes become relatively unreal. Illusion *from above*, but highest Truth *in itself and from below*, this is the nature and expression of manifestation on all planes. For as the Divine pours downward into manifestation, it shrouds Itself in denser and ever denser veils of matter in its journey through the planes, and each plane is *Mâyâ* to the plane above, and all are *Mâyâ* to the Divine Itself. But is it to *conceal* the Divine that these veils of *Mâyâ* are assumed? or, most absurd and unthinkable of all, to veil the Highest from Himself? No, but to *reveal* the Divine, for in no other way can It be revealed.

For we can no more gaze at Truth with eyes unveiled, than with our physical eyes we can gaze at the noonday sun. And when the Unmanifest put on Manifestation, and clothed Himself with *Mâyâ* as with a garment, what, are we told, was His purpose? Was it not for the purpose, inscrutable as this must ever be, of Individualisation, in order that when that purpose was finished, and the harvest of manifestation reaped, He might return in glory, "bringing His sheaves with Him"? Thus, as each veil of *Mâyâ* is indeed a step by which God descends among men, or rather becomes Man, so must these steps become the pathway of re-ascent of the human to the Divine, in very truth

The great world's *altar-stairs*
That slope through darkness up to God.

For the selfsame way by which "the Son" left his Father's Home is the way by which "the Sons" must return; and as each difficult step in the upward Path is won, and a veil of Māyā, no longer needed, is outworn and cast aside, then, *and then only* it is seen for the Māyā it really is. For we can only attain Truth by becoming one with it and thus transcending it. In the words of the great Christian Apostle: "For we all with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory" (*II. Cor. iii. 18*). The glass indeed and the reflection within it are both Māyā, but without the glass there would be nothing visible. And just as a mirror limits a *reflection*, but limits in no way that which it reflects, so does Māyā limit the One Reality, which yet exists in all Its fulness beyond it, and only thus can be made visible to our eyes.

This, then, is what I understand by the word Māyā, and it is obviously very far indeed from the meaning which Mr. Orage gives to it, and which he regards as substantiating his views of the hidden agnosticism of all Theosophy. And should he challenge my meaning, or my right (as he very well may) to propound it so authoritatively, I can but refer him to the following paragraph in what he pleasantly calls the "Old Testament of Theosophy" (has it yet been superseded by a New?) *The Secret Doctrine* (vol. i., pp. 71, 72).

"Māyā, or Illusion, is an element which enters into all finite things, for everything that exists has only a relative, not an absolute, reality, since the appearance which the hidden noumenon assumes for any observer depends upon his power of cognition. . . . Nothing is permanent except the one hidden absolute Existence, which contains in itself the noumena of all realities. . . . Nevertheless all things are relatively real, for the cogniser is also a reflection, and the things cognised are therefore as real to him as himself. Whatever reality things possess must be looked for in them before or after they have passed like a flash through the material world; for we cannot cognise any such existence directly, so long as we have sense-instruments which bring only material existence into the field of our consciousness. *Whatever plane our consciousness may be acting in, both we and the things belonging to that plane are, for the time*

*being, the only realities.*¹ But as we rise in the scale of development, we perceive that in the stages through which we have passed, we mistook shadows for realities, and that the upward progress of the Ego is a series of progressive awakenings, each advance bringing with it the idea that now, at last, we have reached 'reality'; but only when we shall have reached Absolute Consciousness, and blended our own with it, shall we be free from the delusions produced by *Mâyá*."

That, I think, is pretty clear and up to date for an *Old Testament*.

But there is another and lower sense in which *Mâyá* is often used which it may be as well to refer to as anticipating a possible objection of some of my readers, including Mr. Orage himself. It is that sense, and so I have used it myself, in which *Manas* is spoken of as "the maker of illusion."

In speaking of the Mind or *Manas* in this Theosophical sense, it should never be forgotten that it is the instrument used by the Thinker, the mirror in which are reflected the presentations of sense and the thoughts of the Thinker, not the Thinker himself. And this mirror is not only alive, *i.e.*, made of living mental matter, with divers inherited aptitudes of vibration and receptivity, but it is changing in quality and content every moment of our lives, according as by our use of it (thought, memory, reflection) we build into it finer or coarser atoms of "mind-stuff," that it is coloured by all the varying hues of emotion, and vibrating continuously in harmony or disharmony with all the thoughts and feelings with which it may be surrounded, either our own or those of other minds. Is it any wonder that such a mind should be a "maker of illusion," *i.e.*, that it must perforce add something of its own quality to all to which it reacts, so that the resulting "idea" or mental reflection is never an exact image of that which is presented to it either in sensation or thought, but is variously coloured in passing through the mind? As no two people *see* alike, so no two people *think* alike or *feel* alike; there is a subjective element added in all cases. And this element is, in a superficial sense, *mâyá* or illusion; and, like all illusion, relatively and for the time being, *nil*. But this "subjectivity" is not true

¹ The italics are my own.—M. L.

Māyā, not even in the exaggerations of delirium and insanity, except in the sense that all "subjectivity," as well as all "objectivity," is Māyā from the standpoint of Absolute Existence.

In another and more philosophical sense (and it is only in this sense that Mr. Orage's simile of Reason as a serpent swallowing its own tail, and Mr. Mead's simile of the "squirrel-cage of the formal mind," have any meaning), Māyā (metaphysical Illusion) may be predicated of the attempt of the Pure Reason to represent the nature of noumena, or the Kantian "things in themselves." For, strictly speaking, *noumena*, far from being "things in themselves," *i.e.*, ultimate realities, are but a further mental remove from *phenomena*, or "things which appear." For just as phenomena are "creations of sense," the perceptual images of "things in themselves," noumena are "creations of thought," the purely abstract ideas of things from which all subjective elements of cognition have been *ex hypothesi* removed.

The fact remains, however, that noumena in this sense are really one stage farther removed from the objective "reality" of the *Ding an sich*, and are more subjective than ever. These abstract notions of things indeed are, like the spider's thread, in reality spun from the mind's own substance, and the process may not inaptly be likened to a serpent's swallowing its own tail. For the "formal mind," or Pure Reason,¹ can predicate "reality" of nothing but itself, and in attempting to transfer this reality to hypothetical things outside itself, must in very truth commit suicide, as Berkeley, in his *Dialogues of Hylas and Philonous*, and Kant, in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, abundantly proved. And so long as we are confined within the limits of the "formal mind," all knowledge that professes to transcend these limits must be Māyā (illusion)—*to the formal mind*, which was all that Kant or Berkeley had in view. In fact it was to supplement the deficiencies of the formal mind or Pure Reason, with its inevitable antinomies, which no one had demonstrated more conclusively than himself, that Kant wrote his treatise on "The Practical Reason," in which "Will" takes the place of "Understanding."

¹ My squirrel-cage "formal mind" is *not* Pure Reason, but Opinion. My *Pure Reason* transcends the opposites.—G. R. S. M.

Into the differences between these two faculties, which Schopenhauer did so much to elaborate, I have now no space to enter. But to the Theosophist they inevitably suggest the emergence of that sixth sense which is next to be evolved in humanity, and which, in Theosophic parlance, is called "the buddhic consciousness," or pure spiritual intuition. And to *that faculty* the "formal mind" and all its deliverances, will indeed be Mâyâ. But at present, and for the vast majority, Reason, as Gautama Buddha himself taught, in its own sphere and upon its own plane, is not only not a false guide, but the only guide we have. Is Mr. Orage a Master in (educational) Israel and knoweth not these things? If not, on what authority does he teach the "truths" of geometry and mathematics?

MONTAGU LOMAX.

ON KNOWLEDGE

"KNOWLEDGE," says my dictionary, "is the clear and certain perception of that which exists, or of truth and fact"; "indubitable apprehension."

Now man, as the microcosm, is a replica, in his constitution, of the universe in which he lives; and he only lives by virtue of exact adaptation on his part to the environment around him. His existence in the "three worlds" is conditioned solely and entirely by this principle; for the purposes of existence in the physical world he has a physical sense which, of course, must be awake and developed in the proportion that its external, universal counterpart is awakened and developed, otherwise his physical sense will sleep and the man will be unaware of his natural environment. For the sign that the vehicle or sense is alive and awake is its capability of receiving and responding to a stimulus coming from that world to which it itself in its nature corresponds.

Hence by virtue of the reception on the part of my compound physical sense of four distinct kinds of stimuli, *viz.*, sight, smell, taste and touch, I become aware of, experience the physical reality of, an object which I choose to designate by the term

“Christmas pudding”; in other words, I have obtained, by means of physical observation of fact, a knowledge of the objective existence of the pudding; and this particular sight, smell, taste and touch is all that I can get out of that pudding on this, the physical plane. Yet I, the intelligence, working through my physical sense, do not perceive, even as far as its gross, external physical aspect is concerned, the pudding, as it really is on that plane; for the “personal equation,” expressed through my formal mind, coinstantaneously with the sensuous perception, puts its own inevitable interpretation and comment on that which is perceived, thereby quite modifying the image sent through to the intelligence. Thus, although this observation of external fact may be called “knowledge,” it is knowledge which, regarded from the absolute and universal standpoint, is of a very imperfect and unreliable kind. Yet, looked at from the point of view of the physical world alone, it is, for the usual practical purpose of life, perfectly reliable and all-sufficient.

For all normally constituted men perceive external objects in the same way, or almost in the same way. And it is this fact which makes possible the existence in the world of to-day of that activity known as science. Normally constituted scientists never, or rarely, differ on the subject of observation of fact; that which breeds dispute and disagreement is the philosophical deduction drawn from the facts observed, which is a very different thing. For instance, every normal person who chooses to use his ordinary physical senses will describe a wild dog-rose as having five green sepals, five pink petals, numerous stamens, etc., that it is sweet-scented and flowers in June; but the person with a diseased or abnormal condition of the senses or afflicted with delirium might perceive something very different. Abnormal cases may always safely be left out of account.

Now, my present point is this: that although even the normal sense does not perceive an object as it really is, even in its physical aspect, owing to the modifying influence of the ever-active mind in the background, and that this, in the case of the diseased sense, is still more emphatically so; yet we may safely conclude that, in the case of both classes of observers, *something* and—what is more—the *same* thing has been perceived; in other

words, that there is an actual reality in the physical arena which has been sensuously cognised ; but those visions of it which the formal mind takes up, moulding them by its limitations to its own preconceived interpretations, *those* are the illusions, the "*schwankende Gestalten*" of the lower world.

All that I have said above will apply with equal force and meaning to the observation of astral objects by means of the astral sense and to that of mental objects by means of the mental sense, and so on. Now this sensuous cognisance of external objects constitutes true *knowledge* of a kind, because it consists in the establishment of a *rapport* between the intelligence or Ego and something in the external *rûpa* world which is *real* and actually exists ; we may term it Practical or Experimental Knowledge. Inasmuch as we are all roughly under the same illusion this knowledge is perfectly serviceable in the world of practical politics and science ; but from the standpoint of the higher worlds and of the higher parts of man's constitution it is quite unreliable and relatively worthless. This cognisance of the reality on the sensational and the perceptual levels is so veiled by *Mâyâ*, the illusion-producing and impermanent sheaths of matter, that we can make nothing of it ; it is as good as lost to us.

It is only on the *arûpa* levels of thought, the realm of abstraction, of subtle generalisation, of insight, intuition and imagination that permanence obtains, that we reach the state of closer contact with the Divine Mind in nature ; for the ideal mind of our human constitution begins at this level to enter into communion with and become inspired by the Universal Mind of Nature which underlies and governs all the great processes of Nature on all her planes. It is by contact with and response to the touch of that Universal Mind on the part of our "higher" ideal or abstract mind that *real knowledge* is obtained ; real, because such knowledge is true, reliable, permanent and unhampered by the illusion-giving mantle of form. Here dwell the insight and power of the genius, the imagination of the poet, the intuition of the Theosophist. But, for purposes of work in the lower worlds, this abstract faculty must be linked both with the emotional nature and with the ratiocinative formal mind ;

linked with the former the mystic, religious, and love aspects of the faculty are shewn forth; linked with the latter the powers of genius and the philosophical intuition display themselves. For intuition "is but the conviction arising from those *inductions* or *deductions* of which the processes are so shadowy as to escape our consciousness, elude our reason, or defy our capacity of expression."

Now the opinions of the Theosophist are, Mr. Orage says, more durable than those of other people; this is because they are ensouled and inspired by a greater amount, so to speak, of intuitional light and power. The Theosophist (if I may judge the type by myself) may be said to be one who is guided chiefly by his intuition and his mystic faculty; therefore, it follows that, so far from his being equated, as Mr. Orage would have us equate him, with agnosticism, the Theosophist is the one being in this world who really *knows* in the truest and highest and best sense of that word. He seeks after and recognises the Gnosis residing in the Universal Mind, both without and within his own; and it is his first duty to do so. Why insist then with such reiterated emphasis on the value of Agnosis? Perhaps for this reason: that as regards the impressions received through our senses, emotions and formal mind, we may not be quite so cock-sure as formerly.

Yet this negative aspect of the matter has been insisted upon to the neglect of the other, the positive aspect, *viz.*, that there is this higher Gnostic faculty of the mind which will save us from complete absorption and misguidance by *Mâyâ*. And the insistence on all such half-truths as this is dangerous and disheartening to those who can't think deeply but feel immeasurably.

Speaking for myself, I am prepared to maintain that I not only *believe*, but *know* that the doctrine of reincarnation is true. Not true, indeed, in the precise way in which my formal mind and brain-consciousness conceives of it to-day or any day during my incarnate existence; but what I mean is that the logical faculty, the intuition within and behind the formal mind, is able to contact the *essence of the idea*, the Universal Idea, underlying the processes of human existence here and hereafter, so as to give that feeling to the mind of profound and unshakeable

conviction of the *essential truth* of the doctrine. Let him challenge this position who dares! The forms enwrapping the essential principle by and through which we are alone able to study the doctrine are, of course, imperfect, and in so far impermanent; so that I agree with Mr. Orage when he says: "the Truth is that there is no truth," for this latter word spelt with a small 't' must refer to the "Truth" as contacted and seized upon by the *Máyá*-weaving formal mind—the Lower Manas; as Lowell says:

To-day's eternal Truth To-morrow proved
 Frail as frost landscapes on a window-pane.
 Meanwhile Thou smiledst, inaccessible,
 At Thought's own substance made a cage for Thought,
 And Truth locked fast with her own master-key.

But Mr. Orage entirely passes over the other, the positive side. He fails to appreciate the value of the intuition. Not so Browning:

There is an inmost centre of us all,
 Where truth abides.

The compulsion towards belief of the lower mind by the higher I regard as a most Providential arrangement whereby mankind is guided until the ratiocinative and intellectual faculty is sufficiently developed to enable him to choose his way by means of that power of the mind which is, no doubt, what is intended in the future.

By means of the light afforded us by our Divine intuition we can discern enough of the purpose of the universe for our present reliable guidance amid the illusions of sense on every hand. We can *know* enough of what the Divine is, of what Perfection is, to enable us to carve out for ourselves in these lower worlds a most definite path along which we can wend our steps towards that distant beacon-light.

And I am confident that we human beings, or men, will *not* be superseded by any other beings who will more cleverly succeed in "catching the eye" of the Deity, and upon whom, therefore, His attention and interest will be more completely bestowed. For we are already half-way through the universe, *i.e.*, we have completed the main *involutionary* arc of our progress; and the *evolutionary* arc must necessarily be a replica, although in

spiritualising and individualising form, of the involutory; seeing, therefore, that the latter never produced any higher being than man, or the human, it follows that *man* will be the culminating product of the universe as a whole; and we *know* that it is so, for the Masters of Wisdom represent such culminating product, and they are only *men*.

Hence the logical consequence is that the production of Man, *i.e.*, the perfected seventh-round man, as we see him to-day in the Master of Wisdom, is the *sole* object of this manvantara or earth-chain, just as the Barışhad Pitri was the sole object of the evolution of the Lunar Chain; it is for Man and for Man alone that "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth until now," and will continue to groan and travail until this Babe, this Son of God, is brought to real birth.

