

The Platonist.

"Platonism is immortal because its principles are immortal in the Human Intellect and Heart."

Esoteric Christianity is identical with True Philosophy.

VOL. II.

ORANGE, N. J., MARCH, 1884.

No. 3.

RABIA.*

A pious friend one day of Rabia asked
How she had learnt the truth of Alla wholly;
By what instructions was her memory tasked—
How was her heart estranged from this world's folly?

She answered: "Thou who knowest God in parts,
Thy spirit's moods and processes can tell;
I only know that in my heart of hearts,
I have despised myself and loved Him well."

II.

Some evil upon Rabia fell;
And one who knew and loved her well
Murmured that God with pain undue,
Should strike a child so fond and true:
But she replied: "Believe and trust
That all I suffer is most just;
I had in contemplation striven
To realise the joys of heaven;
I had extended fancy's flights
Through all that region of delights—
Had counted till the numbers failed,
The pleasures on the blest entailed—
Had sounded the ecstatic rest
I should enjoy on Alla's breast;
And for these thoughts I now atone,
That were something of my own,
And were not thoughts of Him alone."

III.

When Rabia unto Mekkah came,
She stood awhile apart, alone,
Nor joined the crowd with hearts on flame,
Collected round the Sacred Stone.

She, like the rest, with toil had crossed
The waves of water, rock and sand;
And now, as one long tempest-tossed,
Beheld the Kaaba's promised land.

Yet in her eyes no transport glisten'd;
She seemed with shame and sorrow bowed:
The shouts of prayer! She hardly listened;
But beat her heart and cried aloud:

"O heart! weak follower of the weak!
That thou should'st traverse land and sea,
In this far place that God to seek,
Who, long ago, had come to thee."

IV.

Round holy Rabia's suffering bed
The wise men gathered gazing gravely;
"Daughter of God," the younger said;
"Endure thy Father's chastening bravely.
They who have steeped their souls in prayer,
Can every pain and anguish calmly bear."

She answered not, but turned away,
Yet not sorrowfully nor sadly:
"Daughter of God," the eldest said,
"Sustain thy Father's chastening gladly:
They who have learned to pray aright,
From pain's dark well draw up delight."

Then she spoke out: "Your words are fair;
But O! the truth lies deeper still!
I know not when absorbed in prayer,
Measure or pain, or good or ill:
They who God's face can understand
Feel not the motions of his hand."

"THE SCIENTIA SCIENTIARUM."

BY JOHN R. SUTHERLAND, D. D.

Delivered before "The American Akadêmê," January 15th, 1884.

In harmony with the designs and aims of this Akadêmê, I desire to offer a few thoughts in vindication of the claims of metaphysics as the highest and noblest of the sciences; and at the same time to help forward our interest in the divine problems with which this science deals.

I am aware, and perhaps from a professional stand-point all the more painfully aware than some of you, that the things of the lower life usurp too largely those of the higher; that men in their devotion to the sensible ignore almost wholly the super-sensible; that the seen crowds out of thought, too roughly, exclusively and unjustifiably, the unseen; that instead of spirit being enthroned and swaying the sceptre over a race that makes all subordinate to the demands of her queenly sovereignty, the reverse is true.

Matter, in various ways and forms, is apotheosised, and trails the royal robes of spirit in the dust. In all legitimate ways we desire to place the sceptre where it belongs.

We do not wish to do so, as some have striven to do, by lacerating our bodies in order that, if the matter which stands connected with us be not completely eliminated from our being, it be at least reduced to minimum of influence.

The noblest dominancy of spirit over matter can, we believe, be attained without thus unnecessarily increasing the ills and pains to which humanity is already an heir.

If rightly used, matter instead of being a foe will be a veri-

* Rabia was a saint among the Sufis, and lived in the Seventh Century. Her name is found in Tholuck's work on *Theosophy of the Persians*. She declared herself to be the spouse of God, in whom her will and personality were indissolubly blended. "I attained this," said she, "when every thing which I had found I found again in God."

table Jacob's ladder, upon which spiritual visitants shall be coming and going, ennobling life and crowning matter itself with its highest glory, while thus doing duty simply as the efficient hand-maid of spirit. In that mysterious connection existing between matter and spirit in our present condition the quality of the matter, its reliability in the prompt and healthful performance of its functions, such an adjustment of its relations with spirit as that the efforts of the latter shall be seconded by the sensitive response of the former is worthy of our closest study and attention. Matter may become an efficient servant; but it will work disastrously to degrade spirit and try to make it minister to that by which it ought to be ministered unto. Now, with this universe of the highest and noblest ideas, and of the ultimate causes and ends of being, and of the realities of existence, Metaphysics in its widest sense has to deal. The very provinces, therefore, over which she sways the sceptre and which are peculiarly hers to explore, so far as may be possible, proclaim her queen by divine right among all the divergent activities of the soul.

When I thus speak I must be understood as not confining my eulogy to that department of thought or investigation to which the term Metaphysics has been *technically* applied. The philosophy of mind embraces a wider empire than that. It is true that the department where Metaphysics pursues her explorations is the one that towers above all the balance of the soul's empire, where she has to brace herself for her most daring flights, and where high as she may soar, the inaccessible mountain-tops of being still rear their majestic heights. But though that be so, there are other fertile, wide and numerous provinces of her domain, explorations in which are stamped with her image and superscription receiving the patents of their nobility from her hand, and the right to take precedence in the long procession where mind and matter with their varied manifestations are made the subject of investigation. A brief glance at this territory with its varied names will reveal this more clearly. In the universe of mind and matter our consciousness has to deal with their phenomena or the modes of their manifestation. In obeying, or attempting to obey, the precept "Know thyself," the first efforts of our exploring, observing and reflecting energy must be directed to the phenomena or manifestations in consciousness or states of our souls. The department, therefore, of mental science that deals with these spiritual data—data which can be and are utilised in an inductive manner for further investigation in the higher reaches of the philosophy of being, is called *Psychology*. And also from the fact that it deals with the phenomena of being it is called Phenomenal Psychology. But Philosophy is ever reaching onward and upward toward the ultimate. It does not, therefore, rest satisfied to have its effort circumscribed within the domain of mere phenomenal observation.

In the observation of phenomena of mind as well as matter, an order of procedure may be discovered, a method of manifestation may be observed, and the search after these anterior facts that may appear to operate necessarily and uniformly under like conditions, leads to higher conceptions of being, viz.: the *laws* that may govern spirit in its manifestations or phenomena. To this department of psychologic investigation the term Nomological Psychology has been applied, from its having to do with the laws that govern mental phenomena—laws that enable us to explain mental manifestations. This it would appear is a region where the spirit of man will have to soar to greater heights than when engaged in explorations in the region of the psychology of the phenomena of being, or as it is technically called, Phenomenal Psychology. But there remains a higher region still beckoning the soul to strengthen its pinions for upward flight, or to have them strengthened by such an upward flight. It is a region beyond the realm of con-

sciousness, the nature of which must be learned in an inferential way, if learned at all by the exercise of our unaided powers. The subjects for investigation in this highest department of thought may be embraced within the sphere of our own being, or they may be, as in truth they are, most largely in the sphere of being outside and beyond us.

Investigation by inference into the nature of that unknown substance or essence that lies back of all mental phenomena, and of the existence of which we become conscious only through such phenomena, belongs to another department of psychological study than the two previously mentioned. It not only embraces within its legitimate domain the substance back of the phenomena of mind, but also the substance or essence that lies back of material phenomena and of which they are the main features. Not only so; it goes further and may legitimately enquire into the nature of the cause or ground of all being which lies in a sphere beyond itself and to which it can only attain by an effort to scale the heights, or perhaps I should rather say, cross the abyss by a bridge of inferential judgment. To this department of mental effort, when the spirit seeks information inferentially in regard to unknown being from the observed phenomena of such being—to this department the term *Ontology*, or Metaphysics proper, has been applied. It is dealing inferentially with real existence as distinguished from phenomenal existence. Certain great questions that do not come within the sphere of our immediate knowledge, but which may yet be forced upon the attention of the soul from the nature of phenomena immediately known, may require to be posited as the only rational explanation of such observed phenomena. Such a question is the existence of God. The phenomena of the universe may be such, and we believe *are* such, as to require the positing of His existence as the only rational explanation of such phenomena. The legitimate inference of such a Being as a real existence back of all the phenomena of the universe is a process of thought coming within the domain of Ontology, or Metaphysics proper. So also do investigations into the real existence and nature of that being, substance or essence that lies back of our consciousness and of whose existence, we are not immediately cognisant.

Reasoning inferentially from the immediately known soul-state we mediately become more or less informed about the soul itself—that mysterious substance that arises to consciousness in the various movements of thought, or mental waves that agitate the surface of its being. Such an investigation will be claimed by Ontology or Metaphysics proper. Conclusions relative to the immortality of our spirits so far as these are inferential results arrived at from a consideration of the nature of the phenomena exhibited by spirit, are also to be included within the metaphysical domain. All passing upward from appearances to realities, from the immediately known to that known only mediately, or, in short, from all phenomena to the unknown substance in which such phenomena inhere, is a metaphysical process of thought.

Now, however much such a department of mental effort may be derided in these days of materialistic tendencies, it is nevertheless a department of soul-effort that has exercised a mighty influence upon the destinies of our race in the past, and like Banquo's ghost it will not "down," but will rise again "rejoicing like a strong man to run a race." And in the year to come it will appear endowed with the energy of immortal youth, when Materialism shall be buried and visited in thought simply as one of the relics of an age long gone by. There are not wanting even now striking indications of the certain decay of Materialism. The pick-axe and the shovel have done inestimable service to the world; but with the dirt which they have upturned, enthusiasts have attempted to build a breast-

work from behind which they have striven to repel the spiritual forces of the universe, to relegate God out of his creation. But the effort has proved a failure. It could not have been otherwise. The materialistic philosophy fails at the very point of greatest moment to the human soul. The light which it professes to shed on the great and vital problems of life is but darkness. Its assumptions are as groundless as its outlook is hopeless. Thoughtful minds are beginning to realise this more and more. Metaphysics is regaining its legitimate ascendancy; slowly it is true, but surely. Man cannot live by bread alone. Utilitarianism, which is the twin sister of Materialism, or of the materialistic tendency, is found to be subversive of the highest good. The great questions coming within the proper sphere of metaphysical thought are not simply questions that confine themselves to the philosopher's sanctum. Neither are they such as are merely curious or pleasing, and instrumental in whiling away the leisure of a learned few who may take delight in such efforts. On the contrary they are such as take hold of the immortality of man and of his destiny in relation to existences beyond the sphere of his conscious knowledge. These are questions that touch and that have touched, all along the pathway of history, the very springs controlling the movements of our race. That science, then, that has to do with explorations about the very fountain-head of being has a right from that very fact to a royal place among the bright galaxy of the sciences. Looking at its commanding outlook, as it casts its eagle eye over the wide territory occupied by the rest of the sciences, it has a right to be called, as it has been, *Scientia Scientiarum*, the Science of sciences.

Independently, and outside of all the light that has been, and may still be thrown upon the otherwise unknowable by the divine Revelation, this science shall still have an abundance of problems to stimulate, strengthen and ennoble the spirit of man through the endless future. "The proper study of mankind is man." So Pope tells us, and we would all agree with him. Now that being so, the philosophy of mind in all its departments and bearings is ennobled by its relationship. For what determines man's position in the scale of being—his material or immaterial part? Most assuredly the latter. Therefore it follows that the department of mental energy that has to do with man in his highest and noblest outgoings must itself be a partaker of the halo of glory that surrounds the spiritual being with whom it has to do. Looking at it in this light the various departments of philosophy may be regarded as the permanent; while many of the arts and sciences that absorb so much of human energy are necessarily transient in character. The latter have regard to man as he stands related to the present order of things which soon vanisheth away; while the former, having to do with the higher things of spirit, belong to a category of influences that will survive the wreck of all man's present relationships and needs as viewed from the physical side of his nature. Philosophy has to do with man as man; whereas much of human thought and effort has simply to do with man as an *animal* whose hunger must be appeased, whose thirst must be quenched, whose body must be clothed, and whose passions must be gratified. For the satisfaction of all these needs men may become highly-developed instruments; and on account of their utility in that direction the branches of study that have to do with the developing of the efficiency of men as instruments for the accomplishment of the above ends are called utilitarian. Some would, therefore, classify Philosophy as a department of mental effort that was not useful, in so far as it did not stand related to those transient needs of humanity.

