

SUPPLEMENT TO THE THEOSOPHIST.

VOL. 3. No. 3.

BOMBAY, DECEMBER, 1881.

No. 27.

OUR WORK IN THE N.-W. PROVINCES AND OUDH.

Our work in the N.-W. Provinces this season has been of an important nature. Madame Blavatsky initiated during the last month many gentlemen, European and native, at Dehra Dun, Saharunpore and Meerut on her way from Lahore, where, by the way, there is every probability of our having *two* Branches of the Theosophical Society. Mr. S. J. Padshah on his way from Bombay to Lucknow was present at Allahabad on the 6th ultimo, to assist at the formation of the Prayág Branch. From Allahabad, Mr. Padshah proceeded to Lucknow, where he was received by H. R. H. Prince Mirza Soliman Kadir Bahadur with great cordiality. The Prince, the most enlightened member of the family of the ex-King of Oudh, was initiated as a Fellow on the 11th. His Highness applied for and received a Charter, empowering him to form a Branch at Lucknow, and we have no doubt that we shall be able to soon announce that a powerful and active Lucknow Theosophical Society has been inaugurated. Arrangements have been made for hearing Mr. Padshah lecture twice in the historical Kaiser Bagh. Mr. Padshah has been cordially welcomed by the representatives of the Press in Lucknow.

From Lucknow, Mr. Padshah proceeded to pay a flying visit to Bareilly, the capital of Rohilkund, where he met Madame Blavatsky by appointment. There they initiated several applicants into the Society. A Branch to be called "The Rohilkund Theosophical Society" was formed at Bareilly also. The erection of a Theosophical Hall for the Branch is seriously contemplated, and we are sure the Bareilly Branch will be the outcome of the immediate future.

THE ADHI BHOUTIC BHRATRU THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

A charter for the formation of a Branch of the Theosophical Society, under the above name, at Berhampore (Bengal), was applied for and granted to Babu Nobin Krishna Banerjee, Deputy Collector and Magistrate of Berhampore, who had come down to the Head-Quarters specially for that purpose and for necessary instruction. He left Bombay on the 14th November to meet Madame Blavatsky at Allahabad on his way to Berhampore. We hope to give in our next the bye-laws of the Branch, as also the names of the officers elected.

NATIVE LADIES' THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETIES.

The rules for the formation of these societies, carefully framed by one acquainted for long years with India and its various castes and observances, will be printed in the January Number. The first Zenana Branch that is about to be opened, will be at Berhampore, Bengal, where there are already a few native ladies who have joined the Theosophical movement.

BOMBAY THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

At the regular monthly meeting of the Society held at the Parent Society's Head-Quarters at Breach Candy, on Sunday, the 6th November, at 4 P. M., Mr. Dámodar K. Mávalankar read a lecture on: "The Secret of Life." It lasted for a little over half an hour.

After a short discussion between the President Dr. Dudley and the lecturer on some of the points in the lecture and a vote of thanks to the young gentleman from the audience, the meeting was adjourned.

7th November 1881,

RULES OF THE PUNJAB UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD AND THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY (LAHORE).

(President William Bull, Esq.)

I. To carry out its objects the Society has a body of officers, and a committee of management, who do all the work connected with the Society.

II. The body of officers consists of one President, two Joint-Secretaries and one Treasurer, and the Committee of Management of from seven to twelve Members, with officers acting as *ex-officio* members.

III. The officers and the members of the Managing Committee are elected for one year at the Society's annual general meetings from among the Society's members, and by them they may be re-elected any number of times.

IV. The President of the Society takes the chair at the meetings of the Managing Committee as well as at the ordinary meetings of the Society, and delivers an address at the beginning of the Society's year giving a review of the past year's actions of the Society, and offering suggestions for its future guidance.

V. The Joint-Secretaries keep records of the proceedings and actions of the Society, read reports of the last meeting, and of the past year at the Annual General Meeting, reply to all official letters, correspond with individuals and other Societies in sympathy with the objects of their own, and convene ordinary as well as extraordinary meetings of the Managing Committee as well as ordinary meetings of the Society. The Joint Secretaries work together.

VI. The Treasurer is in charge of all monies belonging to the Society, keeps accounts of receipts and disbursements, collects subscriptions and donations, makes payments under the sanction of the Secretaries, and renders a quarterly account of income and expenditure to the Managing Committee.

VII. The Managing Committee meets when occasion arises, considers all matters connected with the Society, takes necessary steps for the accomplishment of the objects of the Society, instructs the Secretaries to convene extraordinary general meetings, and appoints office-bearers and members of the M. C. when any vacancies occur.

VIII. Members only can vote at meetings of the Society, the members of the Managing Committee at meetings of that body, the general members of the Society at the general-meetings of the Society.

IX. All questions at all meetings of the Society are decided by a majority of votes. When the number of votes is equally balanced, the President has a casting vote, which decides the question.

X. Each member will have to pay a minimum subscription of annas four a month.

XI. The rules of the Society can be altered, modified or changed at the annual general meeting of the Society; also at extraordinary general meetings convened for the purpose by the Secretaries with the sanction of the Managing Committee, and at no other time.

