

• तत्त्वमसि । •

Chhandogya-Upanishad.

“This so solid-seeming world, after all, is but an airimage over Me, the only reality; and nature with its thousand-fold productions and destruction, but the reflex of our inward force, the phantasy of our dream.”—*Carlyle.*

THE LIGHT OF THE EAST

Vol. IV.] FEBRUARY, 1896.

[No. 6.

KEYNOTES.

THE chief religious event of the month is the series of speeches which Mrs. Besant delivered in Calcutta. There is a lack of the great enthusiasm which prevailed during her first visit and the crowd of listeners has considerably decreased. The Epiphany, the organ of the Oxford Mission, is pregnant with its usual cart-load of abuses for the devoted head of the noble lady. Some of the freaks of the Epiphany touching Mrs. Besant are beneath contempt as our readers will be able to judge from the following sample: “Mrs. Besant is delivering lectures in the Star Theatre in this city. We wonder if she has any knowledge concerning the class of females who usually exhibit themselves on the stage of that establishment. If she does we can only regard her as herself utterly shameless.”

**

An altogether novel class of de-

votees has arisen, of late, as the self-elected representatives of the Hindu religion and the exponents of the ancient wisdom of the Rishis. The curious thing about these people is that they make it a point to drug their brains with *Bhang* and Opium and in this manner try to reach temporarily a state of consciousness which their low intellectual and spiritual development forbids them to approach. Some of these men have succeeded in making numerous disciples who deceive themselves by imagining that the calmness of spirit induced by narcotics is the real spiritual calm which dawns upon the human mind at the death of all desires which the flesh is heir to.

**

According to the Evening Telegraph the largest bible in the world is the Buddhist Tripitaka, the Three Baskets, which comprise 325 volumes

and weighs 1,625 pounds. The above paper goes on to say :

"These sacred books are perfectly appalling in their bulk. They are called the Tripitaka, the Three Baskets, and were originally written in Pali, a vernacular form of Sanskrit. They have been translated into many languages, such as Chinese, Thibetan, and Mandshu. They have also been written and published in various alphabets, not only in Devanagari, but in Singhalese, Burmese, and Siamese letters.

The copy in nineteen volumes lately presented to the University of Oxford by the King of Siam contains the Pali text written in Siamese letters, but the language is always the same; it is the Pali or vulgar tongue, as it was supposed to have been spoken by Buddha himself about 500 B. C. After having been preserved for centuries by oral tradition, it was reduced for the first time to writing under King Vattagamani, in 88—76 B. C., the time when the truly literary period of India may be said to begin. But besides this Pali Canon there is another in Sanskrit, and there are books in the Sanskrit canon which are not to be found in the Pali Canon, and *vice versa*

According to a tradition current among the Southern as well as the Northern Buddhists, the original Canon consisted of 84,000 books, 82,000 being ascribed to Buddha himself and 2,000 to his disciples, writes Max Muller in the *Nineteenth Century*. Book, however, seems to have meant here no more than treatise or topic.

What the bulk of such a work would be we may gather from what we know of the bulk of the translations. There is a complete copy of the Chinese translation at the India Office, in London, also in the Bodleian, and a catalogue of it, made by a Japanese pupil of mine, the Rev. Booyiu Nanjio, brings the number

of separate works in it to 1,682. The Thibetan translation, which dates from the eighth century, consists of two collections, commonly called the Kanjur and Tanjur.

The Kanjur consists of 100 volumes in folio, the Tanjur of 225 volumes, each volume weighing four or five pounds. This collection, published by command of the Emperor of China, sells for £630. A copy of it is found at the India Office. The Buriates, a mongolian tribe converted to Buddhism, bartered 7,000 oxen for one copy of the Kanjur, and the same tribe paid 12,000 silver rubles for a complete copy of both Kanjur and Tanjur. What must it be to believe in 325 volumes, each weighing five pounds—nay, even to read through such a Bible!

* *

Leaving every object of knowledge in this world, there remains a residue, the real essence of knowledge. The knowledge, that this is Brahman, is the true knowledge of Brahman.

Panchadasi.

* * *

Man says, "Nature is cruel." This is like saying the mirror is hideous because it reflects ugliness, for Nature is the mirror that reflects man's soul state. When man becomes kind, Nature will be kind also, and "the lion lie down with the lamb."

* *

Evil thoughts cultivated in the mind, and inharmonious words spoken, are elements of corruption, which act upon mental and physical forms, and the atmosphere we breathe, as decay acts upon the food we eat—vitiating them and causing mental and physical diseases, and infecting humanity with the virus of inharmonony.

We occasionally meet persons who talk about "a bloody revolution"; and they then say "I am sorry; but I see it coming; it is inevitable!" They do not realize that by these very utterances they are breeding revolution; for the creative processes, whether operating in good or bad elements, evolve from the invisible to the visible,—from the nebulous in feeling and thought to the more concrete in speech and action,—and whatever a man cultivates in thought and speech he extends its influence until the good or evil crop that he has sown ripens.

Everything in the world, that is the handiwork of man, is here because it first existed in his mind, and then was spoken and acted out. The more good men can imagine, think of, and speak about, the more good there will be in the world; and so of evil.

Too many human beings are more automaton than living souls, for they but repeat automatically the opinions of those whom they look upon as leaders of thought in the various fields of endeavour.

We are sorry to see papers devoted to reform fostering the idea of a "bloody revolution." They are cultivating the force that is the cause of all the wrongs they complain of. We have had enough "bloody revolutions"; let the coming one be a Revolution of Peace, which will give us Love instead of hatred, Fraternity instead of Deviltry.

World's Advance-Thought.

**

The ocean transformed, through the action of clouds, into the form of rivers &c. ceases to be itself; so indeed hast thou forgotten thyself through the power of conditions. Oh friend! remember thy full-Self. Thou Art Brahman, the ground of existence, the All.

Svarajyasiddhi.

**

The following are the opinions of some of the leading scientific and medical men with regard to flesh eating:

Linnaeus (whose zoological classification is generally accepted) places man with the Anthropoid apes, at the head of the highest order of the mammiferous animals. The structure of these apes bears the closest resemblance to that of man and they are all fruit eaters.

Professor Owen: "The Anthropoids and all the Quadrumana derive their alimentation from fruits, grains, and other succulent vegetable substances, and the strict analogy which exists between the structure of these animals and that of man, clearly demonstrates his frugivorous nature."

Cuvier: "The natural food of man, judging from his structure, consists of fruit, roots and vegetables."

Prof. Lawrence: "The teeth of man have not the slightest resemblance to that of carnivorous animals, and whether we consider the teeth jaws, or digestive organs, the human structure closely resembles that of the frugivorous animals."

Ray: "Certainly man was never made to be a carnivorous animal."

Sir Henry Thompson, F.R.C.S.: "It is a vulgar error to regard meat in any form as necessary to life."

Dr. Spencer Thompson: "No physiologist would dispute with those who maintain that man ought to live on vegetarian diet."

Dr. Lyon Playfair, C.B.: "Animal diet is not essential to man."

Sir B. W. Richardson: "I sincerely hope that before the close of the century, not only would slaughter houses be abolished, but that all use of animal flesh as food, would be absolutely abandoned."

**

As the fool, while the images tremble on the bosom of water,

thinketh that trees, towns, and the wide horizon are dancing to do him pleasure; so man, while nature performs her destined course believes that all her motions are but to entertain his eye.

While he courts the rays of the sun to warm him, he supposeth it made only to be of use to him. While he traceth the moon in her mighty path, he believeth she was created to do him pleasure.

Fool! to thine own prides, be humble! Knowest thou not the cause why the world holdeth its course; for thee are not made the vicissitudes of summer and winter.

No change would follow if thy whole race existed not: thou art but one among millions that are blessed in it.

**

The boldest and most original newspaper in America, in 1830, was the *Free Enquirer*, then edited by Robert Dale Owen and Frances Wright. In turning over its dingy little pages I have met with many stories which seem worth reprinting. Let us begin with an unusually well authenticated apparition.

In 1687, the captains of three British ships appeared in the court of the King's Bench with their log-books, in each of which was the following record: "Friday, May 15th. We had the observation of Mr. Booty this day." All three had gone on shore with other men to shoot rabbits on the little island of Stromboli, where there is an active volcano. "And about half an-hour and fourteen minutes after three in the afternoon, to our great surprise, we all of us saw two men running towards us with such swiftness, that no living man could run half so fast as they did run. All of us heard Captain Barnaby say, 'Lord bless me! The foremost is old Booty, my next door neighbor.' But he

said he did not know the other who ran behind; he was in black clothes and the foremost was in gray." All this they put down at Captain Barnaby's request. "For we none of us ever heard or saw the like before; and we were firmly convinced that we saw old Booty chased by the Devil round Stromboli, and then whipped into the flames of hell."

When they came back to England, they heard that Mr. Booty was dead; and Captain Barnaby said he had seen him "running into hell." He was prosecuted for libel by the widow; and the damages were estimated at £1,000. It was proved at the trial that "The time when the two men were seen and that when Booty died coincided within about two minutes." The captains and many sailors swore to the accuracy of the log-book; and ten men even swore to the buttons on Mr. Booty's coat, which was brought into court. One witness, named Spinks, was asked if he knew Mr. Booty, and replied, "I knew him well, and am satisfied that I saw him hunted on the burning mountain, and plunged into the pit of hell, which lies under the summit of Stromboli." Then the judge said, "Lord have mercy upon me, and grant that I may never see what you have seen! One, two, or three may be mistaken; but thirty never can be mistaken." So the widow lost her case.

This story may have been published by the *Free Enquirer* in order to bring its readers face to face with the question, whether any amount of evidence could prove that the order of nature does not exist. Here is a ghost story, which is supported by the testimony of thirty witnesses; and moreover, to quote Captain Cuttle, "It's entered on the ship's log, and that's the truest book as a man can write." If all this proves anything, it is a personal devil, and a hell with real fire under that volcano.

ANCIENT SANKHYA SYSTEM.

(Continued from page 186.)