But if the worth or nobility of means is determined by the character of the end, then most assuredly is Philosophy entitled to take rank as the noblest utilitarian of them all.

Physical Science may deal with man in his transient relationships and needs as a wayfarer on a short-lived pilgrimage. Mental science deals with him in his absolute character as a man—a character independent of the questions of food and drink and clothing. Partaking of this immortal nature we bespeak for Philosophy or Metaphysics at no distant day its rightful place in the interest and regard of men. Toward the speedy accomplishment of this revolution of sentiment the members of this association have pledged their devotion and humble effort. However divergent our views and opinions upon other questions may be, we are, I believe, *one* as regards the sovereignty of Metaphysical Science, as well as the importance of those diviner ideas which tend to lift the human soul into closer fellowship with Him in whom we live and move and have our being.

THE PLATONIC DOCTRINE OF IDEAS, ETC.

A DISSERTATION.

BY THOMAS TAYLOR.

[Prefixed to his version of Proklos on Euklides, London, 1792.]

In short, as in every being we may discern the resemblances of matter and form, so in the pentad, or any other number, the five units—which are the subject of participation, and the quantity of the number—originate from the duad; but the form, that is the pentad itself, from unity. For every form is an unity, which unites its subject quantity, and connects it with its ideal species. It is therefore requisite to understand, that the two principles of mathematical numbers are resident in our souls, with which every mathematical number is co-existent; I mean unity, comprehending in itself all the forms of numbers, and which corresponds to unity in intellectual natures; and the duad, endowed with a generative power, of a formless nature, and of infinite virtue, and which is called boundless, on account of its being the image of never-failing and intelligible duality. Hence, the unity of the soul, with a never-ceasing energy, continually distinguishes and forms all the orderly processions of her numbers, suffers no vacuum to intervene, and leaves no quantity formless and innumerable. Hence, too, no essential number of the soul, as for instance the pentad, is composed from substance and accident, as a white man; nor from genus and difference, as man from animal and biped; nor again, from five units mutually touching each other, like a bundle of wood; nor from things mixed, like water and wine; nor from things subsisting by position, in the manner that stones compose a house; nor lastly, does it subsist like things numerable—for it is not because they are composed from indivisible units that they possess anything besides units. For many points are indivisible, yet quantity is not produced on this account; but because they participate of two natures—the one corresponding to matter, and the other to form. Lastly, it is not proper to say that the number seven—and so of any other number—is composed from the triad and the tetrad; for units indeed composed with units form a subject adapted to the reception of the heptad, or the ideal and essential number seven; but the definite numerical quantity seven, is formed from so many units, and the ideal heptad. Hence, as the soul of a shipwright gives form to the timber from her inherent art; so the numerative soul, from the unity endowed with the relation of a principle which she possesses, gives form and subsistence to all her inherent numbers. But there is this difference between the two, that the shipwright's art is not essential to our nature, and requires manual operation, because it is conversant with sensible matter; but the numerative art is essen-

tially inherent in the soul, and is therefore present with all men, and possesses an intellectual matter, which it easily forms without the assistance of time. And this, perhaps, is what deceives many who think that the heptad is nothing more than seven units. For the imagination of the vulgar, unless it first perceives a thing destitute of ornament, and afterward the operations of the adorning artificer supervening its nature,—and lastly, beholds the thing perfect and invested with form—cannot be persuaded that it possesses two natures, the one formless, but the other endowed with an energetic and forming power.

And here it is necessary to observe that though unity is the form of all arithmetical forms, yet it is chiefly the form of the dekad. For what unity is simply to all the series of numbers, that the dekad is to the following hundreds, thousands, and millions; from whence, according to a secondary progression, it is denominated unity. As intellect, therefore, is the form of all things, but especially of the soul,—so unity is the idea of all numbers and especially of the dekad. But the reason why the Pythagoreans extended ideal numbers no further than ten, is because this number is the ultimate perfection of beings, containing all things in its omniform nature. For all proportion subsists within the number ten; the arithmetical in a natural progression of numbers from unity; the geometrical in the numbers 1, 2, 4, and 1, 3, 9; and the harmonical in the numbers 2, 3, 6, and 3, 4, 6. And since the causes of all things are contained in numbers, as far as to the dekad,* it is superfluous to suppose exemplars of the following numbers.

If it should be asked in what manner we must conceive number as subsisting in the intelligible world, we answer, with the great Plotinos, that we must conceive it as subsisting in being itself, with a power of impelling it to the production of multitude. "Hence number is either the essence or the energy of being, and animal itself, and intellect is number. But perhaps we must call being number united, but beings number evolved or unfolded; intellect, number moving in itself; and lastly, animal, number comprehending." [*Enn.*, VI. lib. vi.]. It was in consequence of this reasoning that the Pythagoreans called ideas numbers; because the gradual evolution of these from ineffable unity produced all the beautiful variety of forms. Their exalted conception of numbers, likewise, originated from the same sublime theory.

Hence Pythagoras, in the *Sacred Discourse*, calls number "the ruler of forms and ideas." But Philolaos "the commanding and self-begotten container of the eternal duration of mundane concerns," and Hippasos, and all those who were called *akousmatikoi*, and those that were yet under the probation of the quinquennial silence, "the first exemplar of the mundane fabric, and the judiciary instrument of its artificer."

6. And here I cannot but take notice, with regret, of the very unphilosophical mistake committed by that great mathematician Dr. Barrow.† I say, with regret, on account of the extraordinary obligations I am under to his writings for my proficiency, whatever it may be, in mathematical learning. But respect must yield to truth. "Unity," says he, "is not indivisible. (For how ex gr. can $\frac{2}{3}$ added to $\frac{1}{3}$ be equal to unity, if unity be indivisible and incomposed, and represent a point) but rather only unity is properly divisible, and numbers arise from the division of unity." Here the Doctor evidently confounds sensible units, which are the subjects of vulgar practical arithmetic, with those units which are the objects of science. Every individual sensible object is indeed an unit, so far as it participates the connecting and conciliating power of an immaterial *one*, but the unity which stands at the top of

speculative arithmetic is perfectly indivisible, or arithmetic would cease to be a science. The truth of this is evident from Euklides' definition: "Unity is that according to which each of the things which are is called one." But if unity be a composite the definition is false; since a composite, or a certain multitude, can never be the cause of unity, but the contrary. And that this immaterial *one* subsists in sensible natures has, I hope, been sufficiently proved in the preceding part of this discourse. But the Platonic Theon of Smyrna fully establishes the indivisibility of unity, as follows: "Unity is terminating quantity, the principle and element of numbers, which remains undiminished by the most immense multitude of subtractions, and being deprived of all number, continues firm and fixed, because it is impossible for division to proceed beyond the bound of unity. Thus, if we separate any one corporeal substance into parts, the *one* again becomes *many*; and by subtracting the several parts we end in one part; and from this remaining part, again divided, arises multitude; and by taking away every part we again arrive at *one*. So that *one*, considered as *one*, is incapable of diminution, and perfectly indivisible. On the contrary, every number is diminished by division, and is separated into parts less than itself; as the number 6 into 3 and 3, or into 4 and 2, or into 5 and 1. But unity in sensible particulars, if divided, is diminished after the manner of body, and by section is distributed into parts less than itself; but it receives increase after the manner of number, for instead of the one, multitude is produced. In this sense, therefore, is unity indivisible; for nothing is divided into parts greater than itself. But that which is cut into parts greater than the whole, and into parts equal to the whole, is divided as number. Thus for instance, if any one sensible body is divided into six parts, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, these will be equal to the whole; but by a section into 4 and 2, it is divided into parts greater than the whole, considered as *one*; for 4 and 2, considered as numbers, exceed unity, and the body was supposed to be one. Unity, therefore, as number is perfectly indivisible. But unity is called *monas*, only, or alone, either because it remains immovable, and does not desert itself, nor surpass the bounds of its nature—for it remains the same, however multiplied into itself, through an infinite progression—or because it is placed separate and apart from the multitude of other numbers, it is denominated the *monad* or *one*."

In consequence of this very mistaken hypothesis, which opposes not only all the wisdom of antiquity, but the sublimest truths,—the Doctor asserts that an arithmetical cipher is the principle of numbers; and that it is analogous to a point in geometry. Just as if a cipher, which is nothing more than a mark expressive by its position with numbers of a certain quantity, had a real existence, and was productive of number; when at the same time any other arbitrary character would serve the same purpose, if applied in a similar manner. It must surely afflict every thinking mind to see how dreadfully the mechanical system of philosophy, which has been so long in fashion, enslaves and perverts the minds of its votaries; for there cannot, I think, be a more egregious instance of its fatal tendency than the present, in which *nothing* is considered as the foundation of that noble science, *Arithmetic*—which was deservedly placed by the ancients in the first rank of the mathematical disciplines. Such a foundation, indeed, may be proper to the *mechanical philosophy*, but is very ill adapted to support the solid fabric of the arithmetical science. But let us attend to the arguments of this most learned man, in defense of so strange an assertion: "A cipher, or arithmetical nothing, is really the bound of every number coming between it and the numbers next following, but not as a part. A cipher being added to, or taken from a number, does neither

*According to the Pythagoreans, "the immortal Gods and earth-born men call the venerable dekad immutable and unwearied."

† In his *Mathematical Lectures*, page 48.

increase nor diminish it; from it is taken the beginning of computation, while itself is not computed; and it bears a manifest relation to the principal properties of a geometrical point." But in what manner are we to conceive the *nothing* which intervenes between any two numbers to be their term or boundary? For Euklides defines a term to be the extremity of anything; implying by the extremity something belonging to that of which it is the bound. But how can a cipher, or *nothing*, in any respect belong to number, or *something*? For if *nothing* be a boundary, merely from its intervention, a point existing between any two disjointed lines, though at the greatest distance from each, must be their common boundary, which is evidently absurd. Besides, what relation does it bear to a point, which is endowed with a generative power, by its flux forming the simple extension of a line, and at the same time everywhere limiting its progression, and subsisting in infinite capacity in its every part? Where are the real and divine properties to be found in an arithmetical nothing which Proklos, in the following *Commentary*, exhibits in a point? And how can computation originate from a mere nonentity?

But a little consideration will convince us that this Saracen or Indian cipher, is nothing more than an arbitrary character, invented for the purpose of facilitating computation. For, suppose the letter *a* to be placed in its stead, and to signify, when connected with the mark for unity, ten, or ten multiplied by one; when connected with the mark for two, ten multiplied by two, and so on. And again, when placed twice after unity, let it express the second power of ten, or one hundred, in this manner, *aa*; when thrice connected one thousand, or the third power of ten, and so on. Shall we say in consequence of this that *a* is the bound of numbers, and the principle of arithmetic? Or, shall we not rather say, that it is an arbitrary symbol, like any other algebraic character, having no real connection with numbers, and depending for its existence and application entirely on the will of its inventor? But this opinion is too absurd to need any further refutation.