Yet even now, embryonic though we be, we can "*know* in part" the Truth of things; we can recognise, by means of logical, inferential deduction combined with the higher synthetic, generalising and abstract process of mind, that the *essential principles*, or the essence of idea underlying the various Theosophical doctrines, such as those relating to the planetary chains, the planes, reincarnation and karma, existence of the Masters, Universal Brotherhood, etc., are *true* and absolutely permanent, for they represent the Divine Mind at work in manifestation which we, Gods *in parvo*, are able, by means of our own Divine mind, actually to contact. Theosophy may truly be said to be Knowledge of God; therefore Theosophy is not Agnosticism. Theosophy is Knowledge; the Eternity of Truth, the Eternity of Beauty—Divine Wisdom.

W. C. WORSDELL.

THE Queen brought me down to earth and flung me on a shore of pebbles.

REINCARNATION AND RESURRECTION

FROM A CHRISTIAN STANDPOINT

WE believe that the doctrine of reincarnation is a key to the understanding of one of the deepest mysteries of the Bible, *viz.*, that concerning the resurrection of the body. From the very inception of Christianity, the doctrine of the resurrection was looked upon as one of the chief difficulties of belief. The Sadducees thought that they had an unanswerable argument in the question that they put to Jesus in regard to the woman who had seven husbands successively, as to whose wife she would be of the seven in the resurrection. The Master in His answer spoke only of the resurrection of the righteous; of those *accounted worthy* to obtain that age, and *the resurrection which is from among the dead*, that they neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither, in fact, can they *die any more*, for they are equal to the angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.¹

Now it is abundantly evident that there is no reference here to the resurrection of the unregenerate, for *they* are *not* sons of God and equal to angels. But it is just as certain that *all* men, whether righteous or unrighteous, are to live again—for “a resurrection there shall *certainly be*, both of the righteous and of the unrighteous.”² But only the blessed and holy shall have part in the first or chief resurrection.³

It is a fact constantly overlooked, that the passage usually read at funerals, does not refer at all to the resurrection of the wicked, but to the first resurrection only. To prove this we need only refer to verse 43 of *I. Cor.*, xv., where, speaking of the body, Paul says: “It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power.”

¹ *Luke*, xx. 34-36 (Rotherham's translation from text of Tregelles).

² *Acts*, xxiv. 15.

³ *Hē anastasis hē prōtē* (*Rev.*, xx. 5).

For no one will go so far as to assert that the wicked will be raised in power and glory, although some have said that they will be raised in incorruptible bodies, in order that they may be capable of eternal torment—and this is the view which is considered orthodox.

There is another class, however, more mercifully inclined, who say that the wicked will be raised with corruptible bodies, in order that the fire may consume them and their punishment end, after a period of torture, in their destruction.

Merely to state these views is to refute them. For surely it is not necessary to raise mankind from the dead in order to punish them, when it is so palpably clear from the Bible that the soul may suffer torment apart from a resurrection? For the rich man is seen in Hades "in anguish," while his five brethren are still living on earth.¹ It is certain, therefore, that the orthodox resurrection had not taken place.

There are some, however, who hold the view that there is no separate existence of the soul apart from the body; so that the wicked are to be raised, according to this theory, for the sole purpose of being punished until the fire consumes them. These of course deny the immortality of the soul, and while professing to accept the entire Bible, *literatim*, are at variance with some of its plainest statements, such as that of the Revelator² that he saw "the souls" of the martyrs "beneath the altar," and the souls of those beheaded under Antichrist; and that of Peter, that Christ "preached the Gospel to the dead,"³ to the "spirits in prison." For how could these spirits hear the Gospel unless they were in conscious existence, or how could the souls cry aloud from the altar?

The Scriptures prove conclusively, therefore, that there is conscious life in the intermediate state, both of the righteous and the unrighteous, and that there are two distinct methods of resurrection, one for the "Sons of God" and another for unbelievers.

The first is described as "*hē anastasis hē prōtē*," the first or chief resurrection, but not necessarily *first* in point of time. The second in degree is described as being brought out of captivity.

¹ *Luke*, xvi. 27.

² *Rev.*, vi. 9 and xx. 4.

³ *I. Pet.*, iii. 19 and iv. 6.

This is made perfectly clear in regard to the people of Sodom—that God “destroyed them all”—“on the day when Lot went forth from Sodom”; and yet God promises, centuries afterwards, that He would bring again the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, *i.e.*, the neighbouring cities which grew up around her, and shared her fate. These shall return to their “former estate,”¹ together with Samaria and her daughters. The same promise is made to many other nations, now defunct, such as Moab (*Jer.*, xlviii. 47), Ammon (*Ib.*, xlix. 6), and Elam (*Ib.*, xlix. 39).

One thing is absolutely certain, *viz.*, that a resurrection in some form is promised to all mankind, but “with what body do they come?” was the question, even in Apostolic days, especially in the Greek cities, which were centres of learning. So the Apostle Paul made it clear to the Corinthians: “Not the body which shall come into existence dost thou sow.”² “It is sown a psychical body [*i.e.*, animated by soul], it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a psychical body, there is also a spiritual.” They are not bodies of flesh and blood, for “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.”

The Apostle is speaking throughout this passage (*I. Cor.*, xv.) of the resurrection of the righteous—those who are to be clothed with incorruption (*ἀφθαρσία*) and immortality (*ἀθανασία*)—and settles the question in regard to them; their resurrection bodies have no connection with flesh and blood. But it is supposed that the “rest of the dead,” the unregenerate, will actually be raised out of the grave.

This must be an entire misconception. In the first place many millions have never been buried, but have been devoured by vultures, sharks and beasts of the earth. But whether they were devoured or burned, or eaten by worms, the physical body is resolved, sooner or later, into its constituent elements, and becomes as though it had not been. Such a resurrection, therefore, of flesh and blood is absolutely unthinkable; *it cannot be*. But the Scriptures which point to a general resurrection are explained by the doctrine of reincarnation.

Take, for example, *John*, v. 21: “For just as the Father

¹ *Ezekiel*, xvi. 53-55.

² *I. Cor.*, xv. 37 ff.

wakes up the dead and *causes them* to live, thus the Son causes whom *He pleases* to live."

The context shows that this resurrection is a continuous work, going on now (v. 20). The Father is said to point out to the Son what He is *doing*. And this work of selection from among the dead of those who are to be brought into the world is the result of a continuous judgment, for God "gave him authority *to be executing* judgment." This judgment is received also upon the living *now*. Those who put faith in Christ are "passed over out of death into life," and he who puts not faith, *already* has been judged."

There are three places named as the present abodes of the dead, *viz.* :

1. ἡ θάλασσα = The Sea = Tehom
2. ὁ θάνατος = Death = Abaddon
3. ὁ ᾗδης = Hades = Sheol

The Sea is the "Great Deep" or "Abyss" into which the demons begged that Christ would not send them.¹ He proclaims liberty to the captives, the opening of the prison to them that are bound; because He has the "keys of the 'Death' and of the 'Hades.'"

It is He who has power to loose the prisoners of death. "He *openeth* and no man *shutteth*; He *shutteth* and no man *openeth*." "The prisoners of the pit wherein is no water," through "the blood of His covenant" become "prisoners of hope."²

"Sheol is naked before Him, and Abaddon hath no *covering*."³

The sighing of the prisoner comes before Him; according to the greatness of His Arm, He preserveth and delivereth⁴ the sons of Death.⁵

How can this deliverance be continuous except by means of reincarnation?

Again, His words in *John*, v. 20-22, seem to denote a *continuous*

¹ *Luke*, viii. 31, "εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον"; "into the Abyss."

² *Zech.*, ix. 11, 12.

³ *Job*, xxvi. 6.

⁴ "Delivereth" (*Psalms*, cii. 20); LXX. λῦσαι.

⁵ *Psalms*, lxxix. 11 (Hebrew).

resurrection. The Father points out to the Son what He is *doing*, viz., waking up dead ones and *causing them to live*—so the Son “also causes whom *He pleases to live*,” because the Father “gave Him authority *to be executing judgment*,” and “to have life in Himself, just as the Father has life in Himself.”

The chief resurrection (*hē anastasis hē prōtē*), therefore, is that of spiritual, glorified, incorruptible bodies; but the partakers of the second or inferior resurrection, being in bodies of flesh and blood,¹ “cannot inherit the kingdom of God,” but are to live again on the earth.

That Elijah and Moses are to live again on the earth appears from the xith chapter of *Revelation*. For they are the “two witnesses” who were seen standing before “the Lord of the earth” in the time of Zechariah the prophet.²

Elijah the Tishbite announced himself, in *I. Kings*, xvii. 1, as “standing before” the Lord—when He shut heaven for three and one-half years—just as the two Anointed ones (*Χριστοί*) have power to do again for a similar period, and to “turn waters into blood” as Moses did. They must appear in bodies of flesh or they could not be *killed*, as it is said they will be.³

Here, then, we have a certain proof of Scripture teaching of the reincarnation of those who have lived before on the earth. In *Zechariah*, iv. 14, they are seen standing before “the Lord of the whole earth”; and in *Malachi*, iv. 5, it is definitely stated that Elijah, whom we find also associated with Moses on the Mount of Transfiguration, should return to the earth.

Our Lord also said of John the Baptist these remarkable words: “If ye are *willing to accept it*, he is Elijah—the one destined to come. *He who has ears to hear*, let him hear.”

The angel Gabriel also predicted of John that he should “go before the face of the Lord” “in the *spirit and power* of Elijah.” So that we, apparently, have two reincarnations of Elijah, with an interval of about 2,000 years between them.

There are many assumptions of reincarnation in the Scriptures as a well-known fact, which assumptions are never rebuked or contradicted.

So we may conclude that the doctrine of reincarnation is a

¹ *Job*, xix. 25, 26.

² *Zech.*, iv. 3, 11, 14.

³ *Rev.*, xvii. 7.

hidden doctrine of Holy Writ—*hidden* so that "none of the wicked shall understand but that the wise alone should understand" (*Daniel*, xii. 10).

HECTOR PRYOR.

PARMENIDES' "TRUTHWARDS"¹

PARMENIDĒS, son of Pyrēs (or Pyrrhēs), was a native of Elea (or Hylē, the Roman Velia, the site of which is now marked by the ruins of the mediæval fortress once called Castell' a Mare della Brucca), on the sea-coast of Lucania in Southern Italy. It was originally a Greek colony from Ionia, founded about 540 B.C., and famous for its good government, the scheme of which was laid down by Parmenides.

Parmenides was the veritable founder of the famous Eleatic School of philosophy, the fundamental conception of which was the Unity of Being. It is very difficult to fix his date with exact precision; 515-450 B.C., however, seems to satisfy most of the indications.

Parmenides came of a wealthy and distinguished family. He joined the Pythagoreans at the instance of Ameinias, one of the community, and had the highest reverence for Diochaitēs, who was also a Pythagorean, and seems to have been the chief teacher of our philosopher.

That Parmenides was a mystic as well as a philosopher, or rather, let us say, was a philosopher, a lover of wisdom, in the true sense of the word, is evident from the fact that Kebēs, the disciple of Philolaus, the Pythagorean, speaks of the Parmenidean life as synonymous with the Pythagorean.

There is what Zeller calls a "surprising statement" made by some scholastics that Parmenides studied also in Egypt. I cannot myself see anything to surprise us in this; it is true that

¹ See Zeller (E.), *A History of Greek Philosophy* (Eng. Trans.; London; 1881), i. 580 ff.; Fairbanks (A.), *The First Philosophers of Greece* (London; 1898), pp. 86 ff., or text; Gomperz (T.), *Greek Thinkers* (Eng. Trans.; London; 1901), i. 165 ff.

we have no reference to such an incident in our older authorities, but Egypt influenced so many of the early philosophers of Greece, that it is not therefore improbable in itself.

Whence Parmenides derived his ruling ideas it is impossible to say with any precision. Gomperz thinks he can trace their heredity when he writes: "If his thought was founded on the pantheism of Xenophanēs, and its lines were determined by the mathematics of Pythagoras, it set its compass by yet a third system, namely, that of Heraclitus." But to me heredity traced to external influences only seems insufficient; and it is quite manifest from the remains of our philosopher's didactic poem that he believed in immediate inspiration, if not in direct apocalypse.

The main interest of the leading conception of Parmenides, at any rate as far as this paper is concerned, is its parallelism with the Advaita Vedānta, and its concepts of Brahman and Ātman and Mâyā, the Unitary or Non-dual system of Indian philosophy; it is also of interest because of its points of contact with the root-idea of Spinoza's philosophy, with the general conception of Monism, and with the One Substance (Spirit-Matter) view of *The Secret Doctrine*.

All antiquity is unanimous in its respect for Parmenides, both as regards his life and his philosophy. Plato makes one of his speakers call him "the great Parmenides," and Socrates to say of him that, in the words of Homer, he was "venerable and awe-inspiring"; that he had met him when a youth and that he appeared to him "to have an in every respect noble depth" of mind. Even Aristotle gave him preference.

Parmenides set forth his philosophy in a didactic poem. What its main title was we are unable to say with certainty; various authors give it as "Concerning Nature" (περὶ φύσεως), "Nature-lore" (φυσικόν), or "Physiology" (φυσιολογία). It was divided into two parts. The first of these was called by the Later Platonists "Concerning the Things-that-really-are"; in the present text, however, the title may be translated "Truthwards," or "Concerning Truth," or "Words of Truth" (τὰ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν). The second was called "Cosmology" by the Platonists; but stands in our text as "Opinionwards," or

"Concerning Opinions," "Words of Opinion," or "Opinions of Mortals" (τὰ πρὸς δόξᾱν).

In the first Parmenides sets forth his view of the One Reality; in the second he sets forth his notion of things according to appearance; for δόξα signifies both sense-perception—"the thing that appears to men," *i.e.*, *māyā* in its naïve sense; and also the idea or view or opinion—"the thing that appears to men to be true," as Gomperz says. In this paper we shall treat of the first part only, prefixing the proœmium, or mythical introduction of his dithyrambic poem, which Parmenides plainly wishes us to regard, at any rate as far as its root idea is concerned, as the fruit of mystic meditation.

PROœMIUM

"The steeds¹ that bear me, sped me on as far as heart² may go, [then] when they brought me to the far-famed way of Her³ who bears the man who knows through all.

"By this way was I borne; for therealong the steeds
5 most sensible, were drawing at full stretch the car; and maidens led the way.

"The heated axle in the boxes of the wheels gave forth sounds like a pipe⁴—for it sped on with its two rounded wheels on either side—when once the maids, the daughters of the Sun, leaving the homes of Night,⁵ hastened to bring
10 me unto Light, back throwing from their heads their veilings with their hands.⁶

"There are the Gates between the Paths of Night and Day; above a lintel, and below a stony threshold, close them in; æthereal themselves they are filled up with mighty doors.

¹ Lit., "mares."

² Or "desire."

³ Lit., the Daimôn, *i.e.*, Goddess.

⁴ Lit., "syrinx"; the car was the chariot of the soul, and the music the music of the spheres, the seven-piped syrinx.

⁵ Night or Darkness is, in the terms of Parmenides, the Material or Phenomenal, as opposed to Light, or the Spiritual or Noumenal.

⁶ The unveiled light-powers of the soul.

“’Tis Justice,¹ stern in punishment, who holds the keys—retributory [keys].²

15 “ Her softly entreating with gentle words the maidens sagely persuaded to draw for them the bolted bar of the doors without hesitation.

“ And falling away the Gate-doors made a vast gap, turning their hinges all-brazen in turn in the sockets, o’er studded with bolts and with nails.

20 “ Thence through them the maidens kept straight on the highway both chariot and horses.

“ The Goddess received me with welcome; she took my right hand in her hand, and thus did she speak and address me :

25 “ O youth, united with deathless rein-holders, with steeds that bear thee, come unto our home, hail [unto thee] !

“ For that it is no evil fate has sent thee forth to travel in this way (for of a truth it is beyond the beaten track of men)—but Right and Justice.

30 “ Yea, there is need that thou shouldst learn all things; both the unwavering heart of all-persuasive truth, and also mortal men’s opinions in which true faith is not.

“ Yet, notwithstanding, shalt thou learn these too ; for it is requisite to judge with judgment things that do appear, passing through all things thoroughly.”