—o—

WE will devote the present paper to the exposition of *Purush* (पुरुष) as understood by the ancient Sāṅkhya philosophers. *Purush* (consciousness) is generally regarded as something which is beyond the twenty-four categories mentioned before. Yet in the Mahābhārata it is termed the twenty-fifth category. It is a quite distinct principle in as much as its nature is not at all similar to the various manifestations of Prakṛiti (प्रकृति). As all the categories of the manifested *Prakṛiti* (प्रकृति) appear as distinct during evolution, and reach the nameless unmanifested condition during involution, so *Purush* (consciousness) appears as multiform during the evolution of *Prakṛiti*, and remains one and single during its involution. That the above is the real view of the ancient Sāṅkhya philosophy, we will try to substantiate hereafter by quotations from ancient Sanskrit works. At present many modern works on Sāṅkhya philosophy are extant and most of them hold the view that according to the system of Kapila there are innumerable *Purushas*. We will show that not only this view is opposed to the system of Kapila but also to reason. The chief characteristic by which *Purush* is distinguished from *Prakṛiti* is consciousness. Consciousness is the constant and unchangeable characteristic of *Purush*; though the higher manifestations of *Prakṛiti* sometimes possess it (as the intellect during its waking state), yet they lose it during deep sleep and similar other states. *Purush* (पुरुष), on

the other hand, is eternally conscious and there is no gap in the continuity of its consciousness. In the state of Samādhi, consciousness (चित्) leaves the body, the senses, and the intellect and assumes its own native state.

तस्माच्चित्तियथावाप्तं चित्तं चास्मिन्मनसः
पुरुषस्य ।

केवलात्माध्यस्तं हृत्पुरुषस्युत्सवः ॥

वासुदेवादिना ।

From the fact of its possessing qualities contrary to those of *Prakṛiti* (प्रकृति), it follows that soul is witness, solitary, by-stander, spectator, and passive.

Unlike *Prakṛiti* (प्रकृति) the soul is devoid of the three qualities, viz., *Satya* (सत्य), *Raja* (रज) and *Tama* (तम); and as these qualities are ever active the soul which does not possess these qualities is like the (passive) witness. As a separate entity from all other manifestations of *Prakṛiti* (प्रकृति) it is regarded as a *bystander*. As it takes note of the various attributes of *Prakṛiti* (प्रकृति), it is regarded as a spectator. Being devoid of the three attributes which compose *Prakṛiti* (प्रकृति) it is called passive.

What is known as *Jiva* (जीव) in the Vedānta System, is called the twenty-fifth principle of the Sāṅkhya philosophy. The host of *Jivas* are so many appearances of the absolute consciousness, one, undivided and

unique, which is termed the twenty-sixth principle. The twenty-sixth principle of the Sāṅkhyās is the Parambrahm of the Vedāntists, the pure consciousness unsullied by name or form.

To recapitulate the statements made in the previous articles : The ancient Sāṅkhya philosophy classifies the whole of the manifested and unmanifested Nature into two principles, viz., (1) *Purush* (पुरुष) and (2) *Prakriti* (प्रकृति). (Whether these two primordial principles are really distinct according to Kapila, will form the subject of a future paper). Again *Purush* (पुरुष) is regarded as manifested and unmanifested in the forms, *Jiva* (जीव) and *Brahm* (ब्रह्म). *Prakriti* (प्रकृति), the absolute unconsciousness, is regarded as unmanifested and manifested, and manifested *Prakriti* (प्रकृति) is divided into twenty-three categories beginning with *Mahat* (इन्द्रिय). We read in the Bhagabat. Gita :

ब्रह्मसत्त्वगुणैश्चैवैवमिदं प्रकृतम् ।

इन्द्रियाणि मनो बुद्धिश्चैव तन्मयाः ॥

Chap. XIII. 5.

The five gross elements, the five tanmātras, the eleven organs, egotism, intellect, and nature (अव्यक्त) — these are the twenty-four categories in which the Sāṅkhya philosophers divide *Prakriti* (प्रकृति). During Mahāpralaya, the five gross elements (सूक्ष्मभूत) merge into the rudiments (तन्मात्र) ; they with the ten organs (इन्द्रिय) into mind ; mind into egotism (अहंकार) ; egotism into intellect (बुद्धि) ; and intellect merges into nature (अव्यक्त).

Let us now see if there is any difference between the *Prakriti* (प्रकृति) of the Sāṅkhyas and the *Māyā* of the Vedāntins.

PRAKRITI AND MAYA.

The *Avykta Prakriti* (अव्यक्त प्रकृति) of the Sāṅkhya system is characterised as follows : (1) It is causeless, (2) eternal, (3) universal, (4) immutable, (5) single, (6) independent, (7) free from qualities, (8) simple, and (9) sovereign.

It is also held by *Kapila* that *Purush* and *Prakriti* are interdependent upon each other, and by their mutual and unconscious cooperation the universe is produced.

If we enter into the spirit of the above two propositions and draw logical conclusions from them, we will at once find that the distinction between the *Prakriti* of the Sāṅkhyās and the *Māyā* of the Vedāntin is nominal and is a mere play of words which deludes the ignorant.

We have seen before in our exposition of the Vedānta system that attributes can have no independent existence apart from consciousness or apart from a witness. Apart from a perceiver, sound, color, touch, taste, smell, or any other conceivable attribute cannot exist as such (vidē; Light, vol. III. p. 327). As there is no perceiver during *Mahāpralaya* (महाप्रलय), what we now call the material world (अव्यक्त) remains in a state which is devoid of attributes. But as matter is nothing else but a group of attributes, in the absence of a perceiver during *Mahāpralaya* (महाप्रलय), it ceases to exist as such (i.e. as matter). The material attributes, then, reach the state of nothingness which is equivalent to unconsciousness. For intellect *Buddhi* (बुद्धि) being absent in both the states (viz., nothingness and unconsciousness) there is none to make any possible distinc-

tion between the two. Nor can we say that nothing else except the above two states can exist during *Pralaya* (प्रलय), for *Buddhi* (बुद्धि) being absent in that state, there is no faculty to perceive or comprehend the state of consciousness which is characterised by its absence. Hence, the *Sánkhya*s called that state *Avyкта* (अव्यक्त), the indescribable state, for beyond intellect (बुद्धि) no state can exist which is characterised by attributes. According to the *Sánkhya*s this state is *real*, for unconsciousness is constant during *Pralaya* (प्रलय) as well as during cosmic manifestation. The *Vedántists* call this *Agnán* (अज्ञान) both real and unreal (सदसत्) as its manifestations are ever-changing and the various states of matter are never constant. Still even through all its changes matter has some sort of existence even though unreal; hence it is also called *real* (सत्) by the *Vedántists*. Where is, then, the so-called real difference between the *Sánkhya* and the *Vedánta* doctrines? The *Agnán* (अज्ञान) of the *Vedántists*, what is it but another name for the *Avyкта* (अव्यक्त) of the *Sánkhya*s, the nameless some-

thing which comes into being only at the complete non-existence of the cognizing faculty (बुद्धि). True, that the *Sánkhya* philosophers call their *Avyкта* (अव्यक्त) *real*; but it is also true that the *Vedántists* call their *Máya* (मैया) both real and unreal (सदसत्). Moreover, the *Sánkhya*s view *Prakriti* (प्रकृति) from the relative stand-point, the stand-point of the appearance or disappearance of the intellect (बुद्धि), while the *Vedántists* view *Prakriti* from the stand-point of the absolute *Brahman*. The *Prakriti* of the *Vedántists*, is real from the point of view of *Buddhi* (बुद्धि) and unreal from the point of view of *Brahman*. The *Sánkhya* which employs the inductive method, views *Prakriti* from the plane of *Mahat* (महत्) and calls it *Avyкта* (अव्यक्त). This reminds one of the saying of the *Bhágabat Gítá* :

यत् संचेतः प्राच्यते खानं तद्योगैरपि भवते ।
एकं संचयन्न योगस्य यः पश्यति स पश्यति ॥

The spiritual goal of the *Sánkhya*s and the *Yogis* is the same. He who regards the *Sánkhya* and *Yoga* philosophies as one sees them in their true light.

OUR EXCHANGES.

AN INDIAN YOGI IN LONDON.

INDIAN philosophy has in recent years had a deep and growing fascination for many minds, though up to the present time its exponents in this country have been entirely Western in their thought and train-

ing, with the result very little is really known of the deeper mysteries of *Vedánta* wisdom and that little only by a select few. Not many have the courage or the intuition to seek in heavy translation

made greatly in the interest of philologists for that sublime knowledge which they really reveal to an able exponent brought up in all the traditions of the East.

It was therefore with interest and not without some curiosity (written a correspondent), that I proceeded to interview an exponent entirely novel to Western people in the person of the Swami Vivekananda, an actual Indian Yogi; who has boldly undertaken to visit the Western world to expound the traditional teaching which has been handed down by ascetics and yogis through many ages and who in pursuance of this object, delivered a lecture the other night in the Prince's Hall.

The Swami Vivekananda is a striking figure with his turban (or mitre-shaped, black cloth cap) and his calm but kindly features.

On my inquiring as to the significance, if any, of his name, the Swami said:—"Of the names by which I am now known (Swami Vivekananda), the first is descriptive of a *Sannyasin* or one who formally renounces the world, and the second is the title I assumed—as is customary with all *Sannyasins*—on my renunciation of the world; it signifies, literally, 'the bliss of discrimination.'"

"And what induced you to forsake the ordinary course of the world, Swami?" I asked.

"I had a deep interest in religion and philosophy from my childhood" he replied, and our books teach renunciation as the highest ideal to which man can aspire. It only needed the meeting with a great teacher—Rama Krishna Paramahansa—to kindle in me the final determination to follow the path he himself had trod, as in him I found my highest ideal realised."

"Then did he found a sect, which you now represent?"

"No," replied the Swami quickly.

"No, his whole life was spent in breaking down the barriers of sectarianism and dogma. He formed no sect. Quite the reverse. He advocated and strove to establish absolute freedom of thought. He was a great yogi."

"Then you are connected with no society or sect in this country? Neither Theosophical nor Christian Scientist, nor any other?"

"None whatever" said the Swami in clear and impressive tones. (His face lights up like that of a child, it is so simple, straight-forward and honest)."

"My teaching is my own interpretation of our ancient books, in the light which my master shed upon them. I claim no supernatural authority whatever in my teaching which may appeal to the highest intelligence and may be accepted by thinking men and the adoption of that will be my reward."

"All religions," he continued, "have for their object the teaching either of devotion, knowledge, or Yoga, in a concrete form. Now, the philosophy of Vedanta is the abstract science which embraces all these methods, and this it is that I teach, leaving each one to apply it, to his own concrete form, I refer each individual to his own experiences, and where reference is made to books the latter are procurable, and may be studied each one by himself."

"Above all, I teach no authority proceeding from hidden beings speaking through visible agents, any more than I claim learning from hidden books or manuscripts. I am the exponent of no occult societies, nor do I believe that good can come of such bodies."

"Truth stands on its own authority, and truth can bear the light of day."

"Then you do not propose to form any society, Swami?" I suggested.

"None; no society whatever."

teach only the Self, hidden in the heart of very individual, and common to all. A handful of strong men knowing that Self and living in its light would revolutionise the world, even to-day, as has been the case by single strong men before each in his day."

"Have you just arrived from India?" I inquired—for the Swami is suggestive of Eastern suns.