7. It may here, perhaps, be expected that I should explain how, in the language of Syrianos, "divine number proceeds from the immortal retreats of unity, till it arrives at the divine tetrad,"* and that I should unfold the properties of the tetractys, according to the Pythagoreans, but an undertaking of this kind would not only far exceed the limits of this Dissertation but perhaps, in the present age, might be justly deemed by the lovers of wisdom a prostitution and profanation of the most exalted truths. Enough, I hope, has been said to excite the curiosity and rouse the attention of the thinking and liberal part of mankind; and those who understand what is here briefly delivered, may apply themselves with advantage to Proklos on Platon's *Theology*, where they will find all the mysteries of numbers unravelled; and to the works of the great Plotinos, who will lead them into the penetralia of the most recondite wisdom. But, in perusing the works of these great men, the reader must not expect to find the sublimest truths explained in a familiar manner, and adapted, like many modern publications, to the meanest capacities. For this, indeed, is impossible to be effected. "Mankind," says Petvin,† "are not to be made any more truly knowing than happy by another's understanding. There is no man who can at once convey light in the higher subjects to another man's understanding. It must come into the mind from its own motions, within itself; and the grand art of philosophy is to set the mind a going, and, even when we think nothing of it, to assist it in its labor." After which he observes that "the ancients never attempt to lead us into knowledge, by a continued

chain of reasoning; on the contrary, they write in such a manner as to force us to think for ourselves." And previous to this he remarks: "that there are certain truths acquired by a long exercise of reason, both in particular, and likewise in those subjects that are most general, as much perhaps out of the reach of the greatest mathematician as Sir Isaac Newton's speculations are above the capacity of some that are now called Mathematicians." The truth of this observation is sufficiently evinced in Platon's definition of a philosopher in the *Sophistes*: "The philosopher is the man who sufficiently sees one idea every way extended through many, every one of them lying apart; and many ideas different from one another externally comprehended under one. And farther, one idea, throughout all manys, wrapt up in one; and many ideas every way separate or discrete. This is to have the knowledge to discern how ideas, as they are general, agree and disagree." Now, he who thinks that a perception of this kind may be acquired by barely reading an accurate discourse on the nature of Ideas, composed in intelligible terms, without at the same time employing a long course of profound meditation, and patient thought, knows but little the difficulty of the task, and until he changes his opinion will never be the wiser. But the folly and presumption of men with respect to this sublime philosophy is really unpardonable; for there are very few who conceive that much previous instruction is requisite to its acquisition; but almost every man decides peremptorily on the most abstract speculations, and reckons himself sufficient for the most profound investigations. In the sciences and arts they are willing to proceed to perfection by gradual advances; but they consider Philosophy as easy, of instant access, and hastily approach to her embraces with an assured confidence of success. Though, like unhappy Ixion, through their presumption, instead of a goddess they grasp nothing but an empty cloud. Platon was so sensible of this truth that, in his seventh epistle to Dion, he expressly affirms that he neither has written, nor ever will write explicitly, concerning these sublime speculations: "For a thing of this kind cannot be expressed by words like other disciplines, but by a long familiarity and a life in conjunction with the thing itself, a light* as it were leaping from a fire will on a sudden be enkindled in the soul, and there itself nourish itself." He adds, that a publication of such concerns is "alone useful to a few of mankind who, from some small vestiges previously demon-

* This light is no other than that of Ideas themselves; which, when it is once enkindled, or rather rekindled in the soul, becomes the general standard and criterion of truth. He who possesses this is no longer the slave of opinion, puzzled with doubts, and lost in the uncertainties of conjecture. Here the fountain of evidence is alone to be found.—This is the true light, whose splendors can alone dispel the darkness of ignorance, and procure for the soul undecaying food and substantial felicity. Of this I am certain from my own experience; and happy is he who acquires this invaluable treasure. But let the reader beware of mixing the extravagancies of modern enthusiasm with this exalted illumination. For this light is alone brought into the mind by science, patient reflection and unwearied meditation; it is not produced by any violent agitation of spirits, or ecstasy of imagination, for it is far superior to the energies of these,—and it is tranquil and steady, intellectual and divine. Avicenna, the Arabian, was well acquainted with this light, as is evident from the beautiful description he gives of it in the elegant Introduction of Ebn Tophail, to the *Life of Hai Ebn Yokdan*: "When a man's desires are considerably elevated, and he is competently well exercised in these speculations, there will appear to him some small glimmerings of the truth—as it were, flashes of lightning, very delightful, which just shine upon him, and then become extinct. Then the more he exercises himself the oftener will he perceive them, till at last he will become so well acquainted with them that they will occur to him spontaneously without any exercise at all; and then as soon as he perceives anything he applies himself to the divine essence, so as to retain some impression of it; then something occurs to him on a sudden whereby he begins to discern the truth in everything; till through frequent exercise he at last attains to a perfect tranquillity, and that which used to appear to him only by fits and starts, becomes habitual, and that which was only a glimmering before, a constant light; and he obtains a constant and steady knowledge." He who desires to know more concerning this, and a still brighter light—that arising from a union with the Supreme—may consult the 8th book of Plotinos' 5th *Ennead* and the 7th and 9th of the 6th *Ennead*, and his book *On the Beautiful*.

* For the tetrad contains all numbers within its nature, in the manner of an exemplar; and hence it is, that in monadic numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4, are equal to ten.

† *Notes to Letters on Mind*, p. 83.

strated, are themselves able to discover these abstruse particulars. But with respect to the rest of mankind, some it will fill with a contempt by no means elegant, and others with a lofty and arrogant hope that they should now learn certain excellent things. * * * There are three things belonging to each of those particulars through which science is necessarily produced. But the fourth is science itself. And it is requisite to establish as the fifth that which is known and true. One of these is the name of a thing; the second is definition; the third, the resemblance; the fourth, science. Now take each of these, desiring to learn what we have lately asserted, and think as follows concerning them all: A circle is called something, whose name we have just expressed. After this follows its definition, composed from nouns and verbs. For that which everywhere is equally distant from the extremes to the middle, is the definition of that which we signify by the name of a round, and a circumference, and a circle. But the third is the circle which may be painted, or blotted out, which may be made by a wheel, or destroyed; none of which affections the circle itself, which each of these respects, suffers, as being of a different nature. But the fourth is science and intellect, and true opinion about these. And the whole of this again must be established as one thing which neither subsists in voice, nor in corporeal figures, but is inherent in soul.* It is, therefore, manifest that this fourth is different from the nature itself of the circle, and again different from the three we have previously mentioned. But among the number of these intellect, by its relation and similitude, proximately adheres to the fifth, while the rest are more remote from its nature. The same may likewise be affirmed of a straight and crooked figure, of color, and of the Good, the Beautiful, and the Just. And again, of everybody, whether fashioned by the hand or the work of Nature, whether fire or water, and the rest of this kind; likewise of every animal, and the manners of souls; and of all actions and passions. For unless among these some one after a manner receives the fourth, he will never perfectly participate the science about the fifth. * * * Every circle which by the hands of men is either painted or fashioned by a wheel, is plainly contrary to our fifth—for it everywhere participates of the right line. But we must affirm that the circle itself has neither more nor less of anything whatever; that is, it possesses in itself nothing of a contrary nature. Besides, none of these is endued with any stability of name—for nothing hinders our applying the appellation of straight to that which we now denominate round, and calling the straight by the denomination of the round; nor will there be any less stability in these when their names are changed into the contrary. The same reasoning is likewise true of definition, since it is composed from nouns and verbs which possess no stability. And in a variety of ways it may be proved that no one of these four is certain and firm." Now, this fifth division of Platôn's entirely respects ideas, considered as flourishing in intellect; by a conjunction with which we acquire true intelligence, and the perfection of human knowledge. The first three of the preceding are obnoxious to various mutations, the fourth less, but the last is perfectly stable and invariable. The three first are rather conversant about the qualities of things, about the image and shadow; the fourth raises us to the participation of Truth, but the fifth to Truth itself, and Permanent Essence. In the first degrees almost all are conversant; in the fourth a few; in the fifth all the gods, but a very small part of mankind, as it is asserted in the Italian. The four first may be known, indeed, without the fifth, confusedly; but from

the knowledge of the fifth they become perfectly manifest, as effects from the knowledge of their cause. But we cannot, by any means, attain to the apprehension of the fifth, unless we have been first accurately conversant with the rest; for from our imperfect condition we are compelled to rise from difference to identity, from multitude to unity, and from shadow to substance. While we investigate the knowledge of things, if we are alone desirous to apprehend their resemblance, which is the case with the multitude, we shall be placed in the third degree, and may easily acquire the object of our pursuit. But if we should fortunately possess the true philosophical genius, which is rare in the extreme, and aspiring to the fifth degree should, by a happy event, attain to its conjunction,—though such a contact is clearer and more certain than all knowledge, yet it is difficult to express it in words, and to manifest it to others. And the reason of this is obvious; first, because words are wanting which exactly correspond to the essence of a thing, since these are only the symbols of shadows. Secondly, because we speak with those who are alone conversant with shadows, and are on this account derided by them, when they find that our fifth does not by any means accord with material resemblances, which they consider as the only realities.

8. And here a question very naturally presents itself for our solution, viz.: whether the soul, while united with the body, is able to perceive ideas without the assistance of the phantasy. For it seems difficult to apprehend how the soul, thus depressed and weighed down with the terrene mass, should be able to raise herself to the supernal light of ideas, and become united with their refulgence. The opinion of the Peripatetics is well known, that some phantasy must always accompany intelligence; but this is denied by the Platonists, and I think with great reason. For the operations of intellect are not dependent on the phantasy, though the perceptions of the latter proceed from the energies of the former. Besides, as Plotinos beautifully observes, our most vigorous energies are accompanied with the least animadversion; and there is no absurdity in supposing that by increasing the force of intellectual energy we may speculate free from all imagination, since the phantasms attending our conceptions become weak in proportion as the intellectual sight increases in vigor. On this account the Platonists affirm that the moral virtues free us from the vehemence of perturbations; but the contemplative from imagination, and the senses. Hence, too, the sciences may be called living waters; in which the wings of the soul being dipped, her feathers, which were either separated or broken by her lapse into body, are repaired and restored to a resemblance of their former perfection. For the wings are the powers of the soul, leading to intelligibles, but the feathers are as well the natural instincts to good and truth as reasons inserted in the soul; which either fall off or are broken by her descent into body, and conjunction with its ruinous bonds. But these are repaired and invigorated by the sciences, which, like living streams, flowing from the fountains of ideas, restore life and perfection to the soul. Hence Platôn, in the *Phaidros*, asserts that these wings of the soul are increased by everything which conduces to supernal elevation, as Beauty, Wisdom, and the like; and by a convenient metaphor in the same Dialogue he considers the chariot of the soul's lives, her charioteer, and the horses by which her car is drawn; and lastly, everything which contributes to the elevation of the soul, and her conjunction with intellect and ideas. We may, therefore, conclude that this conjunction is possible to be effected, though it is rarely obtained; and that it is a flight too arduous and sacred for the grovelling and sordid; a splendor too bright for the sensible eye; and a contact too ineffable to be described by the unstable composition of words.

* Viz., in the dianoëtic part of the soul—for the forms or essential reasons subsisting in this part, are the objects of science.

† For the circle itself is an *intellectual form*, and is not to be apprehended by the discursive energies of the dianoëtic part, but by the simple projections of intellect.