The simile of the chariot of the soul is one of the most beautiful figures of Platonic philosophy, and also of the Upanishads. Plato evidently derived it, as did his predecessor, Parmenides, from his foregoers. The steeds are the purified desires; the maidens the powers that guide the soul-reins, wedded through his purity with the pure and youthful soul of the wisdom-lover.

Guided by these divine intuitions, the soul passes through the Gateway that leads from the Darkness of Opinion into the Realms of Light.

¹ Dikē.

² That is to open or shut according as the soul is for the Light or Darkness.

It is to be remarked that Parmenides is led on by maidens and taught by a Goddess; for as Marcus, the Christian Gnostic, tells us, in his apocalyptic vision of the Truth, this Supernal Reality can reveal itself to mortals only in its "feminine" Form, for the world cannot bear the Power and Effulgence of its "masculine" Greatness.

The same idea is current in India. The God (Shiva) uses His Power, the Goddess (Shakti, Devi), as His means of communicating with mortals. His Own-Form no mortal can behold and live; he who gazes on it becomes immortal. Now the number-system of Marcus is largely based on Pythagorean tradition; we may, therefore, conclude with great probability that Parmenides is in his proœmium environed with the atmosphere of Pythagorean imagery.

And so to his "Words of Truth," or

TRUTHWARDS

"Come, then, I will speak, and do thou listen and receive my words,—what are the only ways of search to understand.

35 "The one—'is'¹ and 'non-being is not'—is the path of [true] conviction, for truth doth follow it; the other—
 'is not' and 'is-not must be'—this verily I do declare
 40 to be a way entirely void of all conviction. For neither couldst thou *know* what really is not (for that's beyond the possible), nor couldst thou speak of it; for the same thing it is to understand and be.

"It matters not to me whence I begin, for there again shall I return.²

"It must be said and understood that what is *is*; for being *is*, while not-to-be [is] naught. These things I bid thee ponder.

45 "First keep thy understanding from this way of search,³ and then from that whereon know-nothing mortals wander, double-heads; for that resourcelessness directs the

¹ That is, how that Being is the only reality.

² All true discourses (*logoi*) should end where they begin.

³ Namely, that there *is* such a thing as non-being.

wandering mind within their breasts; and they drift on
 50 deaf and blind too, amazed, a crowd uncritical, by whom
 the permanent and not-to-be are thought the same and not
 the same. It is the path of contradiction of all things.¹

"For never at all shall this prevail"—said She—
 "that things-that-are-not are. But do thou keep thy
 understanding from this path of search.

"Nor let long-practised habit force thee on this way
 55 to turn a heedless eye and echoing ear and tongue; but
 weigh the much contested² testing of their words³ declared
 by me.

"Alone the telling⁴ of the way remains that [being] *is*.
 And on this path are very many signs that being transcends
 being born and being destroyed.⁵

60 "'Tis whole, begotten by itself alone,⁶ and stable and
 without an end. It never *was*, nor *will* it [ever] be, since
 now it *is*, together, all, one, [and] continuous.

"For what birth of it wilt thou seek? How, whence,
 has it its growth?

"I will not let thee say or understand, it came from
 what-is-not; for neither sayable nor understandable is
 'what-is-not.'

65 "What need, moreover, should compel it to begin to be
 from nothing later or earlier?

¹ This is directed against the doctrine of Heraclitus. Gomperz writes: "He assailed that doctrine with the most poisoned shafts of his invective"—a trite and well-rounded phrase, but somewhat inflated. "Those 'to whom being and non-being are at once the same and not the same'"—an excellent paradox, by the way, like most of the dark sayings of the Obscure Philosopher—"he denounces as 'deaf and blind, helplessly staring, a confused herd'; 'double-headed' he calls them on account of the double aspect of their Janus-like theory of things; and the fate which his satire reserves for them is to fall into their own stream of flux, and be carried away on its flood; 'know-nothings' he calls them and 'retrograde is their path,' like the metamorphoses of their primary matter." As a matter of fact Heraclitus saw farther into the mystery than Parmenides; but that is a subject in itself.

² This shows that Parmenides had to meet with strong opposition.

³ *λόγοι*.

⁴ *μῦθος*. This shows that Parmenides calls his exposition "mythos" as opposed to the "logoi" of Heraclitus. It is curious that six centuries afterwards, Plutarch exactly reverses the meaning of these terms in telling his "logos" of the vision of Aridæus.

⁵ Or death.

⁶ *μονογενής*—perhaps the first recorded use of a term that has been so utterly altered in meaning in Christian tradition. Monogenes is Alone-begotten, Begotten-from-itself-alone, and not Only-begotten.

"Thus must it needs be being is either absolute or not.

"Nor will conviction's strength allow that ever any way from that-which-is should there come any thing besides itself.

70 "On which account Justice hath never suffered it to suffer birth nor yet to suffer death, by slackening its fettering, but holds it fast.

"It is or it is not. It is decided, then, as 'tis necessity, to leave the [way] that thought can never think, and names can never name; for [this] path is not true, and that the other one *is* truly and is real.

75 "How then should being suffer death? And how again should it come into birth? For if it *came* to birth it *is* not; nor will it ever be about to be.

"So then its coming-into-birth hath vanished; nor is there any 'more' in it that should prevent its continuity, 80 nor any 'less'; but it is all, all-full of being. Wherefore all of it is continuous; for being draweth unto being.

"Further, in the completion of its mighty bonds 'tis motionless,¹ beginningless, ceaseless; for that its coming-into-birth and going-unto-death have vanished far away; 'tis true conviction that has cast them out.

85 "Same in the same remaining by itself it rests; and there bides surely as it is.

"'Tis firm Necessity holds it in bonds of [full] completion, which constraineth it about.

"Wherefore the law is not that being should be incomplete, for 'tis not lacking aught; for if 'twere incomplete, it would lack all.

90 "Behold things absent equally as surely present to the mind; for that thou canst not separate being here from being continuous with being there. It is not scattered everywhere entirely through the world, nor is it composite.

"But one and the same thing is understanding and

¹ That is to say, not subject or passible to anything besides itself that can move it. It does not mean rigid in the sense of mass, as so many suppose, but rather self-motive.

95 that because of which is understanding. For that without its¹ being in what is named [being], thou shalt not find understanding.

“There is no thing, nor will there be an other thing but being, since Fate constrains it to be whole and subject to no motion.

100 “Wherefore all things that mortals have determined, believing they are true, will be [but] name [s],—both being-born and being-destroyed, existing and its opposite,² and changing place and altering of colour.

“But since it is the final end, it ends itself all ways, like to³ the frame of an all-perfect sphere that’s equal from the centre everywhere.

105 “For that it needs must be it should not be at all too much nor yet too little, or here or there.

“For there is no non-being that can prevent it coming to equality; nor is being such that there could be more being here and less being there, since it is all beyond the power of spoliation.

“For if from everywhence ’t is equal, it equally abides in its [self-] limits.”

G. R. S. MEAD.

¹ That is understanding’s.

² Lit. “not.”

³ This denotes a simile only and not an identity; nearly every commentator goes wrong here. Parmenides is using the Pythagorean imagery.

BLESSED is he who has acquired a wealth of divine wisdom; but miserable he on whom there rests a darkening opinion concerning the gods.—EMPEDOCLES.

ANCIENT EGYPTIAN RELIGION¹

THE first series of lectures delivered at the "Collège de France," upon the foundation bequeathed by M. Michonis, was by M. Edouard Naville, the celebrated Swiss Egyptologist, and director now for several years of the Egyptian Exploration Fund's excavations at Deir-el-Bahari. It is fortunate for science that the opportunity provided by this course of lectures urged M. Naville to set forth what his erudition enables him to explain concerning the Religion of the Ancient Egyptians. It is now nearly thirty years since he published a translation of the *Solar Litany* and of the *Myth of Horus*, and he is the greatest living authority upon *The Book for the Dead*.

Therefore all that he has to say as to Egyptian culture, worship, and religion will repay careful study. He explains in the preface that he has in these lectures treated only of the six most important phases whose development displays the chief aspects of Egyptian religion, for the field of its study is so vast that no complete analysis could be covered in six addresses, or contained in 270 pages.

His first chapter discusses whether the ancient Egyptians were Autocthones, or originated elsewhere, and immigrated into Egypt, coming into it as a land hitherto uninhabited by mankind; and, supposing that the race whose relics we characterise as the ancient Egyptians, came from outside,—was their imported civilisation derived from Babylonia?

The author sums up his view upon the first question by giving it as his opinion that the original population, so far as any vestiges of their works enable us to judge, was of African origin, and was civilised by Asiatic invaders coming from Arabia, who had crossed the Red Sea and entered Nubia, and so subsequently

¹ *La Religion des Anciens Égyptiens. Six Conférences faites au Collège de France en 1905, par Edouard Naville.* Paris: Ernest Leroux.

came into Egypt from the south. Thus the earliest pictorial records we have, are those of the artist-scribes of these immigrants, who probably formed a governing warrior minority over the still earlier inhabitants.

The primitive people, whom M. Naville considers to have not yet advanced out of the stone age when the superior southerners came among them, he terms "African." He does not by this designation mean that they were negroes, but a white race akin to the Berbers and Kabyles, and members of which are shown upon later Egyptian monuments as representatives of tribes to the west of the Nile Valley, called Temenhou, or Tehennou. These the author connects with the old Anou, or "Archer-people," with whom the Horus-followers, or more civilised invaders of Egypt, whose chief emblem was the falcon, or whose greatest tribe used that bird as their symbol, fought and conquered.

As to whether the Nilotic Anou were sufficiently civilised to reside in cities, M. Naville is uncertain; but he points out that An, the earliest name for Heliopolis, presents the first syllable of their name, and that it was at that town that the conquerors first established any metropolitan religious centre; and so it was probably an ancient town of the Anou period.

That the conquerors who introduced the arts and culture displayed to us by the few small monuments of the first two dynasties, really descended from the south into Egypt, is apparently proved by the universal testimony of the Horus-invader myths as to their arriving from the south; also, M. Naville thinks, by the fact that an Egyptian when orientating himself always faced to the south. But the latter practice is also the posture for facing the sun, and also the region where the beneficent Nile God was stationed, and whence he poured forth the perennial flood, and so this argument appears to be weakened.

The introduction of the vine, the horse and the camel, the lecturer ascribes to late invasions, or to introductions from Asia by way of Palestine and the Delta. But the camel has been found carved upon extremely ancient and primitive specimens of sculpture,¹ so rude as to be apparently the workmanship of the

¹ M. Moeller, in a prehistoric cemetery at Abusir-el-Maleq, found an extremely

indigenous folk before the arrival of the Horus-tribes. Of kings, even of Upper Egypt only, existing before Menes, M. Naville will not hear; for such a Pharaoh as Rameses II., desiring to trace back his royal ancestors to the utmost limit, stops at Menes, and every list of early monarchs we possess does the same.

With regard to the Babylonian origin of Egyptian civilisation M. Naville says:

“I do not believe that Egypt is a daughter of Babylon; but, upon the other hand, we can quite admit that they are both connected with Arabia, and so it was the common origin which accounts for the analogies between the two.”

With profound respect for the erudition of M. Naville, this does not explain the striking fact that the Menes dynasty introduced into Egypt the use of the Babylonian cylinder as a signet, a type not derived from Arabia, nor a suitable form for a Nilotic people whose monuments were inscribed upon stone, leather or papyrus, and excepting for the jar-sealings and so-called funerary cones, not of clay. The use of such cones is also absolutely identical with the practice at Telloh and elsewhere (subject to Chaldean influence) upon the Persian Gulf. Moreover, an extremely ancient drawing upon a small relic discovered by M. de Morgan at Susa shows a boat or sacred barque with “totem-poles” surmounted by bull’s head symbols, and pottery from Telloh displays the lunar crescent upon poles also in a boat, similar to those drawn upon archaic Egyptian pottery.

There is also the probability that such divine emblems erected as tribal or sacred images are alluded to in the old cuneiform texts as being placed at the entrance to Mesopotamian temples, just as such are shown in front of the primitive shrine pylons upon the drawings of the divine processional barques described by M. Foucart as delineated on early Egyptian pottery.

In his *Textes Relatifs à la Divination Assyro-Babylonienne*, M. Alfred Boissier refers to a word, Šurinnu, which M. Thureau Dangin has proved to mean “emblem,” “guidon,” or “flagstaff.”

early representation of a camel, so rough in style that he thinks, as no more perfect carvings of it are found, the animal became extinct in Egypt for a long period and was subsequently reintroduced. See *Mitt. d. Deutsch. Oriental. Gesell.* (1906), No. 30.

Dr. Lehmann has shown that these poles, or pillars, were erected in front of temples. The very old inscriptions of King Gudea of Telloh, in maritime Babylonia, speak of these. Some of the Šurinnu "shone like the light" and were coated with gold, or silver. In the old cuneiform astrological, or augural, reports, a portent of dire disaster was the destruction of these Šurinnu. M. Boissier renders the word by "emblem"; perhaps "totem" would be just as precise.

M. Calice has pointed out that the old Egyptian word "nemset" for a certain class of vase is the "namsa" of the Tel-el-Amarna Syrian tablets, and can be traced back to the old Assyrian "namzitu." Again, M. Heuzey has shown an identical peculiarity of ornamentation in one of the prehistoric Egyptian slate palettes and a Babylonian cylinder engraving, consisting in elongating the necks of animals. Again in vol. vii. of *Recherches Archéologiques* of the French explorers in Persia, just published, M. Jequier, speaking of early proto-Elamite alabaster vases, says: "The most curious are those having animal forms, birds or fish. The only site where to my knowledge similar vases have been found is in Egypt." We must wait until excavations upon the littoral of the Persian Gulf, and the island of Bahrein, have disclosed to us the relics of the maritime Babylonians and Elamites.

The tenth chapter of *Genesis*, the oldest ethnographical survey in the world, associates an Asiatic Persian Kush with an African or Ethiopic Kush; this implies an Asiatic and Afric identity of race separated by the Arabian Sea. In conformity with this a very archaic bas relief, found by M. de Morgan at Susa, shows in a procession a race of Negritos of which the French explorers say they have found numerous examples. They were, with the Semites, probably the earliest masters of historical Susa. The Ethiopic Kushite territory is the very region from which M. Naville thinks Egyptian culture came; and the secret of the similarities between Egyptian and Babylonian culture most probably lies that way. We are of course only treating of Semitic or Mesopotamian analogies upon Egyptian antiquities undoubtedly dating from prior to the Hyksos Kings, and even before any connection of the early Egyptian dynasties with Syria by way of the Sinaitic peninsula. In later

times Asiatic styles in Egyptian art would be attributable to intercourse *viâ* Syria.¹

The second chapter discusses the different styles of sepulture in early times, and the evidence from burial relics as to the belief in a future life. M. Naville considers that in the numerous tombs, or graves, in which the defunct is arranged in the attitude of the knees drawn up to the chest, it is not an imitation of the bodily position of the unborn child, indicative of the hope of a new birth to come, but merely a repetition of the sitting posture habitual to all races unfamiliar with chairs or stools.

This sitting upon the haunches with knees drawn up was precisely the posture of the hunter in his hut on returning from the chase. So his limbs were thus arranged after death, only the corpse was necessarily laid upon its side. Certainly many funerary statues exhibit the deceased in this posture.

Another suggestion relates to the elaborate tomb-, or mastaba-reliefs, which show the person in whose honour the sepulchre was ornamented and furnished, as surrounded with many servants and owning many cattle, fields and orchards, vineyards and boats. M. Naville says that these tableaux do not of necessity indicate that the grave-owner enjoyed such opulence and broad domains with such a retinue upon earth, but are to show what it was hoped he would possess in the world to come. The relief-figures as a matter of fact are, just as the ushabti-statuettes were, ensurers of the possession of slaves and servants in the next world; the means of bequeathing to the deceased a complete estate in the future.

With regard to this view, there is no reason to doubt that the number of ushabti-figures in a tomb frequently exceeded the establishment of domestics employed by its deceased owner; and therefore the quantity of animals and fowls, of groves and pasturages, upon the mastaba-walls may have exaggerated those possessed by him while alive.