"No," he replied. "I represented the Hindu religions at the Parliament of Religions held at Chicago, in 1893. Since then I have been travelling and lecturing in the United States."

"The American people have proved most interested audiences and sympathetic friends, and my work there has so taken root that I must shortly return to that country."

"And what is your attitude towards the Western religions, Swami?"

"I propound a philosophy which can serve as a basis to every possible religious system in the world, and my attitude towards all of them is one of extreme sympathy—my teaching is antagonistic to none."

"I direct my attention to the individual, to make him strong, to teach him that he himself is divine, and I call upon men to make themselves conscious of this divinity within. That," he said, "is really the Ideal—conscious or unconscious—of every religion."

"And what shape will your activities take in this country?"

"My hope is to imbue individuals with the teachings to which I have referred and to encourage them to express these to others in their own way; let them modify them as they will; I do not teach them as dogmas; truth, at length, must inevitably prevail."

"The actual machinery through which I work is in the hands of one or two friends. They have arranged for me to deliver an ad-

dress to a British audience at Princes' Hall, Piccadilly. The event is being advertised. The subject will be on the key of my philosophy—'Self-Knowledge.' Afterwards I am prepared to follow any course that opens—to attend meetings in people's drawing rooms or elsewhere, to answer letters, or discuss personally."

"In mercenary age I may venture to remark that none of my activities are undertaken for a pecuniary reward."

I then took my leave from one of the most original of men that I have had the honor of meeting.

OUTLINES OF A HISTORY OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.

A DISTINCTIVE leaning to metaphysical speculation is noticeable among the Indians from the earliest times. Old hymns of the Rigveda, which in other aspects are still deeply rooted in the soil of polytheism, show already the inclination to comprehend multifarious phenomena as a unity, and may therefore be regarded as the first steps in the path which led Indian people to pantheism. Monotheistic ideas also occur in the later Vedic hymns, but are not developed with sufficient logic to displace the multiform world of gods from the consciousness of the people.

The properly philosophical hymns, of which there are few in the Rigveda, and not many more in the Atharvaveda, belong to the latest products of the Vedic poetry. They concern themselves with the problem of the origin of the world, and with the eternal principle that creates and maintains the world, in obscure phraseology, and in unclear, self-contradictory trains of thought, as might be expected of the early beginnings of speculation. The

Yajurvedas, also, contain remarkable and highly fantastic cosmogonic legends, in which the world-creator produces things by the all-powerful sacrifice. It is worthy of notice that the ideas of those portions of the Veda are intimately related with those of the earlier Upanishads, in fact in many respects are identical;* their connexion is also further evinced by the fact that both in these Upanishads and in the cosmogonic hymns and legends of the Veda the subjects discussed make their appearance absolutely without order. Still, the pre-Buddhistic Upanishads, and, in part, also their precursors, the Bráhmaṇas, which dealt essentially with ritualistic questions, and the more speculative Aranyakas, are of the greatest importance for our studies; for they represent a time (that extending from the eighth to the sixth century) in which the ideas were developed that became determinative of the whole subsequent direction of Indian thought: † first and above all, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and the theory intimately connected therewith of the subsequent effects of actions (*karman*). The belief that every individual unceasingly moves forward after death towards new existences in which it will enjoy the fruits of formerly won merits, and will suffer the consequences of formerly committed wrongs—whether in the bodies of men, animals, or plants, or in heavens and hells—has dominated the Indian people from that early period down to the present day. The idea was never made the subject of philosophical

demonstration, but was regarded as something self-evident, which, with the exception of Chárvákas, or Materialists, no philosophical school or religious sect of India ever doubted.

The dominating idea of this doctrine is the firm conviction that *unmerited* misfortune can befall no one. On the ground of this conviction an explanation was sought for the fact of daily observation that the bad fare well, and the good fare ill; that animals, and often even the new-born child, who have had no opportunity to incur guilt, must suffer the greatest agonies; and no other explanation was found than the assumption that in this life are expiated the good and bad deeds of a former existence. But what held true of that existence must also have held true of the one which preceded it; again the reason of formerly experienced happiness and misery could only be found in a preceding life. And thus there was no limit whatever to the existence of the individual in the past. The Samsára, the cycle of life, has, therefore, no beginning; for “the work (that is, the conduct or actions) of beings is beginningless.” But what has no beginning has by a universally admitted law also no end. The Samsára, therefore, never ceases, no more than it never began. When the individual receives the rewards for his good and his bad deeds, a residuum of merit and guilt is always left which is not consumed and which demands its recompense or its punishment, and, therefore, still acts as the germ of a new exist-

* Compare on this point Lucian Scherman, *Philosophische Hymnen aus der Rig- und Atharva-Veda-Sanhita verglichen mit den Philosophemen der älteren Upanishads*, Strassburg-London, 1887.

† Compare A. E. Gough, *The Philosophy of the Upanishads and Ancient Metaphysics* London, 1882. The singular unfavorable judgment of the whole philosophy of the Upanishads which Gough pronounces in the opening of his otherwise valuable book, may perhaps be explained by the morbid aversion to all things Indian, which difficult and absorbing work so very frequently produces in Europeans dwelling any length of time in India.

tence. Unexpiated or unrewarded no deed remains; for "as among a thousand cows a calf finds its mother, so the previously done deed follows after the doer," says the *Mahābhārata*, giving in words the view which had long since become in India the universal belief. Now, as the cause of all action is desire, desire was declared to be the motive power of the eternal continuance of life. Again, as desire was conceived by the Indian mind to have its root in a sort of ignorance, in a mistaking of the true nature and value of things, in ignorance, it was thought, the last cause of *Samsāra* was hidden. Equally as old is the conviction that the law which fetters living beings to the existence of the world can be broken. There is salvation from the *Samsāra*; and the means thereto is the saving knowledge, which is found by every philosophical school of India in some special form of cognition.

The dogmas here developed are summarised by Deussen, "System des Vedānta," pp. 381-382, in the following appropriate words: The idea is this, that life, in quality as well as in quantity, is the precisely meted, absolutely appropriate expiation of the deeds of the previous existence. This expiation is accomplished by *bhoktrivam* and *kartrivam* (enjoying and acting) where the latter again is converted into works which must be expiated afresh in a subsequent existence, so that the clock-work of atonement in running down always winds itself up again; and this unto all eternity—unless the universal knowledge appears which..... does not rest on merit but breaks into life without connexion with it, to dissolve it in its innermost elements, to burn up the seeds of works, and thus to make impossible for all future time a continuance of the transmigra-

tion. What Deussen here expounds as a doctrine of the Vedānta system is a body of ideas which belongs alike to all systems of Brahman philosophy and to Buddhism and Jainism. But the power of which inheres in the actions of beings extends, according to the Indian idea, still farther than was stated in the preceding exposition. This subsequent effectiveness of guilt and of merit, usually called *adrishta* "the invisible," also often simply *karman*, "deed, work," not only determines the measure of happiness and suffering which falls to the lot of each individual, but also determines the origin and evolution of all things in the universe. At bottom this last thought is only a necessary consequence of the theory that every being is the architect of its own fate and fortunes into the minutest details; for whatever comes to pass in the world, some creature is inevitably affected by it, and must, therefore, by the law of atonement have brought about the event by his previous acts. The operations of nature, therefore, are the effects of the good and bad actions of living beings. When trees bear fruits, or the grain of the fields ripens, the power which is the cause of this, according to the Indian, is human merit.

Even in the systems which accept a God, the sole office of the Deity is to guide the world and the fates of creatures in strict agreement with the law of retribution, which even he cannot break. For the many powers to which the rest of the world, orthodox and unorthodox, ascribe a determinative influence on the lot of individuals and nations as also on the control of the forces of nature,—divine grace and punishment, the order of the world, foresight, fate, accident,—in India there is no place by the side of the power of the work or deed which rules all with iron necessity. On

these assumptions all Indian philosophy, with exception of materialism, is founded.

The most important theme of the early Upanishads, which stand at the head of the real philosophical literature of India, is, as we know, the question of the Eternally-One. The treatment of this question forces all other considerations into the background and culminates in the principle that the Atman, the innermost self, the soul of the individual is one with the Brahman, the eternal, infinite power which is the ground of all existence. In opposition to this idealistic monism of the Upanishads, Kapila founded the oldest real philosophical system of India in the atheistic Samkhya philosophy, which bears a strictly dualistic character and sees in the knowledge of the absolute difference between mind and matter the only means of attaining the highest salvation, that is, the eternal rest of consciousness existence. The contents of this system have already been sketched in the current volume of *The Monist*, page 177; an exhaustive exposition of its principles is given by the author in his work on the "Sámkhya Philosophy," Leipsic, H. Haessel.

In all main outlines the Sámkhya system supplied the foundations of Buddhism and Jainism, two philosophically embellished religions, which start from the idea that this life is nothing but suffering, and always revert to that thought. According to them, the cause of suffering is the desire to

live and to enjoy the delights of the world, and in the last instance the "ignorance" from which this desire proceeds; the means of the abolition of this ignorance, and therewith of suffering, is the annihilation of that desire, renunciation of the world, and a most boundless exercise of practical love towards all creatures. In the subsequent time, it is true, Buddhism and Jainism so developed that some of their teachings were stoutly contested in the Sámkhya writings.* These two pessimistic religions are so extraordinarily alike, that the Jaina, that is, the adherents of Jina, were for a long time regarded as a Buddhist sect, until it was discovered that the founders of the two religions were contemporaries, who in turn are simply to be regarded as the most eminent of the numerous teachers who in the sixth century before Christ in North Central India opposed the ceremonial doctrines and the caste-system of the Brahmans. The true significance of these religions lies in their high development of ethics, which in the scholastic Indian philosophy was almost wholly neglected. Buddhism and Jainism agree, however, with the latter, in the promise, made by all real systems of India, to redeem man from the torments of continued mundane life, and in their perception of a definite ignorance as the root of all mundane evil; but in the philosophical establishment of their principles, both method and clearness of thought are wanting.†

It must also be mentioned in this

* One question here was of the doctrine of the Jaina, that the soul has the same extension as the body—a thought which is refuted by the argument that everything bounded is perishable, and that this would hold good with all the forces of the soul, as this in its transmigration through different bodies must be assimilated to the bodies that receive it, that is must expand and contract, a feat achievable only by a thing made up of parts. But main points attacked are the following views of Buddhism. The Samkhyas principally impugn the Buddhist denial of the soul as a compact, persistent principle, further the doctrine that all things possess only a momentary existence, and that salvation is the annihilation of self. From this it is plain, that the Samkhyas of the later epoch saw in Buddhism, which nevertheless was essentially an outgrowth of its system, one of its principal opponents.