But I cannot conclude this section without soliciting the reader's attention to a comparison of the difference between the ancient philosophy, and that invented by Mr. Locke and the moderns. According to Mr. Locke's system ideas are formed from sensible particulars, by a kind of mechanical operation; so that truth is something by its nature posterior to sensation, and entirely dependent on it for existence. According to Platón, Ideas are eternal and immaterial beings, the originals of all sensible forms, and the fountains of all evidence and truth; so that on this system truth ranks among the first, and not in the last of things; and would still retain its nature though the corporeal senses were no more. According to Mr. Locke the soul is a mere *tabula rasa*, an empty recipient, a mechanical blank. According to Platón she is an ever-written tablet, a plenitude of forms, a vital and intellectual energy. On the former system she is on a level with the most degraded natures, the receptacle of material species, and the spectator of delusion and nonentity.* Hence her energies are nothing but somnolent perceptions, and encumbered cogitations; for all her knowledge terminates in sense, and her science in passion. Like a man between sleeping and waking, her visions are turbid and confused, and the phantoms of a material night continually glide before her drowsy eye. But on the latter system, the soul is the connecting medium of an intelligible and sensible nature, the bright repository of all middle forms, and the vigilant eye of all cogitative reasons. Hence she is capable of rousing herself from the sleep of a corporeal life, and emerging from this dark Kimmerian land into the regions of light and reality. At first, indeed, before she is excited by science, she is oppressed with lethargy, and clouded with oblivion; but in proportion as learning and enquiry stimulate her dormant powers she awakens from the dreams of ignorance, and opens her eye to the irradiations of wisdom. On Mr. Locke's system, the principles of science and sense are the same, for the energies of both originate from material forms, on which they are continually employed. Hence, science is subject to the flowing and perishable nature of particulars; and if body and its attributes were destroyed, would be nothing but a name. But on the system of Platón, they differ as much as delusion and reality; for here the vital, permanent and lucid nature of ideas is the fountain of science; and the inert, unstable and obscure nature of sensible objects, the source of sensation. On Mr. Locke's system, body may be modified into thought, and become an intelligent creature; it may be subtilised into life, and shrink by its exility into intellect. On that of Platón, body can never alter its nature by modification, however it may be rarefied and refined, varied by the transposition of its parts, or tortured by the hand of experiment. In short, the two systems may be aptly represented by the two sections of a line, in Platón's *Republic*. In the ancient you have truth itself, and whatever participates of the brightest evidence and reality; in the modern, ignorance and whatever belongs to obscurity and shadow. The former fills the soul with intelligible light, breaks her lethargic fetters and elevates her to the principle of things; the latter clouds the intellectual eye of the soul by increasing her oblivion, strengthens her corporeal bands, and hurries her downward into the dark labyrinths of matter.

* Lest the superficial reader should think this is nothing more than declamation, let him attend to the following argument. If the soul possesses another eye different from that of sense—and that she does so the sciences sufficiently evince—there must be, in the nature of things, species accommodated to her perception, different from sensible forms. For if our intellect speculates things which have no real subsistence, such as Mr. Locke's ideas, its condition must be much more unhappy than that of the sensitive eye, since this is coordinated to beings—but intellect would speculate nothing but illusions. Now, if this be absurd, and if we possess an intellectual eye, which is endued with a visive power, there must be forms correspondent and conjoined with its vision; forms immovable indeed by a corporeal motion, but moved by an intellectual energy.

Nor is it wonderful there should be so great a difference between the two systems, and so much in favor of the ancients; if we consider the great advantages these ancients possessed over the moderns in everything which contributes to the advancement of philosophy. For, in the first place, they lived in an age when abstract investigations were in the greatest request, and the professors of such pursuits in the highest estimation. Besides this, they united the most exalted abilities with the most unwearied attention and obstinate perseverance; they devoted their whole lives to the search of truth, and relinquished everything which might be an obstacle to its acquisition. We may add, likewise, the advantages of a language extremely philosophical, and a freedom from the toil of learning any tongue but their own. Now the reverse of all this is the portion of the moderns; for in the present age abstract speculation is ridiculed, and its professors despised. The pursuit of truth is considered as perfectly consistent with ordinary avocations, and is rather prosecuted as a relief from the toils of business than as a thing desirable for its own sake, and of the greatest dignity and worth. Hence a few years desultory application at a college, where language is one of the first objects of attention, qualifies a modern for philosophy, raises him above Pythagoras and Platón, and persuades him with presumptuous confidence to enter the lists against these venerable heroes. And lastly, all modern languages are barbarous with respect to the Greek, falling far short of its harmony and energy, its copiousness and propriety. If such then be the true state of the case, what judgment must we form of men who, with all these disadvantages, philosophized without the assistance of the ancients, despising their works, and being ignorant of their contents? Shall we call it prudence or presumption, wisdom or folly? Truth will certainly pronounce the latter, and the general voice of posterity will confirm her decision. There are two egregious instances in our own country of this daring presumption. I mean Bacon and Locke. The former of these is celebrated for having destroyed the jargon of the schoolmen, and brought experimental enquiries into repute; and for attempting to investigate causes through the immensity of particular effects. Hence, he fondly expected by experiment piled on experiment to reach the principle of the universe; not considering that his undertaking was as ridiculous as that of the Giants of old, who attempted to invade the heavens by placing Ossa upon Pelion, and Olympos upon Ossa, and ignorant that

“Heaven still, with laughter, the vain toil surveys,
And buries madmen in the heaps they raise.”

The latter of these, Mr. Locke, is applauded for having, without assistance from the ancients, explained the nature and exhibited the genuine Theory of the Human Understanding. But that this applause is false the preceding comparison between his and the ancient philosophy may evince; and the variety of other self-taught systems which, like nocturnal meteors, blaze for awhile and then vanish in obscurity, abundantly confirms. Had these men indeed, when they justly derided the barbarous writings of the schoolmen, explored the works of antiquity, penetrated the wisdom they contain, and enriched their native language with its illustration, they had doubtless been celebrated by the latest posterity; but, desirous of becoming masters in philosophy by intuition, they disdained the instruction of the ancients, and vainly attempted to soar on artificial wings to the very summit of science. They are, however, destined, like Ikaros, to a precipitate fall; for the influence of time which is continually dissolving the cement of their plumes, is likewise continually weakening their force, and will at last effect their final separation. And thus much concerning the doctrine of ideas and numbers, according to Pythagoras and Platón.

(End of Section I.)

THE HUMAN SOUL:

CAN ITS EXISTENCE BE DEMONSTRATED?

"If a man die shall he live again?" What is that change we call death? Is it the end of conscious personal existence?

The answer to these important questions comes from Religion; from Theurgy and from Philosophy. Each combines more or less with the other. Without stopping to define either of these terms, we will simply say that reference is herein made to the answer which Religion gives, no matter how derived, to the above questions, and which must be taken on faith by the enquirer, hence, as evidence of things unseen, is not demonstration. By Theurgy we refer here to that group of phenomena known in modern times as Spiritualism; while by the term Philosophy, we do not mean that vague speculation into which the human mind has plunged, beginning in hypothesis and ending with nonsense; but rather the logical process of thought based on exact science, and which demonstrates its right to be, *by honoring every truth with use.*

The answer which religion gives to the above question is substantially as follows: Notwithstanding the Bible threatens utter destruction of the wicked, priest and church answer: "Yes, thou shalt surely live forever; the soul is immortal either in heaven or hell. Take our answer on faith and follow our injunctions and thou shalt live forever in heaven. Believe and thou shalt be saved; believe not and thou shalt be damned." Thousands of earnest souls have thus found inspiration in life and consolation in the hour of death. But even the assurance of faith is not a demonstration of the existence and immortality of the soul.

Modern Spiritualism assumes to bridge the gulf and solve the problem by re-embodiment of spirits of the dead, and establishing between them and us written or oral communication; thus claiming final solution by demonstration. The history of spiritualism shows how many there are who are unsatisfied with the assurance of faith. But are they, as a rule, fully satisfied with the ground and answer of spiritualism? Do they rest as in a demonstration, accepting the phenomena as evidence at the time, and leaving such evidence forever afterward unquestioned? Let us see.

Our ideas of matter, motion, space, time and casuality are related to the physical body and translated into consciousness through the organs of sense. When the body dies these avenues of sense die also, and no intelligent person now believes in the restoration and resurrection of the physical body. All agree that if anything survives it is a spirit, a soul, or soul-spirit (the distinction at this point is not important to our argument). (But the difficulty comes in just here; in *realising* first logically, and afterward in a higher manner, that with the death and dissolution of the body, matter, motion, space, time and casuality, die also.) Our ideas of these concepts are strictly related to our present life in the physical body. These with the body belong to the objective world; we have more or less translated them into consciousness, and at death, *for us*, they, like the body, cease to be. What, then, remains? No body: neither head nor heart, hands or feet; neither sensation nor feeling; no matter, no space, no time, no motion. What *can* be left? As to the man, it is assumed that the soul or spirit remains; and as to cosmos, the entity which underlies all phenomena animates all matter and fills all space—that is, the "spirit-world," God, and the human soul. If these exist, they are purely subjective so far as our present life is concerned. *But you cannot prove subjective existence by objective evidence.* True philosophy must observe both widely and closely; must distinguish critically, and must reason logically. Now admitting clairvoyance to be a fact, it is purely subjective, as related to ordinary vision, which never sees through

stone walls or around corners, and is limited by the conditions of the physical body. But to him who does not possess subjective vision, clairvoyance is not demonstration. The clairvoyant sees and describes a "spirit" to one who sees nothing. If the spirit be re-embodied or "materialised" it is no longer subjective, but objective, and to that extent no spirit. Making due allowance for illusion, hallucination, etc., the mind of the non-seer may at best be forced to *believe* during the continuance of the phenomena, only to be left in doubt and uncertainty afterward. This is the experience of thousands of anxious, honest, enquiring individuals. The belief of spiritualism, then, is after all a *belief*, beyond the few who possess subjective vision, or unusual powers; while the phenomena, both objective and subjective, *when genuine*, prove the existence of facts, processes and laws, some of which are objective, some subjective. But they do not prove to the enquiring multitude conscious individual immortality, in the sense desired. Many of the most famous "mediums" are as much in doubt as to the true interpretation of the phenomena as others, and this very doubt has driven many such to suicide, and according to their own confession, tempted many more thereto.

True or Platonic philosophy is based, first, on *correct living*. A pure, upright, active life has the promise: "Live the life and know the doctrine." The mind thus freed from the trammels of sense and sensuality, selfishness and greed, sees clearly and reasons logically; and advancing thus from the known to the unknown, from that which is, it determines that which shall be, which is the highest science. If, therefore, we enquire of philosophy: "If a man die shall he live again?" she answers: **THAT DEPENDS** on how much of spiritual (subjective) existence he has translated into consciousness during his earthly life. Spiritual existence without consciousness is a misnomer. **Immortality immediately following death is not determined** by lottery or jugglery; nor is anything in nature what it is, or changed by our belief. Nothing is so because we wish it so to be. Exact justice, measure for measure, is the method of nature everywhere. A spasm of conscience, a formulated creed with the blessing of priest or "church," have never yet converted a red-handed murderer into a saint in the last, or any, hour of existence here. The ascent is slow and painful by which the "man of sin" is *redeemed*, or subjective existence *realised*.

The demonstration of continued conscious existence comes neither from faith, logic or theurgy; it is a matter of being or "BECOMING" *with each individual soul*. To him who *lives the life*, immortality is near at hand; while to him who is immersed in animalism, it is far removed. This is not only the essence of the Platonic philosophy, but also that of Kabbalah and Theosophy, and the foundation of all the great world-religions.

Of the waifs who drift toward the shores of time, many miscarry. Others, again, give a few gasps and return to the shoreless ocean whence they came. Again, others live sickly, feeble, diseased lives; while beyond these are toiling, anxious, sorrowful, sensual and selfish multitudes of men and women, begetting their kind, and perpetuating the struggle for existence. Returning thitherward, they become in subjective worlds of effect, the blasted germs, the maimed, sickly or healthful souls, conscious or unconscious of the subjective life, according as they have translated spirit into consciousness in this *world of gestation*. Is it not time this truth was made known? "Humanity is the great orphan," said St. Martin. So long as religion holds the masses to a pure and holy life, so long as it can satisfy them with faith, inspiring the life to noble deeds of love and self-sacrifice, giving consolation in the hour of death—so long is such religion divine.

But the world's great religions have long ago become corrupt and are falling in pieces like ropes of sand. There remain honest, anxious hearts who can no longer believe, but who demand to *know*; and if they are also ready to *do* and to *dare*, the daily, hourly *achievement* of immortality may be its *absolute demonstration*. To unsettle the faith of the true believer, whose life corresponds in constant effort and self-denial to the type of the DIVINE HUMANITY, is a crime; to give the only basis of proof, short of death itself, to those who can no longer believe, is a bounden duty. The test of true philosophy is like that of true religion. The good everywhere is ONE. Creed and conduct must accord. An intellectual concept which does not work inward toward God through reverence for all good, and outward toward man, through charity and love, is as barren as superstition, and as hateful as hypocrisy.