¹ In Herr J. Weissenborn's valuable work, *Tierkult in Afrika, Ein ethnologisch-kulturhistorisch Untersuchung*, he says: "The ancient religion of Egypt is formed of two elements; the autochthonous negroid population had been subjugated by some Semitic tribe coming from Asia. To the amalgamation of these two races was due the religion in which, whilst preserving the original beliefs, they sought to make them agree with the conceptions of their conquerors. They assimilated their animal worship to the polydemonism, or polytheism, of the Asiatics, assigning certain animals to certain gods of which they became the symbols." This to a great

In this chapter, when describing the Egyptian's future life, M. Naville comments upon the various sacred books relating thereto, such as the *Book of the Am-Tuat*, and also the *Nether World* portions of the "Pyramid Texts." These latter writings, however, it must now be borne in mind, have been found inscribed upon coffins of ordinary people and so are not, as was once thought, peculiarly Pharaonic.

M. Naville evidently considers the tableaux upon the tomb-walls as merely indicative, or magically productive of parallel environments for the defunct in the next world. It is worthy of note, however, that every scene in these panoramas may be connected, instead, or also, with the providing of a princely funeral feast. For instance, the culture of grain, plants and herbs and flowers, the netting of birds, the weaving of the funerary garments, papyrus-growing and making into papyri for the rituals, seal and scarab manufacture for the funerary priests, beer brewing for beverages, and tree cultivation for timber to construct the sacred boat, and to build the sarcophagus sleigh, or chariot, for the mummy, quarrying stone for the funeral stele, and statuette making for the ushabtis, and sculptors for the statues, also goldsmithy and embroidery for mummy amulets and draperies, may all be connected with it. So also the preparing of animal skins for the boat sails, the writing of the *Book for the Dead*, brickmaking for the tomb walls, dressing and cooking all the viands for the sepulchral banquet, these will account for every action depicted in the Sakkara mastabas.

Is it not possible that the whole *mise-en-scène* has a double object—to describe, with much exaggeration, the funeral feast preliminaries and functions here on earth, and to secure its repetition for the deceased "*quand il ait une bonne sépulture dans l'occident*"? As M. Naville says, the producing reason for the whole practice of these scene-engravings must not be applicable solely to the tomb in which we find the stelæ and the decorations and tableaux provided when it was completed, but to an ideal tomb in the west, the duplicate of that upon earth.

extent agrees with the craniological evidence, for Messrs. Thomson and Randall-MacIver, in *Man* (1906), p. 55, say: "It seems then that Dr. Keith supports our contention that the population of ancient Egypt exhibits two strongly contrasted sets of physical features, *viz.*, a negroid and a non-negroid."

If this is correct it would appear that the Elysian Field scenes are not those of a future "country seat" life for the dead Egyptian, but depict the production of the next world sepulchral service and festival. The justified Egyptian is not shown as a squire in a country manor of the Am-Tuat, but if indicated at all is so merely as a fellow-passenger with Ra and his crew of deities in the Sun-god's ship. Subsequent to having been acquitted in the "Hall of Judgment," and his second funeral in Hades fulfilled, he is free "to go in and out and come forth by day."

M. Naville devotes some space to the question as to whether human sacrifice was in early times an Egyptian practice, and decides in the negative. He points out that had it been common it would be inexplicable that among the innumerable religious functions portrayed upon monuments and papyri, it should be unrepresented. He refers to a relief in a Theban tomb wherein two Nubians, also styled Anou, are apparently about to be executed, and concludes they are images of men, and that the sacrifice was a theatrical performance in memory of the execution of Anou prisoners of war, during the early campaigns of Horus, celebrated in later times at the Festival "*De Trapper les Anou.*" That human beings were occasionally sacrificed, as in other countries, he does not deny. The evidence is presented by M. Lefebure in his work upon Egyptian Rites Relating to Edifices, but such instances were exceptional and were enacted because of the supposed protective character of the spirit of the victim, and not as part of any ritual of sacrificial worship, or, as in many lands, as a funerary custom.

The chapter upon "Rites and Ceremonies, the Divinity of the King, and the Daily Worship," has little that will be new to readers of the works of MM. Moret and Lefebure; but the details M. Naville furnishes from newly recovered reliefs representing a coronation and sundry religious ceremonies performed by the Pharaoh at Deir-el-Bahari are novel. M. Naville says:

"I believe that the worship of the dead king was merely the prolongation of that accorded to him during his life-time. And this leads to a conclusion contrary to that of M. Moret. I believe differently from him, that they have at first been living personages for whom has been continued, perhaps somewhat modified,

or developed, that which had been accorded to them during life.”

This apparently means that the deities possessing temples and cults in Egypt were deified human beings, such as Imhotep probably was. We suppose the tribal chiefs whose animal emblems became their own when deified are, in M. Naville's mind, the precursors of deities they became later on. To become a god one must have first been a king or chief ; whilst later, to be born a Pharaoh was to involve, or ensure, being proclaimed a god.

M. Naville says that the amulet, or figure, known as the Dad or Tat, a sort of double column, or pillar, supporting four cross-bars, is representative of the spinal column with its projecting ribs of the vertebrate order ; adding that the texts leave us in no doubt as to this. He does not, however, quote any passages upon the subject. The symbol has been considered as chiefly exemplifying stability, or firmness, and to have been an hieratic representation of the four corner world pillars which, according to Egyptian cosmogonic theories, supported the firmament, shown in perspective, one above the other. There is a good deal to be said for this first view of the matter, though it must at present be considered as undetermined.

One of the lectures is devoted to the Egyptian Enneads and the Doctrine of Heliopolis, discussing also the rôle of the Ammon God of Thebes, and the religious reforms of Amenophis IV. These last it is now evident were not induced by any foreign influence. It was the selection by Amenophis of a poetical form of the deity who was to have offered to him solely a type of worship already, probably, familiar in many temples. It was not a doctrinal reform, but intended to disqualify the varieties of theology and cult which separated the teachings and ceremonies of the numerous shrine sacerdotal colleges, and so intended to merge into one form of worship all the religious rituals of Egypt.

In conclusion ; the knowledge we possess, although very great, is not sufficient to make any history of Egyptian religion, even in the hands of such a master of the subject, complete, because it is not yet properly tabulated. The myths mingled together in the religious texts are well-nigh innumerable, and, apparently,

frequently contradictory of each other. No further solid progress can now be made until all the texts concerning each deity are collected together and thus all assertions relating to that particular god are assembled.

For instance, M. Daressy has recently, in the *Recueil*, edited nine complete hymns to Khnoum, the Egyptian Demiurge Deity, which are inscribed upon the Esneh temple. These, and other texts relating to him, explain a figure frequent upon monuments, and papyri, of the four-headed ram Khnoum. This deity, after the creation achieved by him, was specially incarnate in the famous Ram at Mendes. But he had from chaos produced a fourfold cosmos, and so his actions or attributes were more specifically symbolised by four ram-deities: The Osiris Ram at Hypsilis, emblem of the Nile flood, or water; the Ra Ram of Elephantine, symbolic of fire; the Seb Ram of Her-urt, emblem of earth; and the Shu Ram of Letopolis, emblem of the air. Such a mythology as this, it will be seen, connects with the cosmological concepts of other peoples, at a later era.

Naturally, M. Naville quotes more often from texts at Deir-el-Bahari than elsewhere, as he, under the auspices of the Egypt Exploration Fund, has rescued most of these; also from other old Egyptian literature first edited by himself, such as the *Myth of the Destruction of Mankind by the Gods*. But all the more important publications of documents are directly drawn upon, or their contents utilised, and a short but very select bibliography is appended to each chapter.

The comparative history of pagan religions can only one day be completely considered when such work as this sets forth correctly the peculiarities of each of them. Towards a comprehension of the Egyptian religion this book marks a notable advance, and will be welcomed by all students.

JOSEPH OFFORD.

AND there was among them a man of unusual knowledge, and master especially of all sorts of wise deeds, who in truth possessed greatest wealth of mind; for whenever he reached out with all his mind, easily he beheld each one of all the things that are, even for ten and twenty generations of men.—EMPEDOCLES.

THE MEANING OF COLOURS

ACCORDING to Science, Colours begin to arise when at least four hundred and sixty millions of millions waves of Light enter our eye in one second. The enormous figures which are coupled with them have the assigned *maximum* of six hundred and seventy-eight millions of millions. But according to the authors of *Thought-Forms*, Colours also represent the quality of our inner dispositions and thoughts; and in this respect figures are of no interpretative value, even if they were conformable to actuality. We cannot learn the meaning of Colours from the rate of vibration which a working hypothesis, *i.e.*, the undulatory theory of light, assigns to them.

This is how *logical reflection* of pure thinking reveals the nature of Colour. Pure Light is at once identical with, and different from, absolute Darkness. As the one cannot be thought without at once also giving rise to the other, each is really a unity of both; but an *unsteady* unity because it is realised only as an act of reflection. In wishing to label this conclusion adequately we may use the category *Radiation*. As, however, we must preserve the distinction between the two moments of reflection, Radiation must be restated accordingly as it refers either to Light or to Darkness. As radiating, these are no more pure or indeterminate, but have a determined Being or are real, manifested, visible. Therefore Radiation must be restated as having the connotation of visible Light and visible Darkness. But as Light as such cannot be seen at all, in manifesting it must appear as a body. It is easy to realise that the sought-for restatement of Radiation is found in the Sun and the Stars, the former being the visible Light as *Day*, the latter the visible Darkness as *Night*.

But, of course, as Day and Night are at the same time the restated pure Light and Darkness, each of them is an unsteady unity of both; and we find that our next step is to restate Radiation in the connotation of an unsteady unity of Day and Night.

This clearly refers to the motion of the sun round the earth, or the diurnal rotation of the earth round its axis, accordingly as we assume the ancient geocentric or the modern heliocentric standpoint. The intellectual consciousness makes great ado about the choice between these two standpoints; they are, however, dialectically correlated, which means that, viewed isolatedly, both are equally incomplete. Had Galileo been a philosopher besides being a man of Science, he would have submitted to the court of Inquisition without any pangs of conscience. It was only a matter of external reflection that was at stake. The thing is to realise the two presumably irreconcilable theories as moments of our present restatement of Radiation, as the *Succession of Day and Night*.

But it is these themselves that now call for a fresh restatement—conformably to the dialectic movement which, in enriching the Being-within-itself of a notion, immediately also creates the need for a category of a correspondingly wider connotation. In realising both Day and Night as an unsteady unity of both, we must now articulate them as such; and this is achieved through the category *Twilight* or *Shadow*. Here we have the first embodiment of the triune nature of the manifested Light, and consequently proceed to deal with it in the character of *species* instead of *genus*. That is, with the beginning of subjectivity arise limitations; and therefore in Shadow, Light and Darkness cease to be universal, but become tied to conditions, which are under our control. We cannot play with the sun and stars, but the requisites for the production of shadows are everywhere within reach.

Now, what has been said about the relationship between pure Light and Darkness, or Day and Night, holds good even now in the sphere of limitations. There are two kinds of Shadows, conformably to the distinction between Light and Darkness; and the two kinds must needs blend into a unity. In realising this, however, we create a need for a still higher restatement of Radiation than the succession of Day and Night. And here we find ourselves at the goal; the sought-for category is—Colour! This is the unrestful unity of the two kinds of Shadows, which are easily identified as due to *Illumining* or *Darkening*.

Indeed, I have verified that Light shining through a darkening cloud against a white background gives rise to the following succession of colours: Yellow—Orange—Red—Blue. If the background is black and the cloud is thinning, the succession is: Blue—Indigo—Violet—Yellow.

The sky is obviously Blue because it is the limit of sunshine viewed through a more or less vapoury atmosphere against the background of interstellar Darkness. If the atmosphere is clear, the blue becomes Indigo, as may be witnessed from high mountains or in dry countries. By staring at the sky on a nice summer day I found it not merely Indigo, but quite Violet—undoubtedly because staring has the effect of Illuminating. The more the eye is developed, the more does it become able to banish or pierce Darkness. And that the ultimate colour of Illumination is Yellow, I have verified from the effect of the glow of the sunset on a hedge of very dark-leaved bushes after a shower. Besides, all Nature proclaims this conclusion in the autumn.

Of course, the darkening medium need not be a cloud, but may be anything more or less transparent, provided its shape makes Light of unequal intensity (*i.e.*, shadows) blend into an unrestful unity. This is illustrated whenever we gaze through a cracked glass or the sloping edge of a mirror or a glass-ball, or a soap-bubble. The most familiar instance is that of a prism. This has been used as a proof of the theory that Light is a composition of seven degrees of darkness, but in the light of pure thinking such hypothesis appears ridiculous. A common-sense man laughs at it—and well he may. It is easy to realise that the *spectrum* bespeaks only the varying thickness of the medium through which the Light is shining. But as, in order to discuss its shape adequately, I should have to deal with matters which are irrelevant to my present object, I am content for the present only to adduce evidence that experiment fully corroborates the conclusion of our reflection that when the two moments of Light, as such, acquire the concretion proper to the subject (the unit of a species), their reflection manifests as Colour.

Now, although we did not continue our reflection beyond the notion of Colour, it is easy to anticipate that, in going on, we should have to keep on restating the movements of the same

fundamental trinity in categories of an ever-widening connotation. In any case nothing that would follow could possibly affect the succession of colours as established experimentally.

It is impossible to determine *à priori* which colour should follow which, or that the first colour of Darkening must be Yellow, because Logic deals only with *notions*, not with *concepts*. A notion implies an act of *arûpa*-thinking which originates in Buddhi, whilst concepts are framed *à posteriori* as mental counters of facts verified through perception, which originates in Kâma, and is the exercise of automatised reflection.

This distinction is, as a rule, beyond the ken of the intellectual consciousness, which cannot help seeking fulness in the wealth of imagination rather than in the blissful thrilling within which accompanies pure thinking. Immanuel Kant spent his whole life in search for notions, and only came to believe that there cannot be any at all; Plato presumably only ventured on rational emptiness in leaving the firm ground of *concrete* thinking behind. But the said distinction holds good whether with, or against, the consent of narrow (*i.e.*, only formal) minds—even as Truth stands *per se*; and in conformity with it, Whiteness, Greenness, etc., have no meaning whatever apart from a subject of perception.

This makes it plain that it is really only the *correspondence* between the scheme of colours and the visualised moments of a rational cycle that can be meant when speaking of a meaning of colours. As logical reflection proceeds in cycles, and each cycle shows forth the same typical moments, the same succession of colours must be predicated whenever we deal with facts having dialectical relationship; for having no meaning *per se*, colours must share the logical character of numbers, and these are utterly indifferent to the nature of what is counted.

Now, it cannot possibly be my object to exhaust the subject of the correspondence between colours in all the spheres of Being. This would be like wishing to enumerate all the instances when it is possible to count up to ten. But there are cases when we are interested in grouping things; and by analogy I shall now proceed to correlate the colours with our dispositions mental and emotional in the course of our Evolution and Involution.

The beginning must be made with the universal, for we must begin with our fundamental intuition, and this proclaims our Being as all-embracing and eternal. Owing to its triune nature, the universal must get determined or specialised; and the species, in turn, must ultimate in the individual. This has been found to be so above. Setting, now, the process of Darkening against our Evolution, the corresponding succession of colours clearly is correlated with the main stages of the Descent from Buddhi into Kâma, the esoteric colours of which are also said to be Yellow and Red. Orange, as the go-between, evidently corresponds to the principle of egotism (*Ahaṁkāra*), in so far as it is the link between the Divine and animal.

Of course, each of the main stages admits of further subdivisions, so that each colour assumes several gradations which correspond to analogous modifications of its fundamental meaning. Thus Yellow stands in succession for pure knowledge, intellectual theorising and the exercise of reproductive imagination; Orange bridges over noble pride with vulgar conceit, and Red implies the contrast between the purest *joie de vivre* and the deadliest hatred.

The fact, that the ultimate colour of obscurity manifests as Blue, does not contradict the correctness of our threefold subdivision, but only serves to remind us that whenever two spheres are dialectically correlated, each ends in becoming the other in conformity with its logical character as an unrestful unity of both. Blue is the first colour of Illumination; in ending by it, the process of Darkening is converted into its opposite. Therefore Blue corresponds obviously to that stage of our growth which is known as Conversion.