† Compare especially the Buddhistic formula of the causal nexus in Oldenberg's *Buddha*, Part II, Chapter 2.

connexion that the religions of Buddha and Jains have as little broken with the mythological views of the people as the Brahmanic philosophical systems. The existence of gods, demigods, and demons is not doubted, but is of little importance. It is true, the gods are more highly organised and more fortunate beings than men, but like these they also stand within the Samsára, and if they do not acquire the saving knowledge and thus withdraw from mundane existence, must also change their bodies as soon as the power of their formerly won merit is exhausted. They, too, have not escaped the power of death, and they therefore stand lower than the man who has attained the highest goal.* Much easier than the attainment of this goal is it to lift oneself by virtue and good works to the divine plane, and to be born again after death on the moon or in the world of Indra or of Brahman, etc., even in the person of one of these gods; but only foolish men yearn after such transitory happiness.

In the second century before Christ the Yoga philosophy was founded by Patanjali. In part, this event is simply the literary fixation of the views which were held on asceticism and on the mysterious powers which it was assumed could be acquired by asceticism. The Yoga, that is, the turning away of the senses from the external world, and the concentration of the mind within, was known and practised many centuries previously in India. In the Buddhistic communion, for example, the state of ecstatic abstraction was always a highly esteemed condition. Patanjali, now, elaborated the doctrine of concentration

into a system and described at length the means of attaining that condition, and of carrying it to its highest pitch. The methodical performance of the Yoga practice, according to Patanjali, leads not only to the possession of the supernatural powers, but is also the most effective means of attaining the saving knowledge.

(To be continued.)

R. GARBE.

COUNT TOLSTOY'S PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE.

BY ERNEST HOWARD CROSBY.

DURING the past few years much has been said of certain peculiar features of Count Tolstoy's doctrines, and his views on the subject of marriage and physical labor, his manner of dressing and living, his objections to wine and tobacco, to gold and silver, are familiar subjects of discussion. To appreciate justly a man's opinions, however, we should examine them from the inside and grasp first those ideas which lie at the base of his system. In the case of the Russian moralist the task of separating the essential from the incidental has fortunately been performed by himself, and in his treatise on "Life"† he gives us the very core of his faith. The fact that the author is the greatest living novelist and one of the conspicuous figures of the age would be enough to give to this volume the interest at least of curiosity. But it is rather on account of its

* This belief in developed ephemeral gods has nothing to do with the question of the eternal God accepted in some systems. The use of the special word (*isvara*, "the powerful") in the Indian philosophy plainly grew out of the endeavor to distinguish verbally between this god and the popular gods (*deva*).

† "Life," by Count Tolstoy, Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York.

intrinsic worth—because it presents with all the freshness of a new discovery one of the oldest solutions, and perhaps the truest, of the mystery of life—that it seems worth while to call attention to the book.

Most men, he says, lead only an animal life, and among these there are always some who think themselves called upon to guide humanity. They undertake to teach the meaning of life without understanding it themselves. These teachers are divided into two classes. To the first, composed of scientific men, he gives the name of "Scribes." These it is who declare that man's life is nothing but his existence between birth and death, and that this life proceeds from mechanical forces—that is, from forces which we style mechanical for the express purpose of distinguishing them from life. It is only in the infancy of a science, when it is as yet vague and indefinite, that it can thus pretend to account for all phenomena of life. Astronomy made the attempt when it was known as astrology; chemistry assumed the same role under the name of alchemy; and to-day the science of biology is passing through a similar phase. While occupied with one or more aspects of life, it claims to embrace the whole. The other class of false doctors he calls the "Pharisees." They are those who profess verbally the tenets of the founders of the religions in which they have been educated, but who do not comprehend their real meaning and consequently contend themselves with insisting on forms and ceremonies.

The wars of the Scribes and Pharisees—to wit, of false science and false religion—have so obscured the definitions of life laid down ages ago by the great thinkers of mankind, that the Scribes are quite ignorant that the dogmas of the Pharisees have any reasonable foundation at all; and strange to

say, the fact that the doctrines of the great masters of old have so impressed men by their sublimity that they have usually attributed to them a supernatural origin, is enough to make the Scribes reject them. Because the speculations of Aristotle, Bacon and Comte have appealed to only a small number of students—because they have never been able to gain a hold on the masses and have thus avoided the exaggerations produced by superstition—this clear mark of their insignificance is admitted as evidence of their truth. As for the teachings of the Brahmins, of Buddha, of Zoroaster, of Lao-Tse, of Confucius, of Isaiah, and also of Christ, they are taxed with superstition and error simply because they have completely transformed the lives of millions of men.

Turning from the futile strife of Scribes and Pharisees we should begin our researches with that which we alone know with certitude, and that is the "I" within us. Life is what I feel in myself, and this life science cannot define. Nay, it is my idea of life rather which determines what I am to consider as science, and I learn all outside of myself solely by the extension of my knowledge of my own mind and body. We know from within that man lives only for his own happiness, and his aspiration towards it and his pursuit of it constitute his life. At first he is conscious of the life in himself alone, and hence he imagines that the good which he seeks must be his own individual good. His own life seems the real life, while he regards the life of others as a mere phantom. He soon finds out that other men take the same view of the world, and that the life in which he shares is composed of a vast number of individualities, each bent on securing its own welfare and consequently doing all it can to thwart and destroy the others. He sees that in

such a struggle it is almost hopeless for him to contend, for all mankind is against him. If on the other hand he succeeds by chance in carrying out his plans for happiness, he does not even then enjoy the prize as he anticipated. The older he grows, the rarer become the pleasures, ennui, satiety, trouble, and suffering go on increasing; and before him lie old age, infirmity, and death. He will go down to the grave, but the world will continue to live. The real life, then, is the life outside him and his own life, which originally appeared to him the one thing of importance, is after all a deception. The good of the individual is an imposture, and if it could be obtained it would cease at death. The life of man as an individuality seeking his own good, in the midst of an infinite host of like individualities engaged in bringing one another to naught and being themselves annihilated in the end, is an evil and an absurdity. It cannot be the true life.

Our quandary arises from looking upon our animal life as the real life. Our real life begins with the waking of our consciousness, at the moment when we perceive that life lived for self cannot produce happiness. We feel that there must be some other good. We make an effort to find it, but, failing, we fall back into our old ways. These are the first throes of the birth of the veritable human life. This new life only becomes manifest when the man once for all renounces the welfare of his animal individuality as his aim in life. By so doing he fulfils the law of reason, the law which we all are sensible of within us—the same universal law which governs the nutrition and reproduction of beast and plant. Our real life is our willing submission to this law and not, as science would have us hold, the involuntary subjection of our bodies to the laws of organic

existence. Self-renunciation is as natural to man as it is for birds to use their wings instead of their feet; it is not a meritorious or heroic act; it is simply the necessary condition precedent of genuine human life. This new human life exhibits itself in our animal existence, just as animal life does in matter. Matter is the instrument of animal life, not an obstacle to it; and so our animal life is the instrument of our higher human life and should conform to its behests.

Life, then, is the activity of the animal individuality working in submission to the law of reason. Reason shows man that happiness cannot be obtained by a selfish life, and leaves only one outlet open for him, and that is love. Love is the only legitimate manifestation of life. It is an activity which has for its object the good of others. When it makes its appearance, the meaningless strife of the animal life ceases.

Real love is not the preference of certain persons whose presence gives one pleasure. This, which is ordinarily called love, is only a wild stock on which true love may be grafted, and true love does not become possible until man has given up the pursuit of his own welfare. Then at last all the juices of his life come to nourish the noble graft, while the trunk of the old tree, the animal individuality, pours into it its entire vigor. Love is the preference which we accord to other beings over ourselves. It is not a burst of passion, obscuring the reason, but on the contrary no other state of the soul is so rational and luminous, so calm and joyous; it is the natural condition of children and the wise. Active love is attainable only for him who does not place his happiness in his individual life and who also gives free play to his feeling of good-will toward others. His well-being depends

upon love as that of plant on light. He does not ask what he should do but he gives himself up to that love which is within his reach. He who loves in this way alone possesses life. Such self-renunciation lifts him from animal existence in time and space into the regions of life. The limitations of time and space are incompatible with the idea of real life. To attain to it man must trust himself to his wings.

Man's body changes; his states of consciousness are successive and differ from each other; what then is the "I"? Any child can answer when he says, "I like this; I don't like that." The "I" is that which likes—which loves. It is the exclusive relationship of a man's being with the world, that relation which he brings with him from beyond time and space. It is said that in his extreme old age, St. John the apostle had the habit of repeating continually the words, "Brethren, love one another." His animal life was nearly gone, absorbed in a new being for which the flesh was already too narrow. For the man who measures his life by the growth of his relation of love with the world, the disappearance at death of the limitations of time and space is only the mark of a higher degree of light.

My brother, who is dead, acts upon me now more strongly than he did in life; he even penetrates my being and lifts me up towards him. How can I say that he is dead? Men who have renounced their individual happiness never doubt their immortality. Christ knew that He would continue to live after His death because He had already entered into the true life which cannot cease. He lived even then in the rays of that other centre of life toward which He was advancing, and He saw them reflected on those who stood around Him. And thus every man who renounces his

own good beholds; he passes in this life into a new relation with the world for which there is no death; on one side he sees the new light, on the other he witnesses its action on his fellows after being refracted through himself; and this experience gives him an immovable faith in the stability, immortality, and eternal growth of life. Faith in immortality cannot be received from another; you cannot convince yourself of it by argument. To have this faith you must have immortality; you must have established with the world in the present life the new relation of love, which the world is no longer wide enough to contain.

The above résumé gives a most inadequate idea of Count Tolstoy's philosophy of life, but it is sufficient to bring out the salient points, to wit, his idea of the failure of man's ordinary life, of the necessity, in the course of nature, of loving self-renunciation, and of the resulting growth in love and the realization of immortality on earth.

"But this is sheer mysticism," is doubtless the first objection. Yes, it assuredly is, but that is no argument against it. Mysticism is nothing but the recognition of the other world as a palpable fact instead of as an abstract theory. All religions had their origin in mysticism, and in so far as they have wandered away from it, just so far have they fallen into formalism. Mysticism is really religion at first hand, such as the faith of General Gordon, who used to say that he believed in the "real presence," meaning, as he explained, the actual manifestation of God in his own soul. It is not becoming for those at least who profess to put their confidence in Him who said, "The kingdom of God is within you," to quarrel with the man who finds it there. In short, all Christians should be more or less mystics.