If we are entering a new era, in which there is to be a revival of true philosophy, let us be divested of all cant and all superfluities. Let the pinnacle of the new temple reach the heavens, and its base rest in the antipodes, the "dark world" from whence in our blind, ignorant animalism, through the "fall into generation" we have sprung; and let it be centered in the very heart of humanity, proclaiming Universal Brotherhood as its corner-stone, and *aspiration* through *inspiration*; holiness through helpfulness its watchword. * * *

DEATH OF THREE MODERN HINDU SAGES.

The philosophic associations of India have been called upon the last season to part with their noblest and most notable men. Dayananda Sarasvati, the famous Swami or spiritual chief of the Arya-Samaj, died at Ajmir, October 30, 1883, in his sixtieth year. He had been for many years the centre of a religious movement, which contemplated no less than the restoration of the ancient *Vedas* to their ante-Brahmanic importance or religious authority, and so far as was possible the rehabilitation of the archaic Aryan religion. Dayananda was of course opposed to image-worship, caste-distinctions, and the like, and was the strenuous advocate of the education of women and of the lawfulness and expediency of the marriage of widows. In close analogy to Chillingworth, who uttered the maxim: "The Bible is the religion of Protestants," he took the stand that the *Vedas* constituted the true Aryan revelation; what was not to be found in them was false or useless, and what was there was the truth beyond controversy. He often held discussions with the Pundits of Benares and other places; and they frequently, on finding themselves unable to cope with him in argument, endeavored to win the victory by personal violence and exciting mobs against him.

The formation of the Arya-Samaj constitutes an important chapter in the religious history of India. Ram Mohun Roy, a Brahman, born in Bengal in 1780, and an accomplished scholar in languages, had published a treatise entitled: *Against the Idolatry of All Religions*. It drew upon him the bitter enmity of Hindus and Moslems, because of its free criticism of both their religious systems. In 1816 he translated portions of the *Vedas* from Sanskrit into Bengali and Hindustani, for free circulation. The Preface contained the following remarkable expression:

"I have never ceased to contemplate with the strongest feelings of regret the obstinate adherence of my countrymen to their fatal system of idolatry; violating every humane and social feeling for the sake of propitiating their supposed deities, especially by acts of self-destruction and the immolation of nearest relatives under the delusion of conforming to sacred religious rites. In these practices I view with sorrow the moral debasement of a race capable of better things, whose character render them worthy of a happier destiny. Under

these impressions I am impelled to lay before them genuine translations of their own Scriptures, which inculcate not only the enlightened worship of One God, but the purest principles of morality."

Ram Mohun Roy had frequent discussions with Christian missionaries. He would not accept the doctrine of the Trinity, regarding it as a form of polytheism akin to the Brahman dogmas. He acknowledged the pre-existence of Jesus and his superior nature, and translated the Parables and Moral Discourses into Sanskrit and Bengali. He regarded the law which teaches man to do to others as he would be done by, as "partially taught in every system of religion," but as being the "essential characteristic of the Christian religion." As a result, he made few friends among Christians, while his Hindu fellow-countrymen became his persecutors. His profound knowledge of the Hindu law enabled him to defeat their endeavors to evict him from his social rank. His disciples were constituted into a free religious association entitled the Brahma-Samaj.

After his death in 1833, the controversies of the leaders of this organisation were continued. They maintained that every argument in favor of the inspiration of the Christian Scriptures was even more conclusive in favor of the *Vedas*. It may not be generally known that the ancient Sacred Writings of the Hindus were kept at Benares, the Holy City, and were only to be found in the original Sanskrit. They were virtually inaccessible, therefore, to Hindus and Europeans alike. Both parties determined to give them to this world. Several young scholars were despatched from Calcutta to Benares to study the *Vedas* and report upon their contents. The result was not what had been expected. The head of the Adi Brahma-Samaj, Devandra Nath Tagora, was sagacious to perceive that however venerable the *Vedas* might be as relics of an archaic age, they would be regarded now as containing much that was childish, erroneous and even impossible. The project of disseminating them among the Indian natives was abandoned; and a very free opinion in regard to their inspiration was now entertained.

Dayananda revolted against this state of things. The fundamental idea of religion with him was revelation. He saw no alternative between a complete giving up of all religion and an unwavering belief in every word and letter of the *Vedas*. He knew them by heart, and to have surrendered anything in them as having come from a human source would have destroyed all his faith. He considered the *Vedas* not only as divinely inspired, or rather *expired*, but as prehistoric or prehuman. He published commentaries on the *Rig-Veda* and the *Yajur-Veda*. Every historical or geographical name in the books was carefully explained away; he regarding everything which reflected historical or geographical information as utterly profane. They were nothing but the voice of the Supreme One. There are those now living who cherish like sentiments in regard to a critical interpretation of the Bible.

Dayananda not only held that everything contained in the *Vedas* was perfect truth, but he went further and endeavored to demonstrate that they mentioned the recent scientific inventions, such as the steam-engine, railway and steamboat. As *Veda* means knowledge, he argued, nothing could be hid from that.

The establishment of the Arya-Samaj was the result of his teachings, and he held the rank of *Swami*, or religious head, till his death. Upon the organisation of the Theosophic Society in America in 1876, he consented to receive it as a branch of his School; requiring, however, of its founders a most sweeping concession to his superiority and absolute passive obedience to his authority. When the leaders of the society

took up their abode in Bombay, they remained for a while in affiliation; but he presently severed the connection.

His zeal for propagandism was most intense. He visited every province of India, except Madras; and he addressed assemblies with the greatest learning and eloquence. He was impatient of contradiction as religious teachers generally are; but he was no sycophant and always had the best interests of Aryavarta at heart. It is asserted of him that he possessed Yogi powers, and that he predicted his own death years ago, as certain to occur before 1884.

The body was burned according to immemorial usage. The pyre was very large. Two maunds of sandal-wood, eight maunds of common fuel, four maunds of clarified butter, and two and a half seers of camphor were used. A large procession chanting hymns from the *Vedas*, performed the last honors. Much doubt exists whether the Societies of the Arya will not end with the life of the great pundit.

The progressive Brahmas have also lost by death their worthy leader, Keshub Chunder Sen. In 1866 he led the secession from the Adi Brahma-Samaj, the original organisation formed by Ram Mohun Roy, because its leader would not sanction his attack on Caste, also the marriage of widows. He soon became regarded with great veneration. He taught that Christ was the great Man and Mighty Reformer of the world, a man above ordinary humanity, whose religion was entitled to the peculiar regard of Asiatics, as an altogether Oriental product, and that he exhibited the grandeur of which Asiatic nature is capable.

Visiting England in 1870 he received high praises from the prominent clergymen of that country. He never, however, fully realised their expectations. "England," said he in 1879, "has sent after us after all, a western Christ,—an Englishman with English manners and customs about him, and with the temper and spirit of an Englishman in him."

He gives a mystic interpretation of the whole matter. "Genuine, deep-souled, perfectly pure-minded humanity, that wholly sacrifices itself to the love and holiness of God, is truly divine. And to Jesus belongs that divinity. It was not personal extinction, it was utter personal subjection; it was the personality of man at one with the personality of God." The resurrection is but the raising of the spirit of Jesus before the throne of the righteousness and love of God. He lives in heaven as a separate, personified soul in its own sphere of blessedness, achieving a higher and still holier standard of perfection than was ever known in his life. "He lives," says Keshub, "in all Christian lives and in all Christian influences at work around us. You may deny his doctrine, you may even hate his name, but you cannot resist his influence. Christ exists throughout Christendom like an all-pervading leaven, mysteriously and imperceptibly leavening the lives of millions of men and women."

He interpreted the Trinity as having the God Jehovah at the apex, the Supreme Brahma of the *Vedas*. "Divinity coming down to humanity is the Son; Divinity carrying up humanity to heaven is the Holy Spirit. This is the whole philosophy of salvation." Christ is humanity pure and simple, in which divinity dwells. He underlies the endless varieties of truth and goodness in ancient and modern times. He is pure Intelligence, the Word of God, the mighty Logos. In all schools of philosophy and in all religious sects is one vast and identical Sonship diversely manifested.

In 1878, the daughter of Chunder Sen was married to the Maha Raja of Cuch-Bihar, a few months before the age prescribed by the Samaj for such alliances. The Rajah was about to go to England, and hence the marriage was hastened. As Keshub had zealously enforced this rule, the technical violation created a schism; and the Sadharan Samaj was formed

May 5, 1878. The new organisation takes advanced ground on female emancipation, adopting so far as practicable European manners and more liberal education. It also takes the lead in regard to religious freedom. The absolute dominion of the Swami, an authority resembling Popery, is discarded by the new party.

The death of Keshub Chunder Sen will hardly result in the dissolution of the Samaj; but the Sadharan party appears to be very largely in the majority.

The following sonnet on the dead sage appears in the *Reis and Rayyet*, a Calcutta paper, January 12th, 1884:

IN MEMORIAM.

BABU KESHUB CHUNDER SEN.

Born, 1838, Nov. 19.

Died, 1884, Jan. 12.

He's gone! the soul magnificently bright
Hath left its mortal tenement of clay;
The radiant star hath vanished far away,
From the eastern skies that gleam'd on human sight—
And all the land is wrapped in gloom of night;
The gorgeous flower that made the orient gay
With glow and scent so rich at noon of day
Hath droop'd too soon beneath a with'ring blight!
We scarce can realise a loss so deep,
For Keshub's magic eloquence yet rings
Within our ears; but he is gone—and nations weep—
As ne'er they wept for princes or kings—
With heart-felt sorrow, for th' untimely end
Of genius rare, Religion's warmest friend.

RAM SHARMA.

Babu Peary Chand Mitra, a writer and teacher of great ability died at Calcutta, November 23, 1883. He was a member of the Theosophic Society at its first organisation in 1876, and held the post of President of the branch society at Bengal. He was also secretary of the Calcutta Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. He wrote much on metaphysical subjects and was a warm advocate of female education. His age was seventy years. He had been in failing health, but his death leaves a vacancy not easy to supply.

A. W.

THE WORKINGS OF A HINDU MIND.

[From an unpublished private letter to William Q. Judge, Recording Secretary of the Theosophical Society.]

MY DEAR ———:—You ask me what is my belief about "reincarnation?" Well, as it is a complicated question, I must give you a plain statement of my full belief. To begin with, I am a Pantheist. I believe that *the whole universe is God*. You must, however, well understand that the word "God" does not convey to me any meaning attached to that word by the Westerns. When I say "God," I understand it to be nature or universe, and no more. Therefore, I might more appropriately be called a "naturalist." To my mind there is no possibility of the existence of an extra-cosmical Deity. For if there were, the harmony or equilibrium of nature could not be preserved, and the whole universe instead of being one harmonious whole, would be but a Tower of Babel. This harmony can be kept only by the working of the Immutable Laws of Nature. And if the laws of nature be immutable, they must be blind, and require no guiding hand. Hence the existence of an extra-cosmical Deity is impossible. This is, as far as I can understand, the chief teaching and principle of any one philosophy. As the position is logical I must accept it in preference to the Semitic theory, which rests on blind faith alone.

Now some of the Pantheists recognise the existence of two distinct entities, viz., Matter and Spirit. But thinking deeply over the subject has led me to the conclusion that

their position is not quite logical; for, as far as I can understand, there can be but one Infinite entity and not two. Call it either matter or spirit, but it is one and the same. Who can say that this is spirit and that matter? Take an instance. Ice is a gross form of matter. If a little rarefied it will be water, which is still matter. Higher still it is vapor; still matter. Higher, gas; it is still matter. Further, it becomes ether, but is still matter; and then you may go on *ad infinitum*. Thus becoming more and more sublimated it will reach its climax in the process of spiritualisation. But still it does not become nothing. For if it does, there must come a time when the whole universe will be nothing. If it is so, it is not infinite, as it has an end. If it has an end, it must have had a beginning; if it had a beginning, it must have been created; and thus we must assume the existence of an extra-cosmical Deity, which, as said above, is not logical. Then we thus logically find that this highest sublimated form of matter can not be nothing. Neither can matter have reached that climax of sublimation when any further action would make it grosser, not finer. What is commonly understood by the word *spirit* then is nothing but that highly etherealised form of matter which we cannot comprehend. But it is still matter, inasmuch as it is still matter and liable to be grosser.