It is a historical fact that periods of intense piety were also periods of frightful savagery, when God himself seemed to endorse the practice of untold abominations against the heretic thinker. The convert at this stage of his career will have none of free-thought. The memory of the ultimate wretchedness resulting from merely intellectual consciousness is with him flaming Red; in fact it is his hell which he does his best to blot out. This is the stage of fervent supplications, of humble self-accusations, of confession. The Protestant gibes at the absurdity of Roman

Catholic ritualism, forgetting that every institution must needs have a *pro* and *contra*. The confessional may be used for unworthy ends—so may *aqua vitæ*; but it is also the last refuge to many a burdened soul, verging on the brink of madness. And what a salutary practice is self-abasement! Of course, my intention is not to propagate Roman Catholicism, but only to remind the reader that the greatest absurdity, spurned by the intellect, may, in truth, meet a vital need of our nature at some particular stage of development. This is what Napoleon pointed out to those who ridiculed the institution of the Legion of Honour. “You call these ribbons and crosses *children’s rattles*; be it so! It is with children’s rattles that men are led.” And all exoteric religions bear out his words.

Turning now our attention to the process of Illumination *per se*, we find that the shades of Blue rightly correspond to the stage of blind religious beliefs. As these are emerging from their savage inchoateness, enlisting intellect in their service, so that now its mission becomes that of the handmaiden of Intuition, the Blue deepens into Indigo, which is also the esoteric colour of Manas. Violet is the colour of spiritual devotion, because even the highest devotion comes under the head of Negation or Darkness, being still only an effort at yoga however near it. Linga Sharfra is also Violet, because it is related to the golden Jiva as spiritual devotion to full enlightenment. Also we find that Yellow and Violet are complementary.

Enlightenment is complete only when one fully remembers himself in all that is, and thus transcends even the subtlest remainder of illusion of separateness, which still clings to spiritual devotion. This is how Yellow is made to shine once more in all its magnificence.

“Hark! . . . From the deep unfathomable vortex of that *golden* light in which the Victor bathes, all nature’s wordless voice in thousand tones ariseth to proclaim: Joy unto you, O men of Myalba! A pilgrim hath returned back from the other shore. A new Arhan is born.”¹

But—the goal is reached only to be lost again! Ignorance and Wisdom are joined in a vicious circle. Full enlightenment

¹ *The Voice of the Silence.*

is also complete disenchantment, and this means paralysis. Yellow is the beginning of a yearning for self-oblivion reached in pure feeling, in spiritual sleep. Pralaya follows Manvantara and *vice versá*. To be at the bottom means to aspire; to be at the top means to go down. Such is Karma! This seems gloomy to the seeker of absolute changelessness apart from the universal commotion. However, the Absolute pooh-poohs utilitarianism. Are we not invited to get rid of *all* attachments? Know that even the highest attainment is only the transitory fruitage of *mâyávic* growth! At bottom all is because it is, and all is done because it is done:

“There is no limiting, nor letting go, no binding nor gaining of success; there is neither the seeker of Freedom, nor the free: this verily is the ultimate truth.”¹

There remain Green and Grey to be dealt with.

Now, Green is evidently the fundamental colour in Nature, and Nature is only as a Being-for-other because it is not *per se*. Accordingly Green ought to represent the characteristic of Being-for-other-ness. And does it not stand for Sympathy and Adaptability, *i.e.*, for plasticity going hand in hand with passivity? It is easy to understand how it is also the colour of deceit, when, however, it is mixed with Grey. The deceitful person must be a good actor. And as the victim to jealousy or envy is equally surrendering the glory of Spirit, *per-se-ness*, Green is also the colour of corresponding thought-forms.

The reason why it is characteristic of the highest virtue—perfect sympathy—and the lowest vices is due to its logical character; namely, as the two processes traced above represent the mediation of the two moments of our nature, they have for their premise an immediate at-one-ment; and that this corresponds to Green may be shown by simply mixing together the two representative colours of Yellow and Blue: we obtain the impression of Green even when the mixture is purely mechanical. Now, as the premise is essential to an argument, it is easy to realise why Green is, so to speak, the permanent background of the evolutionary panorama, associable with the whole gamut

¹ From Shañkara's *Vivekachuddmani: The Crest-Jewel of Wisdom*, in Charles Johnston's translation.

of virtues and vices alike. It is the serpent colour and the serpent symbolises Wisdom as well as utter degradation. In so far as Vāyu is the material substratum of Nature or the negative universality known as the Air, and it is also Green. And it is easy to understand further why a freshman is commonly dubbed a greenhorn.

Ocean is Green, in so far as the element of Water is logically the paralysed element of Fire, which, in turn, is Yellow as the Essence re-awakened from its sleep in the Air. But as the ultimate colour of self-paralysis is Blue, Ocean also passes for Blue. As Green it is a pure Being-for-other-ness or utter formlessness; it assumes readily any shape and its sympathy with everything that it touches is under circumstances most annoying. But it shuns Oil, which is liquid Fire and is thus the symbol of Conversion. This is why it is used for baptising purposes.

By the way, it is easy to understand why aristocratic blood is reputed Blue. In respect of body, the Blue colour indicates the ultimate of self-paralysis; but when it is referred to the blood it evidently is meant to imply a striving for enlightenment or re-birth of the soul. Of course, I do not mean to assert that aristocrats are, as a rule, people of noble character, but that this constitutes the true nobility. It is he who knows the Truth that makes free that alone deserves to be called *Your Serenity*; for, for him, "when he is enthroned in yoga, serenity is called the means."¹

As for Grey, it has been pointed out above that it is a moment of the mediation between pure Light and Colour. It is the twilight. Its meaning implies, then, even a wider range than is that of Green; it ought to refer to the widest conceivable extremes. Indeed, is not the colour of the most and least enformed matter, *i.e.*, of the brain-matter and ashes, grey? Do we not turn livid under the shock of both extreme joy and pain? Grey is the colour of abject fear, but also of the dignity pertaining to old age. Grey is also the eye of the man of action *par excellence*.

Green-grey is the colour of deceit, because it refers to the principle of self-activity as the producer of the Divine Mâyā.

¹ *The Bhagavad Gītā*, vi. 3.

But the combination easily strikes into Purple, which is complementary to the Green, as may be witnessed often in watching the effects of sunshine on meadows or the surface of a lake. Purple appears, then, in the character of a mediated premise or conclusion and consequently ought to be the truly all-embracing colour. In fact, it is associated with the climax of all power as well as the last of social callings—with the majesty of a king and the office of an executioner. It is the colour of outraged innocence and found-out guilt. No poet seems to have yet associated the purple of the dawning sunrise with the blushing cheek of a cheat; but why not do so? *Vanitas vanitatum* is Koheleth's cry and the sun is the chief party to universal humbug.

I used to be often reproached with my seeming indifference to the beauties of Nature; and I nearly came to fancy myself deficient in that sense of beauty which seemed to be the common heritage of everybody I came across. From my present standpoint, however, it is plain to me that, in admiring colours as colours, one only admires different degrees of Darkness. He who is centred in the principle of thought, appreciates keenly only when he understands; this is why the emotional Ah! Oh! Grand! etc., is foreign to him, and under circumstances—when expressing sheer idolatry—jars on his nerves. For he is not a worshipper of Nature. Let him who raves about her beauties be planted in the Paradise itself, but apart from living fellow-creatures, and he would soon find that communion with Spirit is far more essential to happiness than gazing at the grandest scenery. This has been brought to my notice through the fact that I invariably feel saddened or bored where it is customary to admire or rejoice. The country lit up by sunshine on the most beautiful summer-day seems to me conspicuous with some melancholy emptiness, which is banished only when something provokes me into thinking. And is not the Ego the Thinker?

FRANCIS SEDLÁK.

FAST from evil.—EMPEDOCLES.

BENEDICITE OMNIA OPERA

It was Palm Sunday, and the ordinary Anglican morning service was in full swing in a crowded and fashionable London church. An unconventional mind with so-called "Pagan" tendencies is apt to find attendance at such services one of the more oppressive social functions of life, though at the same time recognising that, for a variety of good reasons, in many cases it is necessary to be gone through, and with as much outward attention as possible.

All unheeding what particular portion of the service was in progress, and with a kind of resigned impatience, the inattentive member of the congregation gazed unthinkingly at the east window with its representation of the crucified Christ, and the sorrowful women mournfully gazing up at Him from the foot of the cross. Suddenly the words "O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord, praise Him and magnify Him for ever," sung in rhythmical cadence, fell upon the ear, and awoke interest and attention by their note of appeal to the great Life and Powers of Nature, whose manifestations we become aware of as light, heat, winds and floods.

The east window with its sad dying figure and tearful women, the altar with its dry yellow palms drooping against a purple background, and the semi-gloom of the half-lit church, all vanished. And, as the chant proceeded, there unrolled before the eyes another scene altogether different, yet familiar; for in it another crowd of worshippers and onlookers were listening to the same invocation, sung in a different tongue in the fulness and freedom of the light.

In a circular building of white stone or marble, with an open space in the centre of the domed roof, and four wide portals standing open to admit the throngs of worshippers and spectators, stood a vast crowd kept back from the central portion of the building by a low balustrade.

Inside this space, three circles of priests, clothed in white and yellow garments, and holding in their hands scarves or flags of flame-coloured fabric, were chanting an invocation in rhythmical cadence, which rose and fell upon the ear in measured waves of sound.

In the centre of the space, standing upon a square block of polished red granite, was a handsome youth of slender form and noble appearance. He was clothed in white, and stood with outstretched arms, holding in his right hand a flat shining disc of burnished metal.

Slowly the surrounding priests chanted in crescendo: "O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord"; and at the words "Praise Him and magnify Him for ever," sung in a burst of fullest sound, they moved forward three paces, at the same time raising in the air their brilliant scarves, which clothed the central figure as with a mighty flame of colour. At the same instant a brilliant light glowed out upon the polished metal disc. The scarves fluttered down at the conclusion of each strophe, and the circling bands of officiating priests moved slowly backward to their places. This was repeated twenty-one times. At the conclusion of the last chant, amid the flaming scarves still uplifted, and the light upon the metal disc still glowing, the youth rose slowly from the granite altar, and gradually disappearing through the central open space in the roof, vanished from the gaze of the assembled worshippers and spectators.

He smilingly passed upward with hands outstretched, sign of joyous freedom from the bonds of Time and Space and rapturous reunion with the great pulsing Heart of Being. It seemed as if this were the culminating note of a great ceremony emblematic of the coming forth, and passing back, of the separated spark into the Fire of Life that gave it birth—that Mighty Fire, whose Divine Breath upholds it throughout the cycle of appearance; drawing it in, triumphant and completed, to the Full Heart of all Existence, when the Great Day "Be One with Us" is accomplished, and the need for manifestation and separation has passed by.

H. H. ROBBINS.

SCIENCE AND THE DEVAS

ON the occasion of the British Association's assembly in 1906, a lecture was delivered before the Physiological Section, by Prof. Gotch, the main purpose of which was to show that what is called the "neo-vitalist" theory of certain scientists is not only unnecessary, but is even harmful to the interests of scientific research.

The neo-vitalists are inclined to attribute any (at present) particularly mysterious and unexplained phenomena which they may encounter, to the action of some "directive force" or forces, whose workings, being outside the realm of natural science, it is impossible to investigate by the ordinary methods of scientific research. The result of such a conception is that the investigator feels he has always to reckon with a mysterious, unknown, and unknowable quantity which may at any point obtrude itself, rendering further work on those lines futile—perhaps also neutralising the benefits of previous labour, by casting doubt upon the accuracy of observations and deductions made without reference to such "directive force."

Prof. Gotch refers to the lecture given by Prof. Japp in 1898, in which it is said :

The absolute origin of compounds of one-sided symmetry to be found in the living world, is a mystery as profound as life itself.

To which Prof. Gotch very truly remarks :

The absolute origin of anything, living or non-living, is a mystery which science *does not* attempt to solve, relative, *not* absolute, causation being the object of scientific grouping.

And he then quotes Prof. Japp's summing up of his whole neo-vitalistic argument thus :

No fortuitous concurrence of atoms, even with all eternity for them to clash and combine in, could compass this feat of the formation of the first optically

active organic compound. . . . I see no escape from the conclusion that at the moment when life arose, a *directive* force came into play.

This reference to Prof. Japp is particularly interesting to Theosophical students, as Mrs. Besant also mentions it in (I believe) *Evolution of Life and Form*, as illustrating how scientists are, through their investigations, sometimes led to consider the guiding life behind the form in which it manifests.

Now Prof. Gotch deliberately sets out to prove that this view of Prof. Japp's—that one is necessarily forced, in the face of certain phenomena, to believe in some special “directive force”—is in the light of further research *unnecessary*; that though science cannot elucidate, and does not concern herself with *ultimate* causation, she can elucidate and show reasons for these particular phenomena upon which “neo-vitalism” bases its claims :

Certain physiological phenomena are especially brought forward as necessitating the assumption of vitalistic or biotic conceptions, among these are the phenomena of nervous activities, the formation and activities of enzymes, the passage of substances through living membranes.

Prof. Gotch thinks that we have sufficient scientific data even now to assure us of the subsequent unravelling of the obscurer physical problems through legitimate scientific means.

I wish in this paper to dwell particularly upon recent research with regard to what are known as “automatic mechanisms,” by which the various processes of the body-organs are regulated and co-ordinated for the welfare of the whole organism :

Some of these are “chemical,” the mechanism being the production in minute quantity of chemical substances which are conveyed to remote organs by the circulating blood.

Of several, two very interesting examples are given. It is found that :

Substances elaborated in the maternal ovaries, determine, when introduced into the blood, the changes necessary for the proper attachment of the embryo during the early stages.

Also :

That chemical substances formed during pregnancy in the tissues of the

foetus will, if introduced into the maternal blood, directly evoke the appropriate activities of the remote mammary glands.

Prof. Langley suggests that chemical substances do not directly affect the differentiated tissue, but play upon a hypothetical receptive substance situated at the junction of the tissue with its entering nerve.

Now Prof. Gotch is disposed to believe that although this particular class of automatic mechanisms is strictly *chemical* in character, the supreme example of an automatic-physico-chemical mechanism is the whole *nervous system* itself—"which is in a very special sense the channel for the regulation and co-ordination of the nervous activities of the body," its transference and regulation of energy, etc., taking place through a physico-chemical flow along the highly differentiated nervous strands.

This Automaton view is not the popular one, which supposes the nervous system to be the seat of special "vital directive" forces, so transcendental in nature that they cannot be investigated by Science. "There is," says Prof. Gotch, "a widespread belief, founded upon conscious volitional power, that nervous energy can be spontaneously created, and that even if its manifestations are bound up with the integrity of definite nervous structures, these structures are only the material residence of genii temporarily in possession, at whose bidding the manifestations either take place or cease." Sir Oliver Lodge, in his recent work *Life and Matter*, seems to lend support to this view.

Professor Gotch next proceeds to examine this nervous system, and comes to the very important conclusion that its energies are of an *electric* nature :

In the nerve fibres, which are undoubtedly the offshoots of nerve cells, the only demonstrable changes during the actual passage of nervous impulses are of an electrical type. . . . All the better known aspects of nerve fibre activities are in accordance with such an electrolytic conception. . . .

Further, the brief duration of the activity of the nerve, its rapid development and slower decline, and the circumstance that a second external charge cannot arouse a second activity if it occurs very shortly after an effective predecessor, all have their counterpart on the electrolytic side, and we have convincing evidence that the electrolytic re-distribution during activity cannot be again produced until the electrolytic condition has more or less returned to its original resting poise : the real peculiarity of the living tissue is its

persistent tendency to re-establish the electrolytic concentration of this resting poise.

Finally, experiments show more and more convincingly that the capacity of the nerve to respond to external changes, as well as the magnitude and duration of the aroused activities, are particularly susceptible to modification by all those agents which are most potent in affecting electrolytic aggregates, such as temperature, electrolysis, and impregnation with various electrolytes.

Enough has been quoted, I think, to indicate the *electrical nature* of these nervous impulses, which is exemplified on a large and perfect scale by the electric organs of certain fish.

I take one more quotation as being interesting in another connection.

According to the neuron theory, the fibres of different nerve cells end more or less blindly . . . and do not demonstrably unite at their termini within the central mass, hence gaps exist unbridged by the differentiated structural continuum; but since the nervous impulse can pass from one set to the other a physiological continuum undoubtedly exists, either through *contiguity* in space, or through such delicate nervous matter that it cannot be microscopically demonstrated.