If, then, admitting that the treatise on "Life" is in fact mystical, we

compare it with the works of those to whom the name of mystic is usually given, we are at once struck by the remarkable sanity of the Russian author. The practice of exploring the unseen world is often dangerous for those who attempt it, but Count Tolstoy has escaped the vagaries of Boehmen, the visions of Swedenborg, and the hysterical excesses of St. Theresa. And the reason of his freedom from these extravagances is not far to seek. He opens a door into the invisible, but it is not the door of mere contemplation, of quietism, of retirement into self. There is something morbid in the very idea of making deliberate excursions into another sphere. Here lies the mistake of the Christian ascetics, of the Persian Sufis, of the Hindoo Buddhists, and of the Theosophists of to-day. We may well suspect any form of religion which withdraws a man's interests and labors from this world; its cornerstone must be selfishness in spite of any disguises.

Count Tolstoy's door to the mysteries, however, is simply active love for mankind. According to him, pre-occupation in working for the happiness of others has a reflex action in the depth of our being which makes us feel eternal life. It is this intensely practical side of his mysticism which preserves its equilibrium. Other mystics have made much of love, but it has almost always been an internal love of the Deity which discouraged action and gave free scope to diseased imagination. Of all the old mystics the German Tauler bears perhaps the greatest resemblance to Count Tolstoy, and Vaughan refers to his remarkable combination of inward aspiration and outward love and service (Vaughan's "Hours with the Mystics," fifth edition, vol. i, pp. 251-256). It is noticeable, too, that Swedenborg speaks of offices of charity as the means of conjunction

with heaven ("Heaven and Hell," i, 360).

Lawrence Oliphant, who owed much to Swedenborg, professed opinions substantially identical with those of Count Tolstoy, but the final outcome of his theological speculations, with its detailed account of things celestial and terrestrial, makes the simplicity of the latter conspicuous by contrast. Trances and visions may be very edifying to him who indulges in them, but they are very apt to unfit him for leadership of the masses of mankind, for these cannot follow him, and it is best that they should not.

The proper answer for me to make to the member of the Theosophical Society who wishes to convert me to his belief in the seven planets and the astral body and Karma and Devachan is that these things are none of my business. Granted that I am an immortal being, still this life is too short to study eternity in. But when a man comes to me laying stress on my duties here on earth and promising me the proof of the truth of his doctrines in my own consciousness, I can well afford to give him a hearing. Count Tolstoy makes no claim to novelty for his teaching. It is that of Christianity—of the Christianity of the Sermon on the Mount as distinguished from that of the Council of Niceæ. He virtually says to us: "Renounce your selfish ends; love all men—all creatures—and devote your life to them. You will then be conscious of possessing eternal life and for you there will be no death."

No appeal is made to argument, but we are asked to test the theory in our own experience, and this it is possible for us to do, for love is to a certain extent at every one's command. Ruysbroeck, the German mystic, says: "Everything depends on will. A man must will right strongly. Will to have humility and love and they are thine" (Vaughan,

vol. i, p. 32.) This is entirely consistent with the teaching of Christ, for He says, "A new commandment

I give unto you, that ye love one another."

THE ARENA.

BHAGABATGITA WITH SANKARBHASYA.

(Continued from page 153.)

HE whose every undertaking is free from every trace of desire and whose actions are consumed by the fire of wisdom is called *wise* by men of discrimination. 19.

Sankara. The act of seeing *in-action* in *action* is here extolled. All actions of the discriminating man, if undertaken without a motive and simply intended either to set an example to others or to meet the bare necessities of life produce no fruit and are consequently burned by the fire of wisdom. Action here includes both *good* and *bad* actions. The word Pandit is used in a spiritual sense.

He who is free from all attachment in work, who is self-satisfied and whose actions are free from all motives, temporal or spiritual, is really passive even though working. 20.

Sankara. Some persons just after realising the nature of *âtman* which is inactive leave all work except what is necessary to meet the bare necessities of life; others continue to perform all sorts of work, not for serving their own purpose but for the sake of setting example to the people. The sloka means:

Leaving the sense of agency and attachment, satisfied with the knowledge of self, free from all worldly desires and all temporal or spiritual

motive, such a being not working for any selfish end but simply for setting example to the people is free from work even though working on account of his being conscious of the passive nature of his own self.

Free from the desire of the reward of his actions, always contended and independent, and performing only those actions which are necessary for the support of his body he remains untouched by sin. 21.

Sankara. He who, in the manner stated before, realises the passive nature of *âtman*, naturally looks with indifference in the fruit of his works either in this life or in the next and renounces all work except those necessary for the maintenance of his body. The present sloka explains this:

Devoid of all hope, controlling the mind and the senses, renouncing every undertaking except that required for the maintenance of the body (leaving the sense of agency even in the latter), the wise does not incur sin. The word *sin* (संस्कार) here includes not only sin properly so-called but also virtue (वर्त) in as much as both virtue and vice are hindrances to the upward flight of the devotee.

In the above sloka discussion is raised with regard to the word *कर्तृ* (i. e., belonging to the body). "The word may mean either as necessary

for the maintenance of the body" or it may mean "done or performed by means of the body." Sankara endorses the former view. The latter he objects on the following grounds:

If the word *Shárira* (शरीर) here means "that which is performed by means of the body," then even those actions which are prohibited by the *Shástras* will be regarded as sinless. In the next place, no distinction can be maintained between the performance of good as well as bad actions, both being sinless.

Satisfied with gains received unasked, placed above the influence of the pair of opposites, free from the sense of envy, and equal in success or its opposite, the doings of such a being do not produce fruit. 22.

Sankara. Here the way is pointed out by adopting which the seeker after *Moksha* will be able to fulfil the necessities of his physical existence.

Satisfied will alms received un-

asked, not losing the evenness of the mind though afflicted by heat or cold, pain or pleasure, free from envy as well as unaffected by the success or disappointment met with even in getting daily bread always thinking while trying to procure the bare necessities of life, "I cannot do anything, only the qualities act," such a being never becomes bound even though working. His actions are being burned by the fire of wisdom.

The work of him who is free from attraction and whose mind is filled with spiritual wisdom is done for the satisfaction of God. This being so, the whole of the work including its fruit is destroyed. 23.

Sankara. The result of the actions of the man who is made to work on account of *Prárabdha* but who thinks, "I am doing nothing," is here described.

In this sloka, the commentary of Sankara is the same as the literal translation of the sloka.

MANISHAPANCHAKAM

OF

SRI SANKARACHARYA.

S bow to the *Paramátmá* of good form, omnipresent, the all-knowing, the all-healthy, the omnipotent, the eternal, the pure, the non-máyávic and the formless. I bow to the feet of the Almighty, who is always healthy, who is not manacled by climatic differences nor by change of form, nor by sin and who is the last and best resort for all people that bow to him.

Siva, mercy and riches incarnated,

intent upon freeing the creatures of this world who are immersed in the ocean of misery from the trammels of *samsár*, appeared in days long gone in a *chandála* incognito before Stee Sankarácharya who was going to the holy city of Benares when he having seen Siva under the disguise of a *chandála* wanted him to go aloof when the *máyávic* *chandála* told him thus:

"O greatest of Rishis! kindly an-

wer the following queries of mine properly: Are you wanting my annamayakosa to go aloof from your annamayakosa? Or, are you wanting my animate soul to stand aloof from your animate soul? He who thus questions the veracity of the Rishi's statements, doubts them in order to establish his own theories. It is not right to accept the first question for as your body is a body of food so also is mine. So, on that hypothesis you have certainly no right to make me stand aloof from you. Nor is the second question acceptable, for animate existences are the same anywhere. So it is improper to talk of a multiplicity of souls and a consequent differentiation between them.

"Whence arises the difference between a Brahmin and a non-Brahmin in Parabrahma, who shines supreme as a waveless ocean unalloyed and pure and who is far above the *máyávic*, inanimate and sorrowful *ahamkár* (egoism). To give an example or two, is there any difference between the reflection of the sun as it appears in the holy waters of the Ganges and that which appears in the drains of a *chandál* street? As the *ákása* which fills a golden or an earthen pot is not manacled by any good or bad characteristics so the soul is characterless.

"Whoever sees differences in one's own things would never be freed from the trammels of *samsár* which lead as a necessary consequence to death. It is not right to look for true differences in realities when such differences are the product of noble and mean bodily *upádhis*."

Having thus heard the words of the *chandál*, *incognito* Siva, the all-wise and all-worshipped *Sankarácárya* learnt the Vedanta sutras by every means possible, felt no differentiation of caste any longer as his mind was always wholly immersed in the ocean of *Brahmánanda*, saw certain *mumúksus* (disciples), re-

vealed his own experiences to them in order that they might be released from caste distinctions without undergoing the preliminary *samádhis*, and enjoy the true unity with *Brahma*. While narrating to them the means of attaining this, he showed the unity of the individual soul, the witness of all *Jágratávasthás*, with the universal soul.

Sankara has said that whichever soul in sleep, dream and waking states illuminates the universe and remaining in all animate and inanimate existences from protoplasm to *Brahma* sees the world as a witness—such an intelligent soul is myself, such an intelligent viewer is myself—whoever has firmness of faith in this be he a *chandála* or a twice-born man, I recognise him as my *Guru*.

Whoever recognises that the always pure *Parabrahma* is myself, and the world in which I see a differentiation of beings is a mere *máyá*, an illusion, I recognise him as my *Guru* be he a man of any sort or kind.

Whoever maintains that this dual world becomes unified in *chit-Brahma* and that this *chit-Brahma*, the universal cause, is the only true existence, whoever firmly believes that this world is created using the three-charactered *máyá* (illusion) as an instrument, he is my *Guru* be he any sort of person.

The world being a busy world appears to be true. You say that the silver in the mother-of-pearl is a new reality. How could the world in which we move and which we see every day be a non-reality? If you should say how I can account for *advaita* unless I recognise the non-reality of the world, I answer that the non-reality of the world becomes a necessary consequence if the dual world becomes unified in *Brahma* and we see such a world. Therefore the wise, intelligent *Brahma* remains at last. We must al-

ways think that we are Brahma, the formless, the void, the one without a second.

The wise men whose minds are free from egoism, envy, lust and other similar qualities suffer pleasures and pains without the least intention on their part, after submitting their bodies to Karmic Law.

I bow to that átmá which has sway over life, over Indrias, and over sleep.

In talking about the unity of Jiva and Brahma, if we should say I am a *sthulu* person, I am lame, I am deaf &c., the word 'I' as referring to self seems to apply to the átmá which partakes of the characteristics of the bodily organs. But that which appears like the bodily organs is not the átmá. For it is within the reach of every person's experience to say this is *my* body, this is *my* eye, this is *my* ear, this is *my* life, this is *my* mind, this is *my* intelligence, and to consider the difference between the *meum* and the *tuum*. By thus telling it we seem to think that the átmá is different from the organs of the self.

When the 'I' is referred to the átmá, the 'I' in such a case clearly appears to the mind of every object of the creation as different from the organs of the body, the mind and the intelligence.