There is, then, *only one* eternal Infinite existence, call it either spirit or matter. I will, however, call it by the latter name, as that is most suited in its common understanding for what I am to state. Matter, as you know, we call *Maya*. Some say that this thing does not really exist; but I do not agree to that. In my opinion, it is called *Maya simply on account of these transformations*. It is never steady. The process is ever working. The one infinite agglomeration of matter is in some of its modes becoming grosser, while in others becoming more sublimated. The circle is ever turning its round. Nothing goes out of that circle. Everything is kept within its bounds by the action of the centripetal and centrifugal forces. The *forms* are changing, but the *inner substance* remains the same.

You will ask: "what is the use of being good or bad; our souls in proper time will be etherealised?" But what is a soul? is it material or immaterial? Well, it is material for me, and there is nothing immaterial, as said above. As far as I can think, it is an agglomeration of all the attributes together with that something which gives us the consciousness that we *are*. But in the case of the ice, it was not sublimated until touched by heat. The centripetal force was strong in its action and it required the heat or centrifugal force to refine the ice. Just so with man. The action of the centripetal force keeps us to our gross forms. And if we have to etherealise ourselves we must supply the centrifugal force, which is our *WILL*. And this is the first principle of Occultism. We must study and know the Forces of nature. Every result must be in proportion to the cause producing it. We are every instant emitting and attracting atoms of matter. Now a person who is not an occultist, will have various devices, and unconsciously to himself he will produce a cause which will attract to him such atoms of matter as are not suited for his higher progress. The same way, when he is emitting others, he may give them such a tendency that they will mix with others wisely inclined; and thus, other individualities which are thus formed will have to suffer for no fault of theirs. But an occultist directs both. He is the master of the situation. He guides them, and by knowing their action he produces such conditions as are favorable to his attaining of "nirvana."

But what is *nirvana*? By *nirvana* I mean a *state*, and not a locality. It is that condition in which we are so etherealised that instead of being merely a mode of the Infinite Existence

as at present, we are merged in totality or we become the *WHOLE*. Another thing about the advanced occultist: that he is in a better position to benefit humanity.

The particles of which I am formed have always existed, yet I do not know in what form they existed before. Probably they have passed through billions of transformations. Why do I not know these? Because I did not supply the force that would have prevented the disintegration of my individuality. I will, if I attain nirvana, remain there till the action of the force that put me there ceases; the effect being always in proportion to the cause. The law of Exhaustion must assert itself.

In passing through this process of etherealisation you all along give a certain tendency to the particles of which you are composed. This tendency will always assert itself; and thus in every cycle, or reincarnation, you will have the same advantages, which you can always utilise to be soon free, and by remaining longer in the nirvana state than the generality of Humanity, you are comparatively free. So every consciousness which has been once fully developed must disintegrate if not preserved by the purity of its successive Egos till the nirvana state is attained. Now I believe that the full development of my consciousness as Krishna, is possible only on this earth, and therefore if I die before that is done I must be reborn here. If I reach the nirvana state, even though I am in another body, I shall know myself as Krishna.

Now I suppose this is sufficient for you. It is difficult to put such ideas on paper. Such things are to be understood intuitively. * * *

THE "BRETHREN."

AN ESSAY ON THE ESSENES.

BY JOHN F. OAKEY.

"All ye are Brethren."—Matthew xxiii : 8.

In his own account to the Galatian disciples of his induction into the religion of the Nazoreans, and his call to apostleship, Paul gives the following unequivocal statement: "I conferred not with flesh and blood; neither did I go back to Jerusalem to them that were apostles before me, but I went into Arabia and returned again to Damascus."

The common impression, that Paul went into Arabia merely for the purpose of spending a short time in contemplation, fasting and prayer, must clearly be erroneous. He sought the desert, we are told by another biographer, for another and more particular reason; he fled thither to save his life—to avoid the assassins from Jerusalem, that were put upon his track by the Sanhedrim. From his own mouth we have the testimony that it was not till three years that he ventured to go thither; and then, not again, till fourteen years more had passed by.*

* There exists much reason to suppose that the animosity cherished against Paul was shared by the apostles and their followers at Jerusalem. In this very Epistle to the Galatians, he declares that when he went up the second time to Jerusalem, he was apprehensive in regard to the gospel which he had been promulgating, and so only communicated it privately to those of note. They, however, imparted nothing additional, but contrariwise; and afterward, Kephas and Paul had an open rupture at Antioch, which does not seem to have ever been healed. In Arabia, east of the river Jordan, were communities of the Essenes or Therapeutæ; and Josephus states that he himself repaired thither for instruction. "When I was informed," says he, "that one whose name was Bannus lived in the desert, who used no other clothing than grew upon trees, and had no other food than what grew of its own accord, and bathed himself in cold water frequently, both by night and by day, in order to preserve his chastity, I imitated him in these things, and continued with him for three years." It is, therefore, probable that Paul likewise spent a similar period for a like object, rather than because of any peril of assassination or denouncement to the civil authorities.—A. W.

At the time of Paul's flight to Arabia, about 35 A. D., Christianity was still in an embryo condition. The positive morality and charity taught by Jesus had not yet been thoroughly instilled or put in practice. The little band of disciples remaining in Jerusalem, though full of zeal and enthusiasm, was nevertheless without any decided plan of action, and was in constant physical danger. "We read amiss," declares De Quincey, "if we imagine that the fiery persecution which raged against Christ, had burned itself out in the act of crucifixion; it slept for a brief interval, but that was from necessity; the small flock of scattered sheep easily secreted themselves. No sooner did they multiply a little, no sooner did their meetings again proclaim their whereabouts, than the snake found them out; again raised its spiry crest among them, and again crushed them for a time."

"During the whole of this novitiate for Christianity," says the same author, "there was a brooding danger over its name and prospects. To hold up a hand, to put forth a head in the blinding storm, was to perish."

In the remarkable essay from which we have just quoted, De Quincey has attempted to show the identity of the early Christians and the sect of Essenes that is described by the historian, Josephus. It is De Quincey's opinion that the fathers of the Church, seeing the hopelessness of any open attempt to obtain a foothold for their religion, resolved, in order to avoid that persecution which could only end in annihilation, to form a secret society, the darkness surrounding which was to be so deep as to be impenetrable to the hostile world.

The name adopted was calculated to disarm all suspicion; indeed, to conciliate the jealous defenders of the Mosaic Code.

We learn from various authorities that the term *Essen* was derived from the Chaldee word *Sacha*, (bather or baptist) or "asa," (healer). The *Mishna* (*Talmud*) speaks of them as "Chasadim," (Pious men) "Nazarin," (Abstinent.)

Macrisi, the Arabian, alludes to "Nazirs," "Essenes," "Baptists," as all being "Asanina," or "Essenes."* It is stated that the Essenes were Communists. They denounced logic-metaphysics and Physical Science as useless, and gave attention to ethics. They taught the equality of men and entire supremacy of destiny. They also abstained from wine, flesh and all sensual enjoyments, living on the coarsest and plainest foods and bathing every morning in pure spring-water. They advocated celibacy. Their doctrine was that Jehovah is then original Light from whom proceed a number of spirits, the head being the "Logos," into which after death the soul is again absorbed.

Josephus states that they despised rulers; had no certain dwelling-place; were given to hospitality, and greatly loved one another. He also mentions their avoidance of swearing, yet unswerving truthfulness, their contempt of pain or death, and their practice of antelucan worship.

It is almost unnecessary to point out the similarity of the characteristics of these Essenes and early Christians. The abstaining from meat, commemorating the fasting of Jesus in the wilderness; the abluting in pure water, commemorating the baptism by John; the antelucan worship, in remembrance of the resurrection of Jesus; the doctrine of the "Logos," so dwelt upon in St. John's gospel. All these things were of the greatest significance and are certainly

* As the designation *Essen* appears to be synonymous with *Theraputes*, it would seem to mean *healer*. The character of the Essenes appears to warrant this supposition. It may, however, be the same also as *σωζουενός*, *saved, healed*. CHASDIM is the designation of the Chaldeans. We read in *Maccabees*, of Asideans, who lived in the time of the Hasmonean brothers. The term is also used in the *Psalms* in the sense of *pure*. *Nazir*, usually rendered *Nazarene* and *Nazorean*, means a person separated, consecrated, crowned, invested with authority.—A. W.

proofs in favor of the theory in question. The principal arguments, however, brought forward by DeQuincey are as follows:

"Josephus, who lived at Palestine during the period succeeding the crucifixion, and up to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, a period necessarily contemporaneous with the early Christians, never in so much even as a line mentions the existence of such a sect as the Christians. This is simply marvellous."

"In the New Testament no mention is ever made of such a sect as the Essenes. In the *Gospels* Jesus is made to come in contact with all kinds, all classes of men; the rich, the lowly, the priests and rulers, the publicans and sinners. He dwells in cities and in the lonely hills. He meets and has intercourse with the Pharisees, the Sadducees, Scribes and Doctors, Romans and Herodians, Samaritans and Galileans, but never for one instant do these 'Essenes' cross his path. How can this be possible? If such a sect existed in Palestine during his ministry he must necessarily have come in contact with them, and mention of it would be made in the gospels or at least in one of them. All four of the Evangelists could not have overlooked their existence."

The *Acts of the Apostles*, which purports to be a narrative of the work of the disciples of Christ from the time of the Ascension to the captivity of Paul at Rome, makes no mention of this sect. The Epistles of Peter, James and Paul are silent concerning them; and lastly, the *Apocalypse* of John does not refer to them.

If the theory of De Quincey is to be regarded as fact, then this mysterious silence can be explained.

Josephus does not mention the Christians, because there was no body of men in his time who went by that appellation. "The disciples," we read in *Acts*, "were first called Christians at Antioch;" which would be in the year, say 43 A. D. But what were they called during that period of ten years between the Crucifixion and missionary journeys of Paul and Barnabas?

This pertinent question De Quincey answers by supposing that among themselves the disciples went by the name of *adelphoi*, the Brethren; or, *pistoi*, the Faithful; but to the outside world they were known as "Essenes"—members of the Jewish "Society of the Essen."

It was only after being continually designated as "Christians," a term of derision and reproach, after all disguise could be thrown aside, that the followers of Jesus accepted and assumed that title which would cling to them forever.

Josephus, who claims to have been an "Essene," De Quincey maintains, was only admitted to the Outer Circle,—the novitiate of the society. He was, in fact only nominally a member, and was never permitted to penetrate to the inner mysterious circle composed only of the true believers, the "Brethren," the "Faithful," who had acquired that "peace that passeth all understanding," and were ready to accept all hardships and sufferings, to face the perils that were surrounding them upon every side.

The New Testament, of course, makes no reference to the "Essenes," because to those whose writings it contains, the word "Essene" had no special significance. It was only the mask, as it were, that permitted the "Brethren" to pass unmolested through the hostile crowds. The real name of the society, that by which they were known to each other—"the Brethren," or "the Faithful," is continually found in the *Acts*, the *Gospels* and the *Epistles*; and to the thoughtful reader this term will surely seem to be used not in a mere ordinary way, or in the sense of a friendly designation, but rather as the particular name of a society. Neither is the word "Christian" prefixed, as is so often the affected custom in these latter days, for this term *Christian* is found but three times in the *New Testament*.* In reading the letters of Paul who must always be regarded as the most prominent member of the

* *Acts* xi: 26; xxvi: 28. *I Peter* iv: 16.

Christian society, we are struck with the continual use of the term "brethren," which seems to be used in a way that renders plausible the theory of a secret brotherhood.