I quote this as affording an interesting parallel to the connection between the physical and astral centres in man. Some links of these are complete; in other cases gaps occur, partially spanned perhaps by the possibility of mutual response through spatial contiguity.

But the first point to which I would draw special attention is that the same physical phenomena which to scientists like Prof. Japp and Sir Oliver Lodge seem to necessitate the assumption of the "vitalistic" theory, *do not* present any such insuperable difficulty to minds of a different calibre; nor do they find any warrant for supposing any such "directive force" to be even remotely implied from the results of their research.

This chapter of physiology still bristles with difficult problems and obscure points, yet the unmistakable trend of the immense advances which have been made in recent years is towards the assumption that nervous processes do not in their essence differ from processes occurring elsewhere in both the living and non-living worlds.

We must, I think, concede that the scientists who take this view are as profound and as trustworthy in their research and their deductions as the "neo-vitalists"; and as Theosophists we

ought to recognise with sympathetic interest *both* points of view, though our individual temperament may incline us personally to the one or the other.

But I should like to suggest a parallel between the attitude of the neo-vitalistic professors, and the growing tendency on the part of Theosophical students generally towards the rather dangerously facile adoption of a similar "Theosophic" standpoint. As a very concrete example, which may be taken for the moment as illustrative of this tendency as a whole, let us take the belief in devas, angels. Let devas stand, as to most Theosophists they (or at least certain orders of them) do stand for the "directive forces" guiding the affinities and repulsions of atoms, etc., etc. We are rather apt to imagine that we know a great deal more than the general public, and can consequently explain everything in this particular direction when we talk about the "work of the devas" in the kingdoms of nature, and we are inclined to look down pityingly on the short-sighted scientist who can see no farther than his "automatic mechanism." But do we really *know much* more?

We read about "devas," and because it happens to be a teaching found in a "Theosophical" book, we too often *blindly accept* it as it stands, and think no more about it—except perhaps to trot it out on every possible occasion to "unbelievers" as an explanation of the machinery underneath the stage of the visible universe. But until devas are to us an object of *sense* perception, they *cannot* be more than a more or less reasonable *hypothesis*, mere *names* for a *supposed* unknown force, or creation, the assumption of which may assist our intellectual conception of things, but so far as we are concerned they are a veritable "mâyâ," and perhaps in the last resort may be fairly described as "the creation of a particularising mind." In any case, the "*reality*" underlying the name deva, and kindred orders, will, when we know it, be probably so far removed from our conception of it now, that any points of resemblance will be difficult to find.

Again, we will take it for granted that "devas" and angels, as such, *are* objects of sense perception to more completely evolved people. Deva-ology then becomes a branch of natural science like "anthropology" (or any other "ology"), and its

“professors” are not necessarily more open to the illumination of Divine Wisdom than the scientists who investigate the better known natural orders to-day.

We are apt to regard the portion of the universe that comes within the limited range of our sense perceptions as somewhat “common and material,” while the other portions that remain unknown to us because we have not organs which respond to their vibrations, we regard as something especially holy, mystical, wonderful, and almost necessarily endow with a halo of spiritual insight all who contact them.

I venture to think this is the *disproportionate* view of “*illusion*”—not that of “*illumination*.” To the sage all things are equal—the dog and the angel. “There is no distinction in the creatures of the Merciful”; and this, I think, not through any degradation of the highest to the lowest level, but rather because, to one who through Unbounded Love has reached the Supreme Wisdom—

Beneath the curtain of each atom lies concealed
The life-increasing Beauty of the Face of the Beloved.

We are reminded irresistibly of our own Alexander Pope—

All are but parts of one stupendous whole
Whose body nature is, and God the soul;
That changed through all, and yet in all the same;
Great in the Earth, as in the ethereal frame.
Warms in the Sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glow in the stars, and blossoms in the trees,
Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent;
Breathes in our soul, informs our mortal part,
As full, as perfect in a hair as heart;
As full, as perfect, in vile man that mourns,
As the rapt Seraph that adores and burns:
To Him, no high, no low, no great, no small;
He fills, He bounds, connects, and *equals* all.

To return to our devas; such information as we have about them is found in *The Secret Doctrine*. It is particularly obscure, disconnected, and involved. One fact seems to stand out, and that is their “*automatic*” nature: they respond to the particular karma with which they are connected, precisely as the muscles

respond to the electric nerve stimulant; they respond in exact proportion to the force of the stimulants, neither more nor less. It seems to me that the more we study and think over these problems, the more the sort of "human, divine person" idea—if I may so describe it—the more the ideas of personality, individuality *as we know* them, fade away, and their place is taken by the feeling that that which we are told about "devas" and other mysteries is in truth more of the nature of an allegory, a myth. By means of these material symbols we are enabled to apprehend in some dim, uncertain way (and yet the only way in which perhaps we can be taught) the existence of these potent spiritual forces, these great vibratory powers, which are the manifested laws and motions of the One Energy, irrespective of any particular form or mode they may take at any particular time.

From this point of view there appears a profound meaning in this theory of Prof. Gotch: the *electrical* origin of nerve processes. Here we have this apparently materialistic scientist joining hands with H. P. B. when she speaks of that One Life, that One Force, which manifests in the outer world as Electricity, Heat, Light.

Let us always remember with regard to these things that as members of the Theosophical Society "Our bond of union is *not* the profession of a common belief, but the prosecution of a common search for Truth. We consider that belief should be the *result* of individual study or intuition, not its antecedent, and should rest on knowledge, not on assertion."

It has been said that the disciple should always "stand ready to abandon all he has learned." And this surely is the attitude not of denial, but of the most unwavering faith, the deepest reverence in the *sureness*, the abidingness of *Truth*.

H. M. HOSWAIN.

FOR if thou shall find them in all thy close-knit mind and watch over them graciously with pure attention, all these things shall surely be thine for ever, and many others shall thou possess from them.

EMPEDOCLES.

WHAT THEOSOPHY MEANS TO ME

MAY I, a young and unlearned member of the Theosophical Society, strive to express too, a little of the meaning of Theosophy for me?

And here, at the outset, I confess, with Mr. Mead, that perchance I may divine what it means to me, but never say it. How shall I say with what eyes I view the Divine Wisdom enfolding me everywhere at every moment? With the increasing of all things it increases. In the fulness of their joy of living it becomes a song of triumph whose sound goeth forth into all the earth. In death it is the silent majesty of Him who, from the beginning, is Conqueror of death, and hath all things under His feet. The wonder of it, and the beauty of it, comes over my feeble and dimly-awakened soul, like the half-seen flash of a passing angel. I am a worshipper from afar in this temple of the universe; a door-keeper in this house of my God's.

And of beliefs, I have none. I wish for none. Expound to me, if you will, that the history of the cosmos, as laid down in *The Secret Doctrine*, the history and destiny of man, as put forward by the Theosophical Society, are, or are not, with you, reliable facts. I do not care one jot. The heart of me knows—and it is all-sufficient—that Beauty, Wonder, and Joy are the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. I have absolutely no theories or opinions on man and his destiny. I would not have if I could. That a purpose, and that a glorious one, is in and through all things without exception, is a self-evident proposition to me. Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard it, because it is too great for the eye and ear of man as yet unconscious of his Godship. So I am yet blind—as blind as a stone. Yet I know that the everlasting Light exists. And because I know it I have the patience of eternity, and a song in the heart of me that rises above the crash of my falling worlds.

I look to the beauty of this dear and mysterious universe, which can almost break the heart of man for very love ; to the wonder before which he involuntarily stands with bared head ; and to the joy, throbbing at the world's heart, which is so great it is akin to tears (and who shall say where joy doth touch upon pain ?) ; and I know how terribly blind and deaf and stupid I am. I say to that triune aspect of the eternal One : " Surely *He* is in this place, but I am blind and cannot see Him. Deaf am I, and cannot hear Him." Then it seems to me as if the heart of all mankind cried : " Father, Thy Son waiteth upon Thee." And in that sublime patience a thousand years are as one day.

Did I say that I had no beliefs ? Rather is it that I believe nothing, because I believe *in* everything. If one should ask me, as Pilate asked : " What is truth ? " I would reply : " Everything is truth." " I am," said the Truth of all things, and in that timeless present all that exists, all that is dreamt of, is felt, is known, is true, and real and holy. When we have reached Truth in the Absolute, shall we not look back and find again all truths that, for the moment, seemed to us untrue ? Shall we not look back and know as true—as beautiful—as glorious, all that was ever conceived in the great mind and heart of the world ? I *know* we shall, and knowing this I do not seek Truth, for it is here ; I do not ask to know God's mind, for it is being eternally revealed, and the wonder, and the beauty, and the glory of it is without end. My brother-men become brothers indeed, for I believe in every one of them to his heart's core. So too, man and the world are brothers indeed ; for it is unfitting the sweet dignity of the Sons of this Father if we say that man was made for the universe, and equally unworthy to say that the worlds were made for men. Rather were they made for one another ; to love, and to work with, each other. In the words of Elizabeth Barrett Browning :

And both commended for the sake of each
By all true Workers and true Lovers born.

Then what matters it, if all beliefs, all opinions, all things of this visible world, fall about our ears ? I will not be frightened though the stars fall, and the sun be darkened and the heavens be rolled up as a scroll. Never ! For though heaven and earth

pass away, though beliefs fall from us and leave us desolate, though Time places us within iron bars of grief, from the deeps of every man rises the eternal Divine Song—that “Word” that shall never pass away.

Ah! what matter though we be yet so blind, and the sorrow and desolation of hell come upon us? Though He slay us, yet will we trust in Him! I think God’s nobleman is he, who shall look silently upon the chance and changes of his life, who shall be faithful, even unto death, though the plan of the great battle be unknown to him.

Let kingdom rise against kingdom in our soul, nation against nation, if so be that we hold fast only the Profession of the Faith. And here is my sole Confession of Faith, the rock whereon the tides of life shall beat themselves in vain: “*It is the Lord’s earth, and the fulness thereof is His.*”

If you shall ask me what I exactly mean by “the Lord,” I mean That which can never be expressed, the Song behind all songs—the Beauty shining through all beauty—the Truth in which all things are true. Put it any way you like. And saying this, there is no more to be said, no more to be expressed, for that Confession of Faith is to me as wide as the universe, higher than the heights of it—deeper even than its depths.

My “reasonable” brothers will now accuse me of “unreasonableness.” Ah! well, poor words, which raise so many walls between man and man. He whose heart says ay to this, my feeble attempt at expression, as mine said ay to every word of Mr. Mead’s in his article in February’s REVIEW, *let him be my judge.*

CLARA M. CODD.

BUT come hear my words; for, truly, learning makes the mind to grow: Twofold is the truth I shall speak; for at one time there grew to be one alone out of many, and at another time it separated so that there were many out of one.—EMPEDOCLES.

THE TESTING OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY¹

FROM time to time in the history of the Society—once in ten or twelve years—a great shaking of it takes place, a testing of principles, a trial as by fire. Through such a trial it passed in the Coulomb case, in the Judge case; through such a trial it is passing now. From each previous testing it has emerged purer and stronger, and a period of growth has followed; we may hope that the same result will follow now, and that we shall have a period of vigorous progress. In the first trial, India was tested, and on the whole stood firm; the Judge trouble left her entirely untouched. In the Coulomb trial America was untouched, but failed badly in the Judge case; hence she had to be tried again, and the signs of her success in the present ordeal are few; England was much shaken by the Judge testing and is again in serious peril; Europe, at large, suffered in the Judge trouble, but is now standing perfectly steady, the European Sections, excepting the British, showing that they are ready to take advantage of the coming period of growth.

It may be worth while, ere it is too late for England and America, to recall what has happened. The expulsion of Mr. Jinarâjadâsa drew my attention to the danger of the Rule which placed the sole power of expulsion in the hands of the President. The earlier Rules had laid down certain intelligible principles, and those embodied in Art. XIII., as revised in 1890, might be re-incorporated in the Rules without serious objection; the persons indicated are not giving the "life-recognition," and may therefore be expelled (see my article p. 10); the Theosophical Society had then a certain "moral code"; the abolition of this, in 1896, subjected every one of us to the arbitrary pleasure of the

¹ As nothing else has been received from Mrs. Besant, I reprint the following pamphlet which was sent out to the members of the British Section at the end of April.—G. R. S. M.

President for the time being. This change was made by the governing body, for some reasons not known to me. No one seems to have noticed the change, until Mr. Jīnarājadāsa was expelled under the new Rule last summer. When I read the report of his case, I saw that liberty of opinion in the Society was imperilled; I talked over the matter with several trusted friends; finally, I decided to appeal to the Colonel against his decision—obtained by misrepresentation of facts—and to write an article on the general principle of expulsion from the Society. The first course resulted in the Colonel reversing his decision, and in the Council supporting him by sixteen votes to two—the remaining three members abstaining from the responsibility of giving any decision. The second course brought about a most unexpected result. I had hoped to have originated a quiet and rational discussion: my Indian friends differed much on the question of principle, but no one thought of getting angry; we all sought a common ground, on which the Society might stand, secure and yet free. As from one conversation in which Mr. Keightley had taken part, I knew that his view was the most opposed to mine, I asked him if he would write an article on the other side, so that both views might be presented for full discussion before the Society; he agreed to do so. He also drew up a new Rule, which was to be submitted to the General Council, and was submitted to its members in India. Under this new Rule any one considered “undesirable” would be liable to expulsion. When all this had happened, and when I knew that I was to be nominated as President, I thought I ought not to delay further the statement of my views. On January 5th, I wrote the article; on January 6th or 7th I telegraphed to Mr. Mead asking if he could make room for an article in the February REVIEW; he telegraphed “No.” I posted the article to him on January 8th, so that it might go in the March REVIEW, and had it set up for the February *Theosophist*. I left Adyar on January 8th, returning thither only on the 19th. (The “Conversation” took place during this interval, and I knew nothing of it till after my return; it revived the Leadbeater question, but as my article had been out of my hands for a fortnight, and its genesis had been so entirely different, I did not connect the two.)

To my astonishment, the article, when published, raised a storm in England, instead of provoking a rational and useful discussion. Mr. Keightley forgot his promise to discuss the question of principle, and made a violent and personal attack on me; as a cry of "Fire," yelled out by a mischievous boy in a crowded theatre, raises a wild panic, in which all reason is lost, and all humanity forgotten, so was the cry raised that the article was intended to reinstate Mr. Leadbeater, and the English and American Puritan conscience arose in its fury to devour me. The grave questions of principle were submerged in a flood of personal antagonism; it was announced that the Presidential election must turn—not even on the question of principle, but—on the false pretence that I would, at once, as President, re-admit Mr. Leadbeater; the few, who have long tried to discredit me, flew to seize the opportunity of destroying me, and we have the April issue of the THEOSOPHICAL REVIEW—with my name on the cover as Editor!—filled with violent denunciation, directed against a non-existing idea, supposed to be in my mind. Not one suggestion is made on the real question; no solution is offered of the real difficulty; no one points to any principle which may guide the Society in safeguarding itself. The General Council has rejected Mr. Keightley's proposed rule, and the expulsion of every member is still left to the arbitrary will of the President, subject, possibly, to an appeal to the Council. The English and American leaders are far too anxious to abuse a person to have time to attend to the serious principle on which that person invited discussion. The General Council, when it next meets, will have no more materials before it than it had at its last meeting; none of the thinkers of the Society in England and America has shown a sign of thought for its future welfare. The cries which fill the THEOSOPHICAL REVIEW for April are of the spirit of the crowd that tore Hypatia in pieces in Alexandria, and yelled execrations round the stake of Bruno in the Field of Flowers; they are capped by the remark, in the true spirit of the Dominican Inquisitor, that the heretic, in uttering, in answer to a question, a long-matured opinion, is making fun of his tormentors.

All these articles, containing many errors and misrepresenta-

tions, are likely to have a misleading and prejudicial effect on the minds of members who are anxious to act in the best interests of the Theosophical Society but have not the necessary data. There is no time to make the additions and corrections in the REVIEW, as nothing from me can reach England till the 3rd or 4th of May. So I send this separate circular—the only thing I can do to clear the atmosphere from the thick clouds of misrepresentation. I would also, so far as lies in my power, defend our late President-Founder, whose *bona fides* is accepted at the cost of his sanity, by re-affirming the reality of the manifestations at his death-bed, and the validity of his last official act.