When we talk of *this* object, *that* object and refer the words to a *pot* &c., we consider the objects to be different from our self. Similarly it is manifest by the foregoing sentence that since we apply the words 'this,' 'that' &c., to our bodily organs, we consider these as we consider pots &c., to be different from our átmá. It is plain therefore that the átmá which is called the 'I' is the Sachidánanda Brahma. The bodily organs to which the word 'this' is applied are not the átmá.

The term 'Sachidánanda' was ap-

plied to the 'I' without the bodily organs. But while we say 'I am a man,' the expression means that the term 'man' is applied to 'me.' Here 'Sachidánanda' refers to 'man' and 'I' to the 'átmá.' The expression therefore means the bodily 'I.' Sachidánanda has been applied to this bodily 'I.' But in what has gone before, Brahma was applied only to the 'I'—the non-bodily átmá. In the expression 'I am a man,' if we should at present attribute Brahma to the bodily 'I,' the application seems to be inconsistent. But this inconsistency would be removed from what follows. Bodies are not self-luminous but their luminosity is guided by Brahma. They are therefore distinct from the átmá. The I-ness or egoism in such bodies is a mere illusion.

By the preceding objection it is manifest that the term 'I' refers to the átmá and not to the body. But by stating that the átmá is known only by the knowledge of the 'I,' it seems to be understood that the átmá is not self-luminous but becomes luminous by the knowledge of the 'I.' This statement stands in direct antagonism to the saying of the Sruti that the átmá is self-luminous. But the objection cannot stand, for the *antahkarana* that is in us rises through the Indrias, sheds its lustre on the external objects, and takes the reflections of such objects into itself, *i. e.*, the external objects are reflected in the *antahkarana*. Had there been no lustre in the mirror which reflects our faces when we look into it, the power of reflection cannot have been generated in it, and so our faces too cannot have appeared in it. Thus if the *antahkarana* had not been self-luminous, it can not reflect external objects.

It is evident that *antahkarana* has luminosity from the fact that by our daily experience we are able to see that it reflects external objects.

This luminosity is not innate to it but is the product of its contact with *átmá* and therefore the *átmá* itself reflects in the *antahkarana*. It is this *antahkarana* that has been hitherto spoken of as the 'I.' The 'I' has already been spoken of as the *átmá*. To the dull-witted the *átmá* has been spoken of as the *antahkarana*. As the guru when initiating his disciple in *Brahma* vidyá teaches the student first in order to lead him step by step that food is *Brahma*, then that life is *Brahma* and then after the highest rung of the ladder is reached shows him that the lower steps are wrong, so after establishing at first that the *antahkarana* called the 'I' is the *Brahma*, when the student objects that the *átmá* known by the 'I' loses its luminosity, the guru says that what is there called *átmá* is *antahkarana*; if *Brahma* is to be known by a knowledge of the 'I,' the *átmá* is to be known by the *antahkarana*; that the *átmá* appearing as a witness is the cause of the luminosity which appears in the *antahkarana*; and that the *átmá* is to be known only through the *antahkarana* known as the 'I'.

If the *átmá* is self-luminous, is there any necessity of the assistance of the *antahkarana* (known as the 'I') to know it? The *átmá* is surrounded by *agnána* or ignorance and

to know *átmá* this ignorance ought to be destroyed. When a person firmly knows that the *antahkarana* and *átmá* are one, he attains the *átmá* *sákshátkára* being himself above *máyávic* ignorance. For the destruction of ignorance therefore the *antahkarana* known as the 'I' is necessary. To say that the individual soul is *Brahma* is therefore not faulty.

Sankara therefore says that he recognises him as his *Guru* who after fully knowing that the *átmá* which dwells in the consciences of all creatures and guides the various movements of the *indrias* is the same as the self-luminous *átmá* (the universal soul), enjoys the resulting *Brahmánanda*.

It is but natural for every person to love his *átmá* i. e. himself better than any other object. There can be no love on any uninteresting object. Therefore experience shows that the *átmá* is of greatest interest. Since the form of *Brahma* is *ánanda*, *Sankara* says that the individual soul attains *Brahmatva*. *Indra* and other angels are satisfied with a very little *Brahmánanda*. The man who enjoys eternal bliss having an aimless mind becomes an object of adoration to the angels.

G. R. S.

THE ORIGIN OF SMALL-POX.

THE disease, "the dreadful plague of the *mlechas*," is supposed to have had its origin in the following legend. The story itself may appear curious to many. It is certainly the characteristic of a pathetic episode from one of our numerous *puránas* and has obtained currency in many parts of the *Madras* presidency.

Once upon a time, matters little

when, there lived a learned and pious *Bráhma*n in a beautiful little village of the *Godavari* delta. He spent his days in teaching the *Vedás*, as all *Bráhma*ns of old *India* did, and had thus gathered around him a small circle of young *sishtyas*. To comfort his old age and revive his drooping spirits he was blessed with a daughter. But this domestic happiness was only shortlived and

was marred by the death of his devoted *dharma-patni*. This sorrow was however mitigated in a way by the lisping condolence of his infant daughter and by the pleasure he derived in bringing her up with care—a pleasure which falls to the lot of all old men who suddenly find themselves fathers. The child grew up to be a fair and intelligent girl and her father took care to give her a good education. At this stage of the old man's life an incident occurred which led to the final tragedy we shall relate.

In a certain village in one of the Southern districts, there was a cobbler and his wife both of whom died leaving an only boy. The young fellow was fair and clever and finding himself helpless—not having been trained in his father's profession—resolved to leave his native village to the Northern parts and earn a livelihood there. With no settled purpose he pushed his journey on until he arrived in the village of our old Bráhmaṇ. Here the cobbler boy mischievously thought of personating a Bráhmaṇ, wore the holy thread, which he had somehow managed to obtain, and sought to be admitted a disciple of our old Vedic perceptor. The boy's good looks and intelligence worked in his favour, he entered the circle of *Brahmúcháris* and was taught the Vedás as if he were a descendant of *Rishis*. His progress in the learning of the Shástras was rapid and he was soon talked of as the best *Shástrí* in the village of the younger generation. This fact created a closer attachment between the *Guru* and his disciple of whose low descent the former had not the slightest suspicion.

The old man's daughter had by this time sufficiently grown in years to make him anxious about her marriage; and in a most unguarded moment he resolved to accept his cobbler disciple as his son-in-law

without making the necessary preliminary enquiries about the boy's descent "*tripursham*," as enjoined by the Shástras. The match was arranged and the ill-fated couple united in holy wed-lock. The Brahman wife of the learned cobbler soon gave birth to many children who strangely enough were destined to reveal the truth of their father's descent.

Every child has a favourite toy of its own and tries to imitate in play what its parents may do in earnest necessity. But the children of our cobbler Bráhmaṇ took delight in giving the shape of shoes and slippers to whatever they might get hold of. They would tear up a portion of their grandfather's *krishna ajinam* cut it into the shape of a shoe, stitch it with a thorn and the worn-out holy thread, and produce a neat pair of slippers. Such child's play was indeed a matter of serious consideration of at least that parent who had Bráhmaṇ blood in her veins. The matter was noticed more than once and in spite of the mother's endeavours to divert their attention from that hated play, the children showed a persistence which was something more than merely childish. The woman thereon became furious and swore to sift the matter. At dead of night, arming herself with a knife she awoke her husband, stood before him like the "avenging Angel" and with the weapon of death in her hand fearfully demanded the truth from him. The horrible confession was made by the man who took courage in the thought that it had become too late for his wife to retrieve the infamy. The next morning she went to her father and asked him what the *práyaschittam* was for an earthen pot polluted by the touch of a dog; and the pundit said that throwing it into the fire was the only purification for it. Her resolve was at once calmly taken. The same evening

she purposely sent her father away from the house with a commission, scribbled some lines on the wall of her house, and at night when all was silent, when the cobbler and the children, who were living testimony to her disgrace, were soundly sleeping in their beds, she quietly slipped out of the house and in a few minutes returned to her place beside her husband. The house was immediately on fire which was not extinguished until the inmates were either choked to death or burnt to ashes. The old man returned to the village next morning only to see this fearful tragedy and, from the lines on the wall of his house, received the dying reprimands of his daughter for his indiscretion. It is said that not long after he died of a broken heart.

This woman or rather the spirit of her who was the daughter of a

Bráhmañ and the wife of a cobbler is believed to be the elemental which brings on small-pox.

The excessive heat and the burning sensation of the body and the consequent necessity for cool dirt in cases of small-pox, the custom of feeding people, more especially children, with cold rice mixed with curd in mitigation of the small-pox deity, the practice of standing amidst a pool of water and reciting the "Sitalá Stotram," the total abstinence from sexual intercourse strictly observed in those houses which are visited with the disease, the very name* given to it by the Dravidian peoples, and the havoc which it commits when once it enters the camp of a community of cobblers—all these facts are adduced as evidence in favour of this legendary origin of the disease. C. V.

ASTROLOGY.†

(Continued from page 160.)

CHAPTER IV.

OF SATURN.*

SATURN is the most powerful, and at the same time, the most malignant of the planets.

N. B.—MR. WILSON seems to consider his malefic influence as inferior to that of MARS, but we can by no means agree with this opinion. It is true, the effects of Mars may be more sudden, and consequently more remarkable, but at the same time they are neither so malevolent nor so lasting.

Mars and Saturn compared:—

(1) MARS may be compared to a fever, violent indeed, but short in

its duration—while (2) SATURN resembles a consumption, which though hardly perceptible in its progress, is not to be averted by any human skill.

I. In Nativities:—SATURN is most terrible and destructive.

(1). If placed in the *mid-heaven*, he causes ruin and disgrace; the person is unfortunate in almost everything, and upon the direction of SATURN to the cusp is generally irretrievably ruined. There is scarcely any aspect, however powerful, which can counteract this position.

* Literally means "the Lady" or more correctly "the big Lady."

† For information regarding the "Astrological Bureau" in connexion with the present Astrological series, see advertisement in the title-pages of the first five numbers of Volume IV.

(2) When in the *fourth* in opposition to this point, although certainly *weaker*, he is very unfortunate.

(3). When placed in the *ascendant or seventh*, the native is subject to *falls blows* or other accidents.

(4). If in *conjunction* or evil aspect with the principal significators of mind, the person will be melancholy and hypochondriac, always fretting and repining, timorous and fearful, and a great lover of solitude, penurious and niggardly, such characters not unfrequently, hide money and other valuable property in the earth or secret places.

N. B.—(1) Those individuals who are much under the influence of SATURN, will generally be found to be very *nervous*; --he is undoubtedly the cause of melancholy madness.