In the *Epistle* to the Thessalonians—a short letter containing but five chapters—the apostle addresses them as "brethren" no less than sixteen times. The Philippians he addresses eight times in a like manner. In his two *Epistles* to the Corinthians he makes use of the term "brethren" thirty-five times and of the term "brother" eight times. The Roman church is saluted ten times by the same title. In the *Epistle* to the Hebrews, supposed to be written conjointly by Paul, St. Luke and Timothy, the term occurs many times.

It will also be found often in the *Epistles* to the Galatians, Ephesians, and the *Pastoral Epistles*; although the last named cannot be considered as genuine productions.

In the beautiful short letter to Philemon the apostle makes use of the term in a most significant manner. In sending back Onesimus the slave, to his master, Paul sends him "not now as a servant, but above a servant, a 'brother.'"

The whole tenor of Paul's epistles, in fact, go to prove that the communities he addresses are composed of members of a "brotherhood," possessing secrets unfathomable, incomprehensible to the outside world, the height, depth and breadth of which were only known to those who, having become dead to the world, were alive in the knowledge of the "Eternal God who hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."*

THE RENEWAL OF ISIS.

PREFACE.

Religion (from the Latin *religare*, to bind) should be a bond of love, not only between humanity and divinity, whose mysterious essence evades the sometimes too-exalted hallucinations of its devotion,† but also and especially of all men who could not love each other too much. This is not the case, in consequence of the spirit of partisanship which divides men into sects hostile to each other; for each, pretending to be the only one favored by a supernatural revelation of absolute truth, charges others with error or imposture, who do not fail to retaliate.

Philosophers of all nations and of all ages have, up the present time, vainly attempted to devise an agreement which would put an end to religious dissensions, of which the earth is the sad theatre. Will they ever succeed? I do not know. Perhaps the defect of their systems, based too narrowly on free thought, has been, not sufficiently taking into account the religious sentiment which is so instinctive in mankind that no deception, no abuse, however revolting, can detach them from it.

The philosophy alone capable, if the thing is possible, of uniting the human species in one and the same theodicy to the exclusion of all idolatry and superstitious practices, will not be the one that rejects *a priori* all ancient religious symbols, but really that which shall succeed in dissolving these symbols one by another, melting them all into an original prototype which reconciles and effaces their divergencies, in its majestic simplicity.

* NOTE 1.—The essay of De Quincey is so concise, direct and exhaustive as to leave but little to say upon the subject of the Essenes and their identity with the early Christians. The object of the above essay is merely to recall some of the salient points of De Quincey's argument and to show its bearing upon Paul's conversion to the Christian faith and his subsequent writings. That Paul's conversion was as a bombshell thrown into the ranks of Judaism, and that it served to stir up and increase the already fierce and bitter persecution against the disciples of Jesus, we know to be a fact. It seems quite likely then, that the disciples should have sought and found, in secrecy and symbolism, that safety which was essential to the life and growth of the Gospel.

2.—It is unnecessary to refer to the interpolated passage in Josephus concerning Christ. De Quincey dwells at great length upon the untruthfulness of Josephus and his lack of patriotism, holding him up to the scorn of Jews, Romans and Christians.

‡ "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself."—*Isaiah* xlv., 15. "No mortal has ever raised my veil."—*Egyptian Inscription on the Temple at Saïs.*

PREMISES.

THE BHAGAVAD GITA.*

I.

"It is in my bosom that all living beings reside; for the production and dissolution of the universe is MYSELF.† Above me there is nothing. To me, the universe is suspended like a string of pearls on a thread."

II.

"The multitude of Gods‡ and the great Rishis§ know not my nativity; for I am the absolute principle of the gods and of the great Rishis . . . I am the Soul that resides in all living beings; I am the beginning, the middle and the end of living beings." (*Yoga, X.*)

III.

"Whenever any being whatever, mobile or immobile, is engendered, it is done through the union of matter and Idea.¶ As the sun lights up all this world for himself alone, so Idea illumines all matter."

IV.

"Those who full of faith¶ adore other divinities,** honor me also, although outside of the antiquated rule; for it is I who gather and preside over all sacrifices, but they do not know Me in essence, and they commit a fatal error."††

V.

"Those whose intelligence is a prey to desires, turn toward other Divinities.** They each follow their own worship dragged away, as they are by their own nature.‡‡ Whoever the divine personality may be to which a man offer his worship I strengthen his faith in that god. Full of his belief he exerts himself to serve him, and obtains from him§§ the blessing he desires and which I distribute. But the recompense of these ignorant men is limited. Those who sacrifice to the gods, go to the gods;|| those who adore me come to me."¶¶

SECTION I.—HISTORY.

CHAPTER FIRST.

ANTIQUITY OF EGYPTIAN ISIANISM.

The name Isis signifies *ancient*;*** thus recalling the antique origin of this Goddess.

In fact, we see in prehistoric times monotheism established among the Egyptian in the religion of Isis; at that time exempt from the idolatries and degrading superstitions which sacerdotal duplicity and popular fanaticism later introduced.

Let us remark, however, that the Isiac religion was not purely monotheistic in principle, and that it implied a mitigated ditheism; for Isis, the great primordial goddess, emblem of the active spirit, was represented under the figure of a winged genius, treading under foot the serpent *Apoph*,

* Sacred poem of the Hindus, translated by Emile Burnouf.

† The Great Primordial Nature. ‡ Secondary gods. § Primitive ancestors of the human race. ¶ The Divine Spirit. ¶ Or more exactly, with a blind devotion. ** Fictitious or subaltern divinities. †† That is to say, they are reborn after death in an inferior condition. ‡‡ By their religious prejudices. §§ Or rather in his name. || Inferior gods. ¶¶ To the great Primordial Goddess.

*** The Hindu Isis, ZYAUS, involving in itself the initial Triad, whose manifestation on earth resolves itself into Brahma, Vishnu and Siva, has the same signification. "Zyaus" is the spirit-type, the primordial germ, the universal matrix . . . The immortal germ (Zyaus), whose terrible name ought not be pronounced, is the "Ancient of Days." . . . The sublime monosyllable AUM, (Three in One) is the image of the "Ancient of Days." *Agronchada Parikchair* (Book of the Occult Sciences of the Brahmins; Translation of L. Jacolliot, "La Spiritisme dans le Monde," part II., chapters v. and x. *Antiquus diorum*: (The Ancient of Days), says, in his time, the prophet Daniel (Chapter vii: 9, 13, 22), thus reattaching the circumscribed Hebrew Jehovah to the great Indo-Egyptian Isis-Zyaus.

emblem of passive but *recalcitrant** matter, on which Isis only acts, and over which she triumphs by taming instructive resistances, with living force.

It is nearly the same in the Brahmanic religion, whose tritheism (Brahma,—Vishun,—Siva) resolves itself into a kind of ditheism, if we consider that Brahma-Vishun uniting in their creative and preservative force are held in check by Siva, who strikes all their works with destruction.

As for the religion of Ormasd and of Ahriman, instituted among the Persians by Zoroaster about the thirteenth century B. C., and founded upon pure ditheism, its date—relatively recent—takes away *ab ovo* all proper originality. The system of absolute ditheism implying a complete equivalence of good and evil, besides, could not sustain itself even among the Persians; for it is manifest that the sum of good generally exceeds that of evil, and it had to be mitigated through the addition either of the God of Time (*Zarvana-Akarena*), who will finally render the good principle Ormasd, conqueror of the bad principle Ahriman; or of the god of the sun, Mithra, coadjutor of Ormasd in his incessant struggles with Ahriman.

Thus the tritheist system of the Hindus on the one hand, and the absolute ditheist system of the Persians (tardy conception of Zoroaster) on the other, are only—the first, an odious superfluity; the second, an awkward imitation of the mitigated monotheism of the Egyptians.

The absolute monotheistic system, which we nowhere find vigorously established since the Hebrew Jehovah has his infernal serpent to tame, very like the Egyptian Isis of which it is a copy, the absolute monotheistic system in its turn, cannot maintain itself; for it would necessarily imply the exclusive reign of good and the total absence of evil, a thing assuredly very much to be desired for unhappy mortals if they could delude themselves in this respect, but which is cruelly belied by experience.

Hence the true system, at once philosophic and traditional, the normal principle of a wise theogony, and the only one confirmed by observation of natural phenomena, is and can only be the beneficent monotheism of the Golden Isis, mitigated by the refractory adhesion of the serpent *Apoph*, whose instructive resistance Isis † tames, but not without effort; resistance always overcome, but always lively and indestructible which introduce into theodicy the ditheistic element, more or less veiled, which we discover at the bottom of all ancient religions whose memory the earth has retained.

PRE-EXISTENCE.

BY PAUL H. HAYNE.

While sauntering through the crowded street,
Some half-remembered face I meet.

Albeit upon no mortal shore
That face, methinks, has smiled before.

Lost in a gay and festal throng,
I tremble at some tender song—

* *Tu insidiaberis calcaneo ejus*, says the Hebrew *Genesis*, borrowing from the Egyptian *Genesis* the Satanic serpent, the enemy of Jehovah, whose spiritual head shall crush the head of this serpent under his heel. *Ipsa contoret caput tuum*, (*Ibid.*). Christian theodicy reproduces in its turn this symbolic image, common to all the antique theodicies, in the representation of the Archangel Michael overthrowing the infernal Dragon. Apoph is the serpent Hof. of the Hyk-sos.

† It should be understood here, once for all, that the name in itself, is of little consequence, and Isis, whose Egyptian etymology according to Diodorus Siculus, signifies *ancient*, and recommends itself to our preference, by its antiquity, and by the rectitude of the initial system to which it reattaches itself.

Set to an air whose golden bars
I must have heard in other stars.

In sacred aisles I pause to share
The blessings of a priestly prayer—

When the whole scene which greets mine eyes
In some strange mode I recognise.

As one whose mystic part
I feel prefigured in my heart.

At sunset, as I calmly stood,
A stranger on an alien strand,

Familiar as my childhood's home
Seems the long stretch of wave and foam.

One sails toward me o'er the bay,
And what he comes to do and say

I can foretell. A prescient lore
Springs from some life outlived of yore.

O swift, instinctive, startling gleams
Of deep soul-knowledge! not as dreams,

For aye ye vaguely dawn and die,
But oft with lightning certainty,

Pierce through the dark, oblivious brain,
To make old thoughts and memories plain.

Thoughts which perchance must travel back
Across the wild, bewildering track

Of countless æons; memories far,
High-reading as yon pallid star.

Unknown, scarce seen, whose flickering grace
Faints on the outmost rings of space!

THE AMERICAN AKADÉMÉ.

IMPORT OF THE EMBLEMS.

[Read before The American Akadémé, Feb. 19th, 1884.]

Curiosity appears to have been elicited in various quarters in regard to the decoration and motto upon the card of membership issued by the American Akadémé. Let no one impute to us any desire to be eccentric; indeed, when their full purport shall be well understood, this cannot be done. We have but followed an ancient practice, and our emblems are adopted as indicative of our central idea, and as comprising a world of eloquent meaning in a brief limit.

Symbols and metaphors compose the frame-work of language. They constitute the most natural mode by which to denote every mental concept. We apply them in the common offices of speech; making the letters of the alphabet represent sounds, and sounds or words express our thoughts as well as using the numerical figures and algebraic letters to signify specific numbers and arithmetic combinations. The ancients were likewise profuse of their symbolic representations, and had a sign or emblem to indicate every idea which was not immediately perceptible to the corporeal senses.

The Rev. Dr. Lundy, author of *Monumental Christianity*, says in his Introduction: "It is a fact that among the first and foremost nations of antiquity, philosophical and religious ideas

and truths were expressed by symbols, the better to preserve and teach them. Symbolism was no more than a pictorial language addressed to the mind and soul through the eyes, as spoken language is an address to the inner man through the ears. The painted symbol, however, has the advantage of greater vividness and impressiveness than the verbal statement, just as the portrait of a mother, or the picture of some grand or beautiful scenery, or of a battle, is far more effective than any lengthened description in words. As thought cannot be expressed without language, or some outward sign and representation, either in science or religion, so it is an absolute necessity to employ signs, words, or symbols, to embody and teach the facts to both. If the mathematician cannot do without his signs and formulæ, or the merchant without his figures and secret marks, so the religion of all antiquity could not do without symbols."