Much of what is said in the April REVIEW is, it may be noted, fortunately corrected in anticipation in my address to the British Section written in March; a few other facts may be added here. The assumption that my article was connected with the "Conversation with the Mahātmās" is disproved by the facts, *and dates*, given above. Mr. Mead knows it was not so connected, since he had replied to my telegram of 6th or 7th January, and had received the article posted on January 8th. I do not understand why, as Editor, he allowed the articles written on a false assumption to appear without a note of correction. His note to Mr. Thomas' article on p. 176 conceals the facts that no voice was raised to point out the obvious wrong done to Mr. Jīnarājādāsa till I appealed to the Colonel, that I am condemned in America for redressing this wrong, and that no one in England has raised any protest against the threatened expulsion of thirty private members from the Chicago Branch for their refusal to answer inquisitorial questions. Mr. Thomas is, doubtless, ignorant of all this, but ignorance does not justify him in attaching a false significance to my article. The whole great edifice of misrepresentation, based on a mistake, falls to pieces by looking at dates.

It now appears that the British Executive received, and failed to publish, the formal Executive Notice written at the Colonel's wish and signed by him on January 21st. Mr. Mead prints it in *April*, under the curious heading of "Memorandum from the late President" instead of as the "Executive Notice" of the then living President. Other Sections acted on the order;

the British, for some unknown reason, kept it back, and asked Mr. Sinnett, after the President's death, to regularise his first letter. Probably the matter will be explained at the meeting of the British Section in July.

I do not understand the letter of the Colonel, dated January 17th, on p. 152 of the REVIEW, said to have been sent after his death. I left Adyar, as said above, early on January 8th, having seen only Colonel Olcott's private letter to myself, appointing me his successor. I did not arrive again in Adyar till the late afternoon of January 19th. I received no communication from Adyar on these matters between my leaving on the 8th and returning on the 19th. I did not see the letter to the Theosophical Society nor the "Conversation" till January 20th, when both were in type. Mrs. Russak told me that she had posted all the papers to me at Benares, but the telegram summoning me to Adyar had called me away before the letter arrived, and it only reached me about the 27th January. The date January 17th, therefore, must be an error. However, I saw the articles on the 20th, before they were issued, and made no objection to their publication, though I saw, at once, what the "Conversation" meant for me, and something of the use that would be made of it against me. I may add that the "Conversation" in no way suggests Mr. Leadbeater's reinstatement, and that we at Adyar could not read that into it, as we were told at the same time that the Master, in answer to a suggestion to that effect, had sternly refused his approval. As said, I was not in Adyar when the "Conversation" occurred, so only have it at second-hand, *with the exception of the statement about glamour.*

My position as regards the REVIEW I must consider when I reach London. I edited it with H. P. B. and she left me the copyright. I associated Mr. Mead with myself as Sub-Editor—as he had held that position under H. P. B. and under our joint editorship—and then as Joint-Editor. Last Xmas, I executed an instrument, with Mr. Keightley, who is co-partner with me in the T.P.S., securing him in that position during my life, and making him Editor after my death. It will probably, therefore, be best for me to sever my connection with the REVIEW, as I do not care to remain morally and legally responsible for such issues

as that of April. I do not, however, regret the publication, as it is but the open expression of the feelings which, for long years, have used every secret method to cripple and injure me. If I am to be President, it is well that "friends" should be known in their true colours.

I have to thank Miss Spink, General Secretary of the British Section, for her justice and kindness in permitting a statement of the other side of the case to appear in the *Váhan*; and I gratefully thank Mr. Fricke and Miss Severs for their generous defence of a friend too far away to place the facts before the Theosophical public.

I finish with the thought with which I began. The Theosophical Society in Great Britain and America is on its trial. Will these Sections march forward with all the others to a new cycle of life, of strength, of progress, preparing for the return of the two great workers who have left us, and who have severally placed in my hands the carrying on of their respective tasks now linked together; or will they place themselves in opposition to all the rest of the Society, wrench themselves away from the work of the future, and sink into a disregarded sect? That is the issue which is now to be decided. The confusion into which the issues have been thrown, the false issues raised to mask the real one, the misconceptions, misstatements, oblivion of the past, all show whose hands are at work to strike a death-blow at the Society. They may wound; I do not believe they can kill, unless the time has come for the Society to have a new body.

Mrs. Scott-Elliot, after a rather serious mis-quotation of a Christian text, says: "We must each of us take up our responsibility, and laying aside all blinding veils of 'affection,' 'gratitude' or cowardice, decide whether we mean to serve God, and His Servers, the Masters of Wisdom." One of those Masters has said: "Ingratitude is not one of our vices."

ANNIE BESANT.

THERE is no origination of anything that is mortal, nor yet any end in baneful death; but only mixture and separation of what is mixed.

EMPEDOCLES.

CORRESPONDENCE

WHAT THE GODS APPROVE

To the Editor, THE THEOSOPHICAL REVIEW

ON page 135 of the April number of the REVIEW you have, among suggestive thoughts, printed the line, "The Gods approve the depth and not the tumult of the soul," ascribing it to Fiona Macleod. I do not know from what work of this writer the line has been taken, but if Fiona Macleod has put it anywhere, she must have copied it without acknowledging its true source.

The line forms part of a magnificent poem, "Laodamia," by Wordsworth. Laodamia mourns fervently and long for the death, on the Trojan field, of her brave husband King Protesilaus, and makes strenuous efforts to evoke his shade, which at last appears and takes visible form. She is overjoyed, and springs forward again and again to clasp the phantom, which retreats and fades at each attempt. At last Protesilaus reproves her in these terms :

Be taught, O faithful consort, to control
 Rebellious passion : *for the Gods approve*
The depth, and not the tumult, of the soul ;
 A fervent, not ungovernable, love.
 Thy transports moderate ; and meekly mourn
 When I depart, for brief is my sojourn.

She is not satisfied, and answers :

The Gods to us are merciful—and they
 Yet further may relent : for mightier far
 Than strength of nerve and sinew, or the sway
 Of magic potent over Sun and Star,
 Is Love, though oft to agony distrest
 And though his favourite seat be feeble woman's breast.

He then exhorts and advises her as follows :

And thou, though strong in Love, art all too weak
 In reason, in self-government too slow ;
 I counsel thee by fortitude to seek
 Our blest re-union in the shades below.
 The Invisible world with thee hath sympathised ;
 Be thy affections raised and solemnised.
 Learn by a mortal yearning to ascend—
 Seeking a higher object. Love was given,
 Encouraged, sanctioned, chiefly for that end ;
 For this the passion to excess was driven—
 That self might be annulled : her bondage prove
 The fetters of a dream, opposed to love.

The poem rests on a genuine Grecian story, and shows how through prayers and sacrifices the shades of the dead used sometimes to be evoked. It is well worth reading, and the words put into the mouth of Protesilaus might do credit to a teacher of wisdom.

N. D. KHANDALVALA.

POONA.

We thank our old colleague for his note. The scrap was, if we recollect rightly, found among the MSS. of Fiona Macleod without any indication of source. Hence the error and hence the exposure of our ignorance of Wordsworth.—ED.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

RAMBLES IN THE VEDĀNTA

Rambles in the Vedānta : Being a Collection of all Contributions to *The Prabuddha Bhārata* (1896-98). By B. R. Rājam Aiyar, B.A. (Madras : Thompson & Co ; 1906.) Pp. xxi. and 716.

THIS is a collection, as the sub-title explains, of miscellaneous essays on the Vedānta and kindred subjects. It might, however, perhaps be more fittingly described as a reprint of *The Prabuddha Bhārata*, from the founding of that journal to the time when it was transferred from Madras to Mayāvati near Almora in the Himālayas. The collection seems to include everything that was ever published in the journal during this period, not excepting even notices and reviews of books and extracts of various sorts—the sources of such extracts ranging

from the Upanishads and Manu to Bacon, Wordsworth, and other more recent Western writers.

There is a Preface apparently by the editor of the collection, and an Introduction which includes a short biography of Rājam Aiyar, the brilliant young founder and first editor of *The Prabuddha Bhārata*. There is also a portrait of him which forms the frontispiece of the volume.

Although the volume seems to be, as stated above, a mere reprint of everything that ever appeared in *The Prabuddha Bhārata* while it had its home in Madras, yet most of the book consists of the writings of Rājam Aiyar himself. This is natural, for, as the biographical note explains, he was not only the editor of the journal but the chief, and even, it would seem, the only contributor to its pages. In the latter capacity he wrote under various *noms de plume*. This speaks volumes for the ability and energy of the young Vedāntist, whose premature death—for he died when he was only twenty-six—has been a great loss to the cause of the Vedānta and to India generally.

From his writings one can see at once that Rājam Aiyar was not a mock Vedāntist of the purely intellectual type. The Vedānta meant life to him, and inspired him with the noblest of ideals, and with a devotion that was sweet but strong and deep.

It is a pity that the editor of the volume should have included in it, without any discrimination, everything which Rājam Aiyar wrote. He might with advantage have left out not only a good deal of Rājam Aiyar's own writings, such as the unfinished story entitled "True Greatness or Vāsudeva Shāstri," and perhaps the equally unfinished accounts of the lives of Rāmakṛṣṇa and Jayadeva, but also the whole series of extracts from other writers, ancient and modern.

"True Greatness or Vāsudeva Shāstri" does not seem worth reproducing either as a good story or as a balanced representation of things. In it the author, in his extreme dislike for psychic and other phenomena of a cognate nature, goes so far as to brand them *all* as "clever frauds" (p. 566). It is undoubtedly a good thing to discourage psychic phenomena and warn people against the very serious dangers with which they are involved, and also to make it quite clear to their minds that psychism is as different from true spirituality as darkness from light. All this is necessary and one cannot dwell too often and too strongly on this aspect of the subject; but to see in every psychic or magical phenomenon nothing but a clever fraud is shutting one's eyes to truth

and facts. Some are undoubtedly frauds, as many of us know to our cost, but to call every one of them a fraud is going too far. And a true Vedântist, as Râjam Aiyar aspired to be, should be a balanced man without any prejudice one way or the other, and one of calm and perfect judgment. I am, therefore, afraid Râjam Aiyar has not succeeded in setting forth a Vedântic ideal in Vâsudeva Shâstri by putting such exaggerated statements into his mouth.

He has also had occasion to refer to Theosophy and the Theosophical Movement. Here again he has displayed a spirit which is anything but Vedântic. For the spirit seems not only to be full of prejudice but even of suppressed bitterness. It is a great pity that the movement which was initiated by the late Svâmi Vivekânanda, and with which Râjam Aiyar was connected, should entertain such a feeling towards the Theosophical Movement. Many of its adherents are perhaps not aware of the real cause of it. I was enabled to gather the reason from what Vivekânanda himself once told me when he was staying in London on his way back from America after his first and most successful visit to that country. Now that Svâmi Vivekânanda and the President-Founder of the Theosophical Society, Colonel H. S. Olcott—for he was the subject of the story—are both removed from this world of misunderstanding and consequent ill-feeling, the story may be repeated here.

Before leaving India for America, where he went to attend the great Parliament of Religions, Svâmi Vivekânanda, who was then, comparatively speaking, a little-known man, had asked Colonel Olcott for a few introductory letters and such other help which the President-Founder might give to make the Svâmi's way easier in the States. The Colonel, however, for reasons of his own, refused, the Svâmi said, to give him any such. For this the latter never forgave the old man, as one could see at once from the way in which he referred to the subject when talking to me. He told me in a triumphant tone, and not without some bitterness, how he was most successful in America, in spite of the Colonel's refusal to give him any help. From this purely personal feeling of bitterness towards Colonel Olcott the Svâmi seems to have conceived a similar feeling towards the Theosophical Society as a whole.

The hostile feeling thus created in Vivekânanda seems to have passed on to the Râma Kriṣhṇa movement in a general way. The sooner, therefore, it is removed the better it is both for the Râma Kriṣhṇa movement and for our own.

The friends and followers of Svâmi Vivekânanda should further remember that, although apparently Colonel Olcott refused help to their late chief, the latter's success was still due, to a great extent, to the help that he received at the hands of the Theosophical Society members in America. For when he arrived in Chicago the first people to give him a warm welcome were members of the Theosophical Society. Seeing, then, that the success of the Svâmi was made possible to some extent at least by the members of the Theosophical Society, it ill becomes the Râma Kṛishṇa movement to entertain any but kindly feelings towards the helpers of their late talented head, especially when the Theosophical Society has no enmity with them.

But if there are these defects and un-Vedântic tendencies in the volume under notice, there are things in it which are most excellent, and they far outweigh the shortcomings. Let me particularly recommend to the reader such essays as those on "Work and Saintship," "The Sages and their Real Usefulness"—in fact most of the articles grouped under "Editorials" and "Elements of the Vedânta." Some of the "Miscellaneous Stories" are also good, to say nothing of the accounts of the beautiful lives of Nandu the Pariah and other great saints and devotees. It will well repay the spiritually minded to read these.

Facing p. 192 of the volume there is a portrait of Râjam Aiyar's Guru. Above the portrait there is a beautiful motto. It has been translated as :

When work permits turn thou with mind controlled,
And take firm hold of That which needs no hold.

This embodies, apparently, one of the practical directions which his Guru gave him. Much of its beauty is lost in the translation. In the Sanskrit the paradox sounds most striking, and produces a deep impression on one's mind.

Altogether the collection can be heartily recommended to all lovers of the spiritual. Râjam Aiyar was a worthy son of India, who possessed a beautiful and spiritual nature which was at once brilliant and devotional. It is this spirit which chiefly breathes through the pages of the volume, and in reading it the spiritual aspirant will not fail to catch some of it, while he will get a correct view of the main position of the Vedânta. This view will no doubt be one of bare outline, as the essays reproduced in the book pretend neither to give an exhaustive account of the Vedânta nor even a very systematic one.

They are rather like the lines in a Japanese picture—few, and apparently very insufficient; nevertheless, they still convey an idea of the original, and though not giving a view of the details, impress one with a delightful sense of the supreme beauty of the scene.

J. C. C.

PROGRESSIVE BUDDHISM

Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot: Addresses on Religious Subjects. By the Rt. Rev. Soyen Shaku. Translated from the Japanese MS. by Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki. (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company; London: Kegan Paul; 1906. Price 4s. 6d. net.)

THESE addresses were delivered by the Rev. Soyen Shaku, Lord Abbot of Engaku-ji and Kencho-ji, Kamakura, Japan, during his visit to the United States in 1905-1906; to them is prefixed a translation of *The Sûtra of the Forty-Two Chapters*.

By means of these instructive Sermons we are introduced to a view of Buddhism that differs widely from traditionalism. Abbot Soyen Shaku claims that Buddhism is progressive and evolutionary; it is essentially practical and based on activity. It repudiates absolutely mythology, asceticism, and other-worldliness, and its one endeavour is to improve the conditions of life and bestow benefits upon posterity. The main interest is that we have here a Buddhist priest fully alive to the problems of the day, and striving to adapt his faith to modern conditions. It is Buddhism envisaged by the active practical Japanese spirit.

The Rev. Soyen Shaku is at pains to contrast his doctrines with those of popular Christianity, and this he does directly, without periphrasis or apology. He is also at pains to reject the doctrine of the ego in every form, and preaches a doctrine of reincarnation that empties it of all individual considerations, and reduces it to a species of pure Positivism which looks to continuance solely in the repetition by posterity of the great deeds and thoughts of ancestors.

While we agree that this may be the mode of activity of great souls, we ask what becomes of those who do no great deeds and think no great thoughts? Do they live solely in the wrong deeds and false thoughts of posterity?

We will therefore inquire further into the problem, first quoting from *The Sûtra of the Forty-nine Sections*, a Sûtra of selections, and the most authoritative scripture of Japanese Buddhism:

The Buddha said : Those who leave their parents, go out of the home, understand the mind, reach the source, and comprehend the immaterial, are called Shramana [the Strenuous—*lit.*, those who exert themselves or make effort].

Those who observe the two hundred and fifty precepts of morality, who are pure and spotless in their behaviour, and who exert themselves for the attainment of the four fruits of saintship, are called Arhats.