(2) The natives of SATURN are generally very *malicious, firm in their friendships*, and *implacable in their enmities*; *close, thoughtful, and reserved*. and without the assistance of MARS, *very bashful*.

(3). If SATURN be in good aspect with Jupiter, the evil is much diminished, although Jupiter himself is perhaps not much improved by the familiarity.

(4). If SATURN be in *conjunction* or *bad aspect* with MARS, the disposition is extremely evil, to the cowardly revengeful disposition imparted by SATURN is added a portion of courage, which often leads to the most dreadful enterprises.

(5). If SATURN be in *good aspect* to the luminaries or MERCURY, he gives much of prudence and subtlety and the whole conduct of the native evinces much *permanency*, and *stability*.

• II. In Horary Question :—

(1). SATURN rules *Aquarius* by day, and

(2). *Capricorn* by night.

(3). He also governs the *Airy Triplicities* by day.

(4). His *exultation* (दुःखस्थान) is *Libra*, his *fall* (नीचस्थान) in *Aries*—his *detriment* in *cancer* and *Leo*.

[*Def.* (1) The *querent* is the person who asks a question, (2) The *quesited* is the person or thing enquired about].

N. B.—(1) The *querent* will be most successful in dealing with *aged* persons, and in *mining* and *agricultural* speculations.

(a) If *well-dignified*, the person signified by SATURN is acute, grave, and circumspect; fond of money, and very laborious, and patient in his endeavours to acquire it; long in forming an opinion, (which when once decided is generally pretty correct), and obstinate in maintaining it.

(b) If *ill-dignified*, the person signified by SATURN is sordid, jealous and mistrustful, cowardly and deceitful, envious, covetous, without natural affection, miserable, wretched, and universally despised.

CHAPTER V.

OF JUPITER.

JUPITER is the largest, and, next to Saturn, the most powerful planet in our system.

I. In Nativities :—

Those persons in whose nativities JUPITER is *most powerful*—are generous, open and sincere, neither practising fraud themselves, nor suspecting it in others; above any mean or unworthy action; their carriage is manly and noble, far removed from the *sheepish stupidity* of SATURN, or the *impudent forwardness* of MARS. They are scrupulously honest, firm friends, and generous enemies; religious, kind and charitable.

(1). If in *conjunction* or *bad*

aspect of SATURN, the disposition is remarkably altered :—

The native is profligate, careless, and irreligious, very fretful and peevish, foolish and extravagant.

(2). If JUPITER aspect the luminaries, or (3) be placed in the ascendant,—he gives a sound healthy constitution, capable of resisting very evil directions.

(4). When posited in the mid-heaven,—he confers (a) on the nobility—great honour and dignity; (b) on the merchants—success in trade and speculations.

II. In Horary Questions :—

(1). JUPITER rules *Sagittarius* by day, and

(2). *Pisces* by night.

N. B.—This means that—if in a

horary question *Sagittarius* should be placed in the cusp of the first house, JUPITER would then be said to be the lord (अधिपति) of the ascendant.

(3). He governs the *Fiery Triplicity* by night.

(4). His exultation is in *Cancer*, his fall in *Capricorn*.—his detriment in *Gemini* and *Virgo*.

(a) If well-dignified,—the querent is respectable, fortunate, and prudent, fair in his dealings, and just in all his actions.

(b) If ill-dignified,—the person is dull, hypocritical, mean and very conceited, a sycophant to his superiors, and a tyrant to his dependants.

(To be continued.)

H. M. BANDOPADHYA, F.T.S.

—o—

THE GENESIS STORY OF THE CREATION AND FALL OF MAN.

—•—

IT is not possible here to quote largely to prove my point. I shall allude to only a few passages sufficient for my purpose. Any one who reads the Bible carefully can collect numberless passages to prove the sanction of each of the crimes and moralities mentioned here.

Lying and Deception—If we turn over to 2 Thess. ii, 11, we read: "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie."

Ezek. xiv. 9; "If the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I, the Lord have deceived that prophet."

In Exod. iii 18, we find that God commands Moses to deceive Pharaoh.

In Josh. ii. 1-6; vi, 25, we see that Rahab is rewarded for treason and falsehood.

Cheating.—"And I [the Lord] will give this people favour in the sight of the Egyptians; and it shall come to pass that when ye go, ye shall not go empty; but every woman shall borrow of her neighbour, and of her that sojourneth in her house, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold and raiment; and ye shall put them upon your sons, and upon your daughters; and ye shall spoil the Egyptians" (Ex. iii. 21, 22).

"And the Lord said unto Moses. ... Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow of his neighbour, and every woman of her neighbour, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold." (Ex. xi, 1, 2).

"And the children of Israel did according to the word of Moses; and they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment; and the Lord gave the people favour in the sight of

the Egyptians, so that they lent unto them such things as they required; and they spoiled the Egyptians," (Ex. xii, 35, 36). Here we find the Lord distinctly advising his people to cheat.

Murder.—We find murder taught in the pages of the Bible Ex. xxxii, 27, says: "Thus saith the Lord, God of Israel, "Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbour."

Ezek. ix, 9: "Slay utterly old and young, both man and woman, infant and suckling."

Jer. xlvi, 10: "Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood."

Jael, the murderess of Sisera, is eulogized in this blessed book. See Jud, v, 24—28.

In their wars the Israelites were often commanded to exterminate the enemy without pity: And they warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses; and they slew all the males..... And the children of Israel took all the women of Midian captives, and their little ones, and took the spoil of all their cattle, and all their flocks, and all their goods. And they burnt all their cities wherein they dwelt, and all their goodly castles with fire." (Num. xxxi, 7—10). When Moses learned that the women and children were saved, this Man of God, and this great legislator orders: "Kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man."

In Deut. iii, 3—6 we read: "The Lord our God delivered into our hands Og also, the King of Bashan, and all his people: and we smote him until none was left to him remaining. And we took all his cities at that time, there was not a city which we took not from them, threescore cities..... And we utterly

destroyed them as we did unto Sihon, King of Hishbon, utterly destroying the men, women, and children of every city." Not even the helplessness of women and children, found its way to the hearts of Jehovah and its people. Joshua's leadership is also another long account of bloodshed and plunder.

Intolerance and Persecution. Deut. xiii, 6—9 teaches: "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife or thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly saying, "Let us go and serve other gods..... Namely, of the gods of the people which are round about you... Thou shalt not consent unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him; neither shalt thou spare; neither shalt thou conceal him; but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be the first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people."

Mark xvi, 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

Paul, who may be said to be the real founder of Christianity says: "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed" (Gal. i. 9). And in Gal. v. 12, this great apostle says: "I would they were even cut off which troubles you." It was these, and other similar teachings in God's holy word, that during the course of eighteen centuries deluged Europe with the best and bravest blood. That turned a smiling continent into a vast Acedama, where the Church purchased her existence with the price of the blood of the grandest and best. That made that continent one huge Golgatha of human skulls. Run over the pages of history and behold the rivers of blood rushing through the once bright land. See the smoke ascending from the piles

where the doubters, the thinkers, the pioneers of human progress are being sacrificed to maintain the existence of this fiend known as Christianity. : *Adultery*.—In Ex. xxi., 7—11 A father is permitted to sell his daughter into concubinage. The word euphemistically translated maid-servant properly means concubine.

Rahab, the harlot, is specially honoured by being one of the chosen ancestresses of the son of God. Other passages might be pointed out if necessary.

Human Sacrifices are sanctioned in the Bible as witness the intended offering of Isaac ; also the account of Jephthah's daughter ; and other passages. Liv. xxvii, 28, 29.

Injustice to women, cruelty to children, any many other things which civilized beings cannot possibly endorse are taught in these pages. When a Christian tells you that evil is mentioned only to be condemned he either forgets or does not know his Bible.

I have now gone over nearly all I had to say, imperfectly, indeed, I know it has been done, but however imperfect, I have at least shown you, that the course of things have not been so smooth as the Church wishes to make it appear. If I have not succeeded in convincing you of the absurdity of believing this book to be the Word of God—this book which tells you with daring audacity that an all-good and merciful father, as you believe God to be, could give the brutal and ferocious and immoral commands which you have heard me read—I trust I have at least succeeded in arousing in your minds a suspicion of the truth of all you are told to believe, a suspicion which I hope may lead you to a serious investigation of this momentous question. When men like the Rev. Dr. Westcott and others tell me that, for instance, the Epistle of Paul to the

Hebrews, could not possibly have been written by Paul, when he read for instance in Kitzo's *Cyclopaedia of the Bible* that the canonicity (that is, its right to a place in the Scriptures) of this Epistle is a pure assumption ; when the Rev. Dr. Angus collects 80,000 various readings in the N. T. and Griesbach collects 140,000 ; when I find that the Hebrew contains verses which are not in the Septuagint, and the Septuagint contains verses which are not in the Heb. or the Samaritan version, when I find devout and orthodox men admitting that the Septuagint is a corrupt and unreliable version, and yet when I learn that Christ quoted from this corrupt and unreliable version in preference to the Hebrew, from which our bibles are translated, I ask you in the name of common sense, what am I to believe ? and whether you can blame me for my unbelief ? We are not endeavouring, as some Christians assert to tear down public morality, but we are protesting against the elevation of stupidity as intelligence.

"THE GENESIS HISTORY OF THE CREATION AND FALL OF MAN."

Excavations on the site of Nineveh, begun by Sir Henry Layard some years ago, and continued by the late Mr. George Smith, Mr. Rassam, and others, brought to light certain "cylinders and tablets," bearing cuneiform inscriptions, which proved to be records of the Creation and Flood legends, etc. Of two remarkable series of tablets, one gives the story of the Creation and Fall, the other the Izdubar legends. "Izdubar, by some scholars, is supposed to be the Nimrod of the Bible. This series consisted of twelve tablets, and there appear to have been four editions, if not more, in the Assyrian library. All the tablets are much mutilated except

the eleventh, and this contains the Chaldean account of the Deluge, which was committed to writing earlier than the story of the Creation. The first two tablets are occupied with events, for the most part miraculous, in the life of Izdubar. The gods are said to have delivered into his hands the city of Erech (Warka), which is mentioned in Genesis as being one of the cities of Nimrod. Izdubar became monarch over lands extending from the Persian Gulf to the Armenian Mountains, and from the Euphrates to Elam. The eighth tablet of the legend relates how he fell sick, and was told in a dream to undertake a long journey in order to be cured by a sage who dwelt at the mouth of the river Euphrates. Hasisadra, the sage, has survived the Flood on account of his piety, and he relates to Izdubar the story which is read in the eleventh tablet. The inscription records how the gods commanded Hasisadra, or Xisuthrus, as Berosus (third century B.C.) calls him, to build a great ship. Its size and manner of construction are told, and also its purpose: the builder his family, his servants and slaves, are to enter it, with his grain, furniture, and goods—into it enter, and the door of the ship turn. The beasts of the field, and all animals, are also to be sheltered, because a heavy rain from heaven will descend, on account of the wickedness of mankind. The description of the outpouring of the waters is highly poetical. A storm at dawn,—

'Arose from the horizon of heaven, extending and wide;
Vul in the midst of it thundred, and
Nebo and Saru went in front;
The throne bearers went over mountains and plains;
The destroyer Nergal overturned;
Ninip went in front and cast down;
The spirits carried destruction.—
In their glory they swept the earth;

Of Vul the flood reached to heaven:
The bright earth to a waste was turned.'