"Man cannot feed on cold ascetic dreams,
And mutilate the beauty of the world
For something far and shapeless; he must give
His eyes the form of what in him aspires,
His ears the sound of that diviner speech
He pines to speak, his soul the proud content
Of having touched the skirts of perfect things."

I therefore respect, not to say venerate, the peculiar rites and symbology of the archaic world. I do not believe that the devout souls of that day were mere worshippers of stocks and stones. The religious and philosophic systems and symbolisms were outgrowths—the aspirations of thinking and reverent men—to solve and express in suitable form the facts which underlie and constitute all things. The stock represented the Tree of Life, and the stone set up as a pillar denoted what Jacob called it: Beth-El, which in the Semitic tongues meant *God within*. Sometimes the stones were meteoric like that of Astarté at the Holy Island of Tyre, that of Aphrodité at Paphos, Kybelé Pessinuntika in the mountains of Phrygia, and that of Aluza now in the Kaaba at Mekka. The fact that they fell from the sky and were magnetic assured their significance as symbols, representing the dynamic force, that great principle of nature, the mother of us all. I join my deprecatory plea in this matter with that of the amiable Lydia Maria Child: "If we have degraded the ideas which they cherished with reverence, if we have rendered obscure the mysteries of life which they adored as pure and instituted by God himself, let us not add to the injury by endeavoring to cast upon them the reproach which belongs to those who calumniate them."

It is hardly necessary to remark again that the literature as well as the worship of antiquity consisted largely of symbolism and symbolic utterance. The myths of the gods and heroes, and more than probable much that we are now endeavoring to decipher and interpret as history, were of this character. Perhaps, also, the reverse of this is sometimes true. We can see these facts in many of the relations of Herodotos, and Plutarch gives us a similar idea in his treatise on *Isis and Osiris*. The very names of places and individuals which have been transmitted to us, were often employed symbolically. It is doubtless equally true that the works of Platô abound more or less with this same kind of picture-writing.

The Hebrew Scriptures follow the same usage. Nobody intelligently doubts the figurative character of the account of the Garden, or Sacred Grove of Eden, which men and divine beings occupied in common, and in which a wise Serpent spoke to the woman and instructed her that she would by eating of the Tree of Knowledge herself become as a god. The apostle Paul did not hesitate to declare the story of Abraham an allegory; and that the wanderings and adventures of the Israelites were types, written for admonition.

The serpent which Moses is recorded to have erected in the Desert near Sinai in Arabia was denominated: "a sign (or symbol) of salvation, to put them in remembrance of the commandment of the law." Hence the introduction to the Book of *Proverbs* significantly declares that a man of understanding will attain to wise counsels—to understand a proverb (or parable) and the interpretation, the words of the wise and their dark sayings. In fact the interior sense, rather than the outward spectacle appears to have constituted the staple matter of the old Hebrew story. It was so understood by the most notable of the Christian Fathers, Clement, Origen, Jerome and Augustin; and, indeed, we have the caution of Maimonides himself, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, that he who had in anyway discovered the true meaning of the Book of *Genesis* ought to take care not to divulge it. Doubtless because the book BA RASHIT (*Concerning Wisdom*) was wisdom that might be spoken only among the perfect. Platô, our master in these things, has instructed us well: "To discover the Creator and Father of this Universe is indeed difficult; and when discovered it is impossible to utter him to the many." We will do well to follow his counsel, "by imitating the uniform revolution and operations of Divinity, to set right our own absurd errors and blunders."

In the matter of the emblem and motto upon the card of the American Akadémê the question may be asked why we had resort to Greek antecedents. In reply I will say this: "We are not mere dwellers in the Present Time, cut off and estranged from the former life of the Human Race. The Past is still in being and we are part of it, as it likewise is a component of our own individual selves. A man or a people having no affiliation with that which was of aforesaid time, has no legitimate existence. Especially is this true in regard to what is sacred and intellectual."

In accordance with this idea, the older worships and religious rituals have been characterised by an adherence to some primitive or antique language. The rites of the Kabeiri at Samothraké were celebrated in a barbarous dialect which the hearers did not understand. "Never change them," said the oracle; "they are God-given and possess arcane power at the initiations." Iamblichos also says: "Though it be possible to translate them, yet they no longer preserve the same power when translated." Any person conversant with the original text of the New Testament knows how far any of our versions fall short of expressing its meaning; and the fire of the sense smoulders in the ashes of authorised translations. Hence to this day the Judean Rabbi chants his liturgy in Aramæan Hebrew, in which dialect ancient Judaism was constructed. The Parsi Mobed sings the *Gathas* in the old Baktrian language; the Brahman in Sanskrit, and the Roman Christian in Latin.

The philosopher has the Greek for his sacred tongue. The Wisdom of the East was assimilated and so transfused into it by the Ionian sages, Hérakleitos, Anaximenes and their fellow-laborers. Pythagoras added the divine lore of Egypt and Assyria. Then came Anaxagoras with his grand postulate of Mind as the primal source of Matter and Form; and finally Platô, God's anointed High Priest and Prophet, to show us how to read and understand the mystic *petroma*, the eternal Tablet of our being inscribed by the finger of Divinity. As the Bible is best read in the original dialect, and the God-names of the Mysteries were full of deific energy when spoken in a holy language, so we as students of philosophic truth are most at home in Greek. We are somehow nearer to the Master of the Akadémê.

Our classic scholars appear to feel a similar impulsion. This is shown in the growing tendency to set aside the Latinised forms and orthographies, with which we are all familiar.

Zeus and not Jupiter now rules in the sky; Poseidôn and not Neptune is lord of the earth and sea; and Hadês is god of the vital fire, and the arcane wisdom which relates to the real life of the world beyond. Bishop Thirlwall, Grote, Gladstone, Max Müller and other expert Hellenists have introduced the practice of writing Greek names to a great degree after the orthography of the original words; and we have accordingly very respectable authority for the peculiar spelling of our own designation, as well as the additional advantage of a distinction thereby from the various High Schools and scientific bodies which are miscalled *academies*.

The emblem on the card is purely Grecian. The name of the butterfly in that is also *psyche*, the same as the designation of the soul.

Mr. Richard Payne Knight, in his elegant Treatise in *The Symbolical Language of Ancient Art and Mythology*, remarks, (§ 169): "The celestial or æthereal soul was represented in symbolic writing by the butterfly; an insect which first appears from the egg in the shape of a grub, crawling upon the earth, and feeding upon the leaves of plants. In this state it was aptly made an emblem of man in his earthly form; when the æthereal vigor and activity of the celestial soul, the *divina particula mentis*, was clogged and encumbered with the material body. In its next state the grub becoming a chrysalis appeared, by its stillness, torpor and insensibility, a natural image of death, or the intermediate state between the cessation of the vital functions of the body, and the emancipation of the soul in the Funeral Pile; and the butterfly breaking from this torpid chrysalis and mounting in the air, afforded a no less natural image of the celestial soul bursting from the restraints of Matter and mixing again with its native æther. Like other animal symbols, it was by degrees melted into the human form; the original wings only being retained, to mark its meaning. So elegant an allegory would naturally be a favorite subject of Art among a refined and ingenious people; and it accordingly appears to have been more diversified and repeated by the Greek sculptors, than almost any other which the system of emanation, so favorable to Art, could afford." A conspicuous example is the representation of the soul of Achilles as a female figure with wings, seated upon the capital of the pillar which marks his tomb, when the maid Polyxena, his betrothed wife, is about to be immolated, in accordance with the ancient custom of *Sati*.

I am not quite ready, however, to accept this conjecture with all its seeming plausibility. It was a very ancient practice to construct symbols by means of these homonyms. Mr. Robert Brown, the author of *Poseidon*, remarks: "Occult symbolism has frequently availed itself, either of two words of similar sound, or of one word of manifold meaning, by commemorating a person or event signified by one of such words or meanings under the form of the thing signified by the other. Thus, if the name of any particular deity had the same sound as the word meaning fir-tree, the representation of the fir-tree was, to the initiated, the symbol of the god." It needs no further illustration to show that the figure of *psyche*, the butterfly, is to be read as the divine *psyche*, the soul, whose purification and exaltation we severally profess to be seeking. The expressive language of Platô, our object is to restore to the soul its wings. The admirable work of C. W. King upon *The Gnostics* has a picture from a gem, representing the soul as a butterfly in the act of escaping from under the winged foot of Hermês, the messenger of death.

The fall of Psychê upon drinking the beverage offered her by Venus or Passion, her subsequent imprisonment in Hades or the transition-world, and her final restoration by Eros or the Divine Love, is one of the most charming of the ancient mystic allegories.

The motto is equally suitable and eloquent: "Ἡ Ψυχὴ ναι,

ἢ ἀμβροτος"—*ha psuche; nai, ha ambrotos*—the Soul: aye, the immortal. I know nothing that can be added to render this confession more forcible and impressive. The Greek text is more full of meaning than any translation. This adjective *ambrotos* is very closely related to the *amreta* of our Aryan kindred of India, the beverage of imperishable life which was drunk only by gods and god-like men. In Orphic fable Zeus, the eternal god, was called *ambrotos*,* immortal, as well as male and female in one. Ambrosia was the subsistence of the divinities on Olympus.

Hence the immortality which our motto imputes to the soul is infinitely more than mere escape or liberation from dying. It denotes the possessing of life which is inherently eternal, a being which transcends every thing limited and measured by Time. Such is the life of the denizens of the world beyond, who abide in the presence of God. The soul is not merely an undying entity, but a divine being, eternal like Him.

FEBRUARY MEETING.

The regular meeting of the American Akadémê was held February 19th, 1884, at the residence of Doctor H. K. Jones, Jacksonville, Illinois. It was a very tempestuous evening, the wind blowing a perfect "blizzard," the thermometer having fallen from 80° to zero, and there being a severe storm of rain, sleet and snow; nevertheless the usual number were present.

The journal of the meeting held in January was read and approved. The names of fourteen candidates were duly proposed and elected to membership.

The President read a poem by Prof. Lewis J. Block, of Chicago, called *The Inlet*; representing the universality of the Soul. This was followed by a paper from Dr. Wilder: *The Import of the Emblems*, explaining the significance of the emblem and Greek motto on the certificate of membership.

The paper of the evening came next. This was a rare production on *Dialectic*, by Mr. Angus Dallas, of Toronto, Ont. It was remarkable, unique in its mode of treatment of the subject, and stirred up enquiry like flaming substance from a distant star upon a dark path.

Several speakers objected to the declaration by the author, that Homer has been brought down to a level with Virgil and Shakspeare. It was insisted that both these writers belong in the same category *with* the ancient Ionian bard; also that Shakspeare, especially, has not been read any more than Homer.

One speaker demanded: Can Shakspeare be called a sensuous author dealing in flesh and bones and the emotional accompaniments of the mental passions? Are not his themes as high as those of Homer himself?

Question was had likewise of the correctness of the statement by Mr. Dallas, so new to many, that letters have the same definiteness as numbers.

Indeed, the session appears to have been purely Platonic in character, as Mr. D. regards it, and would have pleased him immensely.

The several contributions were ordered to be transmitted to THE PLATONIST for publication.

All Literature should be guided by truth—a certain kind of artistic and moral truth, even in fiction, a more literal and material veracity in History, Description, Science and Biography. What do we mean by such veracity of the latter class? Surely it is the simple rule of all truth—THE JUST EXPRESSION OF OUR IMPRESSION. Our impression may be more or less nearly identical with absolute objective fact; but the faithful rendering of such impression in the manner we conceive best calculated to convey it to another is our truth—that which each of us "troweth."—*Frances Power Cobbe.*

* The Orphic Hymn, cited by Thomas Taylor, has *aghtos*.