The Arhat is able to fly through space and assume different forms ; his life is eternal, and there are times when he causes heaven and earth to quake.

Next is the Anâgâmin [*lit.*, he who does not return]. At the end of his life, the spirit of the Anâgâmin ascends to the nineteenth heaven and obtains Arhatship.

Next is the Sakṛdâgâmin [*lit.*, one who comes back once]. The Sakṛdâgâmin ascends to the heavens [after his death], comes back to earth once more, and then attains Arhatship.

Next is the Shrotâpanna [*lit.*, he who enters the stream]. The Shrotâpanna dies seven times, is born seven times, when he finally attains Arhatship.

With this before us it is difficult to understand the Rev. Soyen Shaku's absolute contempt for mythology and mythological heavens. We say further that, while we share in the belief that no material or semi-material body of John Smith, or any form of him, is reborn, we hold firmly that there is "something" that is "permanent," in the sense of lasting from birth to birth, or otherwise the words of the Buddha would be empty of sense.

Twice does the Abbot of Engaku-ji tell the story of the hero-general Masashigé, who some 600 years ago, when he had done all humanly possible in an impossible position, committed *hari-hari* after the solemn utterance : "I pray that I be born seven times on this earth and crush all the enemies of our Imperial House." He also mentions the last utterance of Commander Hirose, who blocked the entrance of the harbour at Port Arthur : "Though I may die here while executing this work, I will come back seven times over and again to discharge my duties for my country."

But asserts our absolute non-egoist :

He did not mean to come to this life exactly seven times, nor did he mean to continue his personal existence as he was individually. He did mean this, that his work should find its new executors in the form of a worshipper or an imitator or a successor or a disciple or a friend, who would be inspired by that noble example.

There is great truth in this idea, we believe, as may be seen from

"The Story of a Monk," which appeared in our April number of 1906; but it applies to those only who show forth "example" in their lives, it applies to the greater acts of the greater life of them, and not to the rest which we call "personal." It may be that the fire of such acts of selfless heroism may burn up the dross of the personality, and so incontinently purify the whole nature, and deify it. But for the rest, for the little men of this world, what of them? What of the "processions of Fate" and not of those who have married their Fate with selfless love? If there is no reincarnation and if there are no "mythological" heavens and their opposites, what is the good of it all? We go out; *extincti sumus*.

Much as we sympathise with Buddhist scholars in their endeavour to dematerialise our conceptions of superphysical things, we still hold firmly to faith in a *continuum* of consciousness. We can, therefore, only conclude that the Rev. Soyen Shaku has been forced into extremes by contact with an extreme environment; and this is contrary to the doctrine of the balance which he preaches so eloquently.

We hold ourselves that there must be a *continuum* of consciousness, and therefore also a *continuum* of substance; we make a present of matter and form to our absolute non-egoist, and stick to *prajñā* and *sattva* as conditioning man so long as he is within the evolutionary spheres of *samsāra*. When he transcends these he can be spoken of as non-egoistic, but not before.

That, however, it is our privilege to transcend the fate sphere, that we potentially are here and now able to do so, that this is the whole duty of man, we agree. Therefore *absolutely* the ego-idea is false, for it is the holding to this idea which keeps us in the squirrel cage; but in the realm of relativity it is as true as any other fact—physical, psychic or mental.

The truth of the matter is that the Buddhist philosophers use the term *Ātman* in a way that shows they have inherited it as an heirloom from ancient embittered theological controversy. They believe that *Ātman* = *Ahaṁkāra* and even *Upādhi*; that this is the Brāhmanical position. Whereas nothing can be more fatuously ridiculous. It is to be regretted that the Rev. Soyen Shaku has not studied the Upaniṣhads.

There is much else to be noticed in these remarkable addresses, and much that we agree with heartily; but we have not space except to quote a striking passage in which our author sets forth the main platform of his faith.

This God of Buddhism works constantly and everlastingly; he knows no rest, no fatigue, he has not to stop his work after six days of toil; he does not resort to any special revelation in order to announce his existence to the world; he has no favoured son to sacrifice for the sake of the sin of which the poor innocent child has no conception. On the other hand, the Buddhist God is able to turn the meanest creature in the world to the noblest figure in which his glory is manifest to its full extent. He can destroy this whole universe and raise it again in the twinkling of an eye, it not being necessary for him to wait even for three days. His revelation is not an historical event, but it is happening every minute, and those who have eyes see it, those who have ears hear it. And to know the truth of this, it is only necessary to cleanse the heart of its egoistic impurities and defilements, which have been accumulating by virtue of our subjective ignorance. When this fundamental purification is completed, "we all with unveiled face reflecting as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory." Again, we are glorified with the "glory which he had with him before the world was." When we arrive at this exalted stage of spiritual enlightenment, Buddhism declares that we have attained Nirvāna.

G. R. S. M.

A PROTESTANT VIEW OF THE RELIGIOUS CRISIS IN FRANCE

À Propos de la Séparation des Églises et de l'État. Par Paul Sabatier.
Troisième Edition complètement revue et très augmentée.
(Paris: Libraire Fischbacher, 33, rue de Seine; 1906.)

IN a small book of about 120 pages, M. Sabatier summarises his view of the present state of things in France with regard to the separation of Church and State. He submits that the situation is an entirely new one in France, indeed in any country, and that it is one that other countries would do well to take to heart. It would be an error to say, or to think, that the idea of separation is one provoked politically, and those who declare themselves to be the authors of such an idea can be proved to be quite wrong. In fact separation is not the word to apply to this very complex movement. It is important also to note that the idea of separation, as understood, for instance, in America, which recognises all Churches alike, cannot be held in this case.

In France, although the Protestant Church exists and is in a sense influential, its religious activity is at present *nil*; the only Church to be reckoned with, the one which has provoked the crisis, is the Roman Catholic Church. If France were Protestant the crisis would be deferred, but *only* deferred, twenty, perhaps fifty years.

One thing is clear, that the Roman Catholic clerics have long ago pointed the way to separation, and have provided men, arms and ammunition for the attack on the State.

The priests are political and election agents ; they would be forgiven if they were only sincere and convinced reactionaries, but they are not forgiven for applying the authority in things political which they have always applied in things ecclesiastical. The sense of the nation as a whole is beginning to see and to resent this. " The citizen, in the opinion of Frenchmen of to-day, is not the elector, is not even the soldier ready to shed his blood for his country ; to make a citizen worthy of the name something more profound, more far reaching is needed ; a personal and manly effort to see clearly, to gain an opinion for himself and then to act in consequence of it." The conflict between this ideal of citizenship and that of the Church of Rome is the setting forth towards a new destiny and the main origin of the crisis. The independent Catholic is looked upon as a " sort of monster " ; he must be a member of a secret revolutionary sect or that enemy of humanity, a Free Mason.

Among other causes of the crisis the warning given to the Church in 1882 was not understood. The clerics only saw in it a fit of temper, and they took possession of the country. The history of the *Bonne Presse* Campaign is treated forcibly ; the entire lay press and some clerics saw the danger.

Since 1870, M. Sabatier holds, democracy has triumphed over all crises, has eliminated every poison and has rejected all idea of divine political right. In 1896, it is true, during "*l'Affaire*," the clerics saw their chance, but then began also that movement among the intelligent public, and the Church now stood forth as the genius of reaction.

The position of French clerics is described in brief as very precarious. The most moderate are the most suspected, and the informer is busy with bishop and country priest alike. The ignorance of the ordinary *curé* is phenomenal, and the general clerical intelligence at very low level.

In the third part, however, there is a strong note of hope. The " Church of hate " is only a part of the Church ; a stirring of real life is to be sought and found all over the country. That many of the clergy are alive to the change is evidenced by the success of the works of M. Loisy, and by the writings of such men as the Abbés Dabry, Lemire, Naudet, Mgr. Lacroix, Bishop of Tarentaise, and many others.

Protestants are cold because they see that the question is one of internal reform. Freethinkers are not anti-clerical, and lead the generous praise of M. Loisy, and the drawing together of young Catholics and freethinkers is an evidence of the]sense of need for sincerity and initiative on the part of the Church. The independent Catholics will be in the majority in ten years—not slaves to but sons of the Church. So much the worse for the Church if she shuts her eyes to these changes.

M. Sabatier's preface, which is longer than the essay itself, is devoted to the examination of the opinions of his critics, to a statement of his belief in the effect of evolution of religion, to admiration of those who so fearlessly plead for reform within the Church in this "reign of Terror," as M. Marc Sangnier calls it, and to a summary of his belief that a better state of things has not only begun but is to be confidently expected in the near future, and in this work "France will be aided by the *élite* of the clergy . . . and there will be a new Catholicism . . . which will no more resemble the old than the butterfly resembles the chrysalis."

C. M.

BUSINESS ASTROLOGIANISM

Astrology for Everybody. By Llewellyn George, Astrologian. Issued by the Portland School of Astrology, Oregon, U.S.A.
The Planetary Daily Guide: Better than Magic. Same Author and Publisher.

We may at least commend the candour of the author who here provides us with pocket handbooks for success in life, "specially arranged for those who have not made a study of astrology." For a small consideration (50 cents, to be exact) the Ordinary Person may be equipped with a set of tables by which he may know his "lucky and unlucky days" without the aid of an astrologer—we beg pardon!—*astrologian*; and become for all practical purposes as "weatherwise" as those patient scientists who "shun delights and live laborious days." We seem to recognise the voice, not of the teacher, but of the tipster, making his selections.

In strange contrast to this feverish care for the separated self stands the profound saying—was it not of Stevenson?—that "whatever else Man may be meant for, clearly he was not meant to *succeed*."

E.

MAGAZINES AND PAMPHLETS

The Theosophist, April, opens with an important paper by Mrs. Besant on the "Brotherhood of Religions." It is a sorrowful fact that anyone writing on this subject must begin with the confession that this mutual self-respect existed unbroken until Christianity came into being with its new claim of being the *only* true religion; and that religious persecution, in its strict sense, is confined to Christianity and its bye-product Islâm. She points out that the increasing bitterness of controversy in India is not original to the Hindus, but owing to the influence of missionary methods. After this she gives us a treatment of what the world-religions have in common, which is to be continued in the next number. Miss Edger's "Devotion in Zoroastrianism" is concluded, as is M. Bernard's "The Soul of India," from which we take this useful note: "The Spiritual Direction which the Hindus approve of by no means exacts, but on the contrary refuses, an abdication of the intelligence or of the will; it demands only a complete receptivity. It permits no mere inertia nor indolence on the part of the pupil; it requires on the contrary an intense super-activity of all the energies of the individual, but an activity turned inwards." And this: "The same reverence which the Hindu feels for his Vedas, the Theosophical Society claims for all the sacred Scriptures of every race; every teaching which bears the seal of the higher inspiration has the right to be respected and deserves to be studied, without compelling credence thereto." P. T. Srinivas Iyengar, in his "What is Spirituality," defines that "to the Bhâkta growth of Spirituality is proportionate to the intensity of the union with Îshvara he feels, to the identification of his will with that of Îshvara which he succeeds in making. When all flow in harmony with Îshvara, he gains mastery over Nature and over his bodies." Râma Prasâd's "Self Culture" and the Buddhist "Illustrative Stories" are continued; and we have also "Japanese Tea Ceremonies," by L. V., and "Help from the Invisible," by C. W. Watson. Matters relating to the Presidential Election we need not notice. By the time this number of the REVIEW is published, the Election will be decided, and there will remain nothing but to accept loyally the decision of the Society, and to forget as speedily and completely as possible the passions which have been aroused in its course.

Theosophy in India, April. For this reason we confine ourselves to a simple acknowledgment of this number.

Central Hindu College Magazine, April, appeals for funds to enlarge the Boarding-house accommodation, at present limited to 125 and far too small for the pressing need. The conclusion of Mrs. Besant's address on "The Ideals of the C.H.C.," and the notice of the Hon. Mr. Gokhale's address on the inexpediency of college students mixing themselves up with politics, both appeal to a wider circle of readers than the merely Indian one. The presentations and addresses to Miss and Mr. Arundale, on their leaving for their six months' holiday in Europe, will also interest their many friends here and elsewhere.

Theosophy and New Thought, April. Here the contents of permanent importance are "Plato," by Prof. E. A. Wodehouse, M.A.; "The Place and Function of a Theosophical Lodge," by R. N. Bijur; "Freemasonry a Stepping-stone to Theosophy," by T. N. Panchapagesa Aiyar, B.A.; and a notice of the late President-Founder, by D. D. Writer.

The Vâhan, May, is entirely occupied with the Election.

Lotus Journal, May, announces that, notwithstanding the scattering of the members of the late Lotus Lodge, the Lotus Circle for the little ones continues to meet as usual; presumably until the "little ones" grow big enough to form a new Lodge of their own. The contents of the number are fully up to the mark.

Bulletin Théosophique, May, in addition to Election matters, has an answer as to the best way of bringing up a child, and a continuation of M. D.'s "The Cultivation of the Heart."

Revue Théosophique, April, reprints Mrs. Besant's "The Basis of the Theosophical Society," and has the continuation of Dr. Pascal's valuable paper on Consciousness, and an interesting account of Paracelsus, by J. Hemdé. We are glad to see the completion of the translation of the two volumes of *The Secret Doctrine*.

De Theosofische Beweging, May, is (like the *Vâhan*) entirely occupied with documents relating to the Election.

Théosophie, April, also reprints "The Basis of the Theosophical Society" with a portion of Mr. Mead's criticism. Mrs. Besant's "Kârmic Problems" is continued, and the Editor makes mild fun of a correspondent of *Le Matin*, who informs its readers that Mrs. Besant has now abandoned Theosophy and "is to be found in the front rank of the Salvation Army."—Tableau!

Lucifer-Gnosis, No. 33, is chiefly occupied with an important lecture by Dr. Steiner on "The Education of Children from the

Standpoint of the Gnosis," which we hope some one will give us in English ; but has also a notice of the late President-Founder ; and a still more important unfinished study, also by the Editor, on the future work of the Society.

Sophia, March, is mainly devoted to the memory of Col. Olcott. The April No. has a very interesting account of a certain Samuel Zarza, who was, by order of the Chief Rabbi, burned alive in the year 1450, for asserting the eternity of the Universe. The "Dialogues of Love" and "El Regalo de los Dioses" are continued, and Eugenio Astol contributes a paper on "Silence," of which we are informed that Maeterlinck is the great apostle.

Also received with thanks: *Teosofisk Tidskrift*; *Omatunto*, in which the original articles are upon such practical subjects as "The Theosophical View of Life," "The End of the World," "Is Brotherhood Realisable?" and "What is Sin?"; *Theosophic Messenger*, April and May; *Fragments* (Seattle), January and April; *Theosophy in Australasia*, March; and *New Zealand Theosophical Magazine*, March, both excellent numbers, but needing no special remarks; *Theosofisch Maandblad*; *La Verdad*; *Luz Astral*.

Of periodicals not formally Theosophic we have to acknowledge *Broad Views*, May, in which the Editor's own contribution is "The Age of Humanity." Now that Mr. Mallock's story of a duplex personality is drawing to a close, we may venture to say how much we prefer Mr. Sinnett's own briefer, but far more artistic, treatment of the subject in his two papers, "A Bridal Pair" and "Married by Degrees" (*B. V.*, Nos. 28 and 30) to the more detailed, but decidedly crude handling of "An Immortal Soul"; *Occult Review*, May, of which Mr. Waite's "Chronicles of the Holy Quest" and M. C.'s "Reality of Dream Consciousness," form the most important part; *Modern Astrology*, May; the second number of *Coenobium*, which more than maintains the promise of its first; *The Dawn*; *Siddhanta Deepika*; *Notes and Queries*—perhaps we ought not to do it, but the temptation to quote this is irresistible: "Nicolai even thinks that the 'Fama Fraternitatis' suggested to Lord Byron [*sic*!] the notion of his 'Instauratio Magna'"; *Fellowship*; *The Grail*; *Herald of the Cross*; *New International Review*; *O Mundo Occulto*; *Health Record*.

Should Socialists be Christians? by Vallance Cook (Open Road Publishing Co.); *The Story of the Bahai Movement*, a Universal Faith, by Sydney Sprague (Mayle's Penny Series), a brief, but very interesting study of the work of a great soul.

W.