The deluge and storm continued for six days and nights, and then came the calm; and we are told how Hasisadra sat down and wept when the light broke over his face, and he saw the waste of waters. On the seventh day after he sent forth a dove, then a swallow, both of which returned; until, at last, the raven was sent forth, and found once more a home on the earth. We are further told of the exit of all persons and animals from the ship, or ark, and how a sacrifice was offered, and was followed by a covenant and blessing, with an understanding that the world should not again be visited with a similar destruction. These are a few of the most striking incidents in the Chaldean account of the Flood, and the agreements and differences between it and the Mosaic account are very remarkable, both of which differ from the history of Berosus, the Babylonian priest, who derived his knowledge, like the writers of other Assyrian copies, from the more ancient Chaldean text.

"Equally interesting is the story of the Creation, which contains also very striking agreements with the Book of Genesis, but has fuller details and incidents not mentioned by Moses. It relates the fall of a celestial being corresponding to Satan, and a war in heaven; the creation of the world by successive stages, and each of which, as it appeared, was pronounced by the Deity to be good; last of all the creation of man endowed with speech and divinely instructed as to his noble state and privileges; then the temptation by a dragon, and the fall of man, bringing upon him the course of Deity. Oriental scholars are still undecided about the meaning of proper names in the legends, and their correspondence with those in the Bible;

and also as to the geographical position of the mountain on which the ark rested. One derivation that is agreed upon is too interesting to be omitted: The name Adam given to the first man in Genesis, is found in the Chaldean account of the Creation as meaning all mankind—Adami, or Adini. On a very early Babylonian seal in the British Museum one of the most ancient legends seems to be illustrated by the drawing of two figures seated, one on each side of a sacred tree, and reaching forth a hand to its fruit, while behind one of the persons is stretched a serpent. The variations between the earliest Assyrian copy, the history of Berosus, and the Bible are such as to preclude the idea that one borrowed from the other. They all suggest that each was a separate, independent embodiment of an earlier tradition, the common source of all the narratives. When Abraham left 'Ur of the Chaldees' he would certainly carry with him traditions of his early home similar to those which afterwards formed part of the Hebrew history.

Much of the ancient literature contained on these clay tablets was destroyed beyond restoration by their being broken into thousands of pieces, and, "and when we learn that the Royal Library at Nineveh contained at least 30,000 tablets, the few in comparison we possess, however highly we may prize them, cannot but make us impatient to have unearthed the thousands that still lie in the mounds of Konyunjik. Yet, inestimable as is the value of what has been recovered, pieced together, and deciphered, the interest does not lie in the fact alone that it is from the contents of an ancient Assyrian library that we have new light and fresh meaning given to history, but chiefly because this very literature was in most

part, derived from that of a much older nation—the Chaldeans. When we have read how Abraham left 'Ur of the Chaldees,' we have, perhaps, not often imagined him as going out from a city that had a royal palace, a library, and a temple for religious worship; we have not fully realised that this city was the centre of a nation ruled by a king, whose people possessed laws, institutions, and a literature, giving proof that they enjoyed a civilisation capable of a very favourable comparison with our own. About 2000 B. C. the city of Ur, now represented on our maps by the mounds of Meyhein, was the residence of a king, Uruk, as he is usually called. The earliest monumental remains that we know of belong to his period, and the cylindrical seal of his son and successor, Dungi, has been discovered and is now in the British Museum. Before this time there had existed many ancient traditions among the Babylonians, some relating to their own history, others giving accounts of the Creation, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, besides legends of heroes. At the period of which we speak, contemporary with Abraham these traditions had already been partly committed to writing. Mr. Smith, in his 'Chaldean Account of Genesis,' says that from 2000 B. C. to 1850 B. C. was the time of greatest literary activity, that there was a general collecting and developing of the earlier traditions.*

In these legends, then—pure fragments of the human mind—we have the origin of the Genesis story of the Creation and Fall of Man, on which has been built that very unsubstantial fabric, the Christian faith; and that this story can still be accepted as given by Divine inspiration proves how clingingly "Authority" rides on the shoulders of Reason like Sindbad's "old man of the sea."

HENRY DAY.

* "Chaldean and Assyrian Libraries," *Day and Rest*, March 1881.

PARASARA'S PRAYASCHITTENDUSEKHARA.

(Continued from page 64.)

WHERE a person who knows not the necessary prayaschitta comes to know it at a future date, he should perform it secretly as soon as known. A person knowing it can do it himself. When a person wants to rid himself of all sin, he should perform ten lakhs of Gáyatri Japa. As an expiation for all sin, an Ekadasi. Rudrabhishika with an ash-smearing of the entire frame and lying on a bed of ashes can be adopted. Purushasukta repeated sixteen times a day continued for a month would rid a man of all sin. Similarly, Pavamanasukta Japa or Aghamarshana Sukta Japa or feeding on milk &c. or Prayaschitta at the time of Mágha &c., or bathing in sacred streams, or informing an assembly of a sin committed, or feeling sincere sorrow for the sin committed, or studying the Veda and the Vedanta would suffice as expiation for a number of sins. When the man is unable to repeat the name of Krishna as an expiation for sin, he may chant the name of Hari. Bathing in the Ganges would relieve a man of all sin and would be better than doing a thousand Chándráyanas. Sins would fly off by a bath in the Ganges as snakes fly off at the appearance of a kite. Whoever says that as Brahmahattya would not vanish by bathing in the Ganges would suffer as much as the doer of a crore of Brahmahattya. Whoever thinks otherwise would suffer the sin of Kumhipáka. He would be born an ass after the lapse of a Kalpa. By bathing in the Ganges, a person would attain Heaven and salvation. There is no better waters than the Ganges and no better good than Kesava, no better caste than the Brahman, so says Brahmá. In the Kritáyuga sins would vanish by bathing in any

stream; in the Treta yuga, at Pushkara &c., in the Dapara yuga at Kurukshetra; in the Kali yuga, in Ganga. There is no better thing than Ganga. All sins vanish in it. In the Krittayuga, sins would be very few and therefore they vanish by a both in any other stream but in the Kali yeas sins are in the ascendent, they can vanish only by bathing in the Ganges.

If a person of good character, having no desire, should commit a sin unknowingly but is unable to expiate it, and if the sin is any other than a Mahápataka, he should perform a strict prayaschitta for six years; if done constantly, for twenty years; if done knowingly, for eighteen years; if done knowingly several times, for twenty-four years; if continued for too long a period, for thirty-six years. If upapáthakas occur, prayaschittas extending over a period of two, four, six, eight, ten, or twelve years should be made. If Prakirnas, prayaschittas extending over one to six years should be performed; if Kashudra sins, krichra, athikrichra and chándráyana, and twelve fasts should be undergone. A non-Brahmin or an illiterate Brahmin should undergo a two-fold prayaschittya; if a Sudra or non-karmic Brahmin, three fold. For Mahapatakas, prayaschittas should extend for over a dozen years. For sins whose expiations are untold, Chándráyanas should be done according to qualifications; for sundry sins, a fast for three days and a Prájapatya; for still minor sins, twelve or thirty Pranayamas; for women and Sudras, pranáyamas without mantra; for sundry sins, sundry gifts as giving alms to Brahmans. Where silence is lost, think of Vishnu.

A rider on a chariot drawn by an ass or a camel, a naked sleeper, a naked eater, a copulator with his wife during the day, all these should bathe with tied cloths on, and do a Pránáyama. If the deed is done unknowingly, he should merely bathe; if done twice, four Pránáyamas; if done four or five times, a day's fast; if done on many occasions, a three nights' fast. If a man sits on either an ass or a camel he should fast for six days.

If a Guru is talked of in the singular number, if he is addressed as a person would talk to a menial, if a Brahman is put to fright, if he is lightly talked of, if a culpable homicide not amounting to murder is made, if he is thrashed a little, the man that does it should immediately prostrate himself before the Guru or the Brahman, ask his pardon and fast till the evening. Some are of opinion that two or three fasts should be observed. If a Guru is put to shame, the doer should observe a three days' fast.

If a person should spit at, retort, frighten, abuse, leap over, or talk disrespectfully of Gurus, angels, Bráhmans, purohits, parents and kings, such a man should cut off the tip of his tongue. He should make an offering of gold; if on two or three occasions, a thousand Gáyatri; if done unconsciously, a Prajapatya, a bath and request to the Guru.

If a Sudra puts a Brahman to shame, he should fast for seven night, if he puts a Kshatriya to shame, a single fast; if he employs others to be at a Brahman, a Krichra; if he beats, an athikrichra; if blood gushes out, a krichráthi-krichra; if by beating, the outer skin goes off, a krichra; if a bone is broken, an athikrichra; if a limb is lost, a Parakakrichra. This is one view, some others hold that if he intends to beat, a half krichra should be done; if he beats, a

krichra; if there is an oozing of blood; an athikrichra. But this is a foolish view. If a Brahman is put to shame unconsciously and accidentally, a quarter, a half or a full krichra should be done; if a limb is lost, ten cow gifts; if the loss of the limb is caused voluntarily, twenty cow gifts. If a Brahman is thrashed with his leg, he should fast, bathe, prostrate himself before the Brahman and ask his pardon. If there is a mere contact of the leg, he should apologize with him. It is a very heinous crime to thrash a person who cohabits with another's wife till blood gushes out from him.

If a sickly man should answer the calls of nature in the waters, he should bathe with tied cloths on and touch a cow after bathing. If the deed is done conscientiously, he should fast and then bathe; if done conscientiously on two or three occasions, he should fast for three days. He should also perform Gáyatri Japa. If a healthy person should commit the same deed, he should bathe thrice and should chant Aghamarshana Sukta japa thrice; if done on various occasions, a Taptakrichra. The same expiation hold good for one who answers the calls of nature without water by his side. The same holds good with the depreciation of any other Dharma. If a traveller eases himself at a place where there is no water, he should clean himself at the place where there is water and should bathe with the same clothing on. When he holds fast the calls of nature he should perform one hundred and eight Gáyatri. When the ordinary Karmas are not done, he should fast. The same holds good with sundry Karmas.

(To be continued).

G. R. S.