XII. If a body of the Members of the Society larger than the Managing Committee with its *ex-officio* members send up a written requisition to the Secretaries, requesting them to call an extraordinary general meeting, they are bound to convene it; if they do not call such a meeting within a reasonable period, the applicants can themselves convene the same.

XIII. All notices concerning meetings of the Society are issued at reasonable periods before their date of meeting with the objects of the meetings stated therein,

XIV. Members can be expelled only at the General Meetings of the Society.

PROSONNO COOMAR DEY,
Secretary.

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY AND ITS DETRACTORS.

In closing our accounts for the current year, we are happy to give some substantial proofs to our many societies and numerous Brethren, who have been lately deploring the insults to which the Founders of the Society have been so long subjected in India, that truth must triumph. There is a silver lining to every black cloud, and, as they will see, we have not remained without friends or defenders.

THE "SATURDAY REVIEW" AND THE "THEOSOPHIST."

In the July number of the 'THEOSOPHIST' appeared a paper upon astrology, kindly communicated to this journal by Sardar B. V. Shastree, of Poona. This gentleman, than whom few are more generally respected by Anglo-Indians as well as by the natives, committed the mistake of forwarding the number containing his article to the London *Saturday Review*. It might have been anticipated that the *Saturday Review* would see nothing but a subject for satire in an essay, seriously dealing with so unorthodox a topic as astrology; it was, therefore, useless to count the shallow and concealed criticism which was all that could be expected from a journal of that class. But the Sardar could not have foreseen, and is, therefore, wholly free from the moral responsibility of having provoked the results that actually ensued. As it fell out, the *Saturday Review* fastened on the THEOSOPHIST which contained the article, specially intended for its inspection as a whole, and as a text for a comprehensive diatribe, aimed at occult inquiries of every sort, at the Theosophical Society as connected with these, and at the founders of the Theosophical Society in particular, and by name as guilty of the heinous crime of recommending investigation into certain branches of knowledge which the *Saturday Review* does not deign to explore and, therefore, conceives to be unworthy of exploration. The intellectual attitude of that journal, in discussing the value of occult inquiries, is thus too foolish to excite any serious indignation; one can only suppose that an orthodoxy thus resting its claims to respect on its own indirect confessions of ignorance, must be unlikely to retain its hold on the intelligence of the world at large for very much longer. But the article in question, unfortunately, is something besides an appeal to the public to refrain from taking an interest in matters concerning which the *Saturday Review* chooses to shut its eyes; it is a very savage attack on the personal character of the founders of the Theosophical Society whom it pleases to designate as "unscrupulous adventurers." It would be useless to attempt to characterise the journal which can apply such terms to people of whom it knows no more than that they believe in the existence of various principles in Nature that the *Saturday Review* knows nothing about. Fortunately it is unnecessary for the THEOSOPHIST to argue the questions concerning the founders of our Society which have thus been raised, as this has been done on their behalf very kindly and very ably by Mr. A. O. Hume. That gentleman has addressed to the *Saturday Review* a letter which has meanwhile been very extensively published in India. Sent *en premier lieu* to the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, it is as follows:—

Sir,—In a recent issue you republished an article from the *Saturday Review* which, amongst other equally erroneous statements, designated Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky "unscrupulous adventurers."

I enclose a copy of a letter addressed by me to the Editor of the *Saturday Review*, in regard to this article.

As you have seen fit to publish these false accusations, you will, I am sure, see the propriety of similarly publishing my enclosed refutation of them.

I am, Sir,
Yours obediently,
A. O. HUME.

To the Editor of the "*Saturday Review*."

Sir,—In a recent issue (that of September 3, 1881) you noticed a copy of a journal, the THEOSOPHIST, which had been sent to you from India by some native gentleman; and in commenting on this publication and on the subjects with which it professes to deal, you took occasion to call Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott a couple of "unscrupulous adventurers," and you further expressed a doubt as to "whether Colonel Olcott's title was earned in the War of Secession or at the bar of a drinking saloon."

As regards Colonel Olcott's title the printed papers which I send by this same mail will prove to you that that gentleman is an officer of the American Army who rendered good service during the war (as will be seen from the letters of the Judge Advocate-General, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Assistant Secretaries of War and of the Treasury), and who was sufficiently well known and esteemed in his own country to induce the President of the United States to furnish him with an autograph letter of introduction and recommendation to all Ministers and Consuls of the United States on the occasion of his leaving America for the East, at the close of 1878.

Surely this is scarcely the kind of men to whom the epithet "unscrupulous adventurer" can be justly applied.

I may add, from my own knowledge, that a purer-minded, more noble, or more self-devoted gentleman than Colonel Olcott does not exist. He may be right or wrong in his belief, but to the cause of that belief he has devoted his fortune, energies, and the remainder of his life; and while I can quite understand many treating him as a fanatic, I confess that I am surprised at a paper, of the high class to which the *Saturday Review* belongs, denouncing such a man as an "unscrupulous adventurer."

As regards Madame Blavatsky (in Russia still

"Son Excellence
Madame la Generale
Helene P. Blavatsky")

though she dropped all titles on becoming a naturalized American citizen). She is the widow of General N. V. Blavatsky, Governor during the Crimean War, and for many years, of Erivan in Armenia. She is the eldest daughter of the late Colonel Hahn, of the Russian Horse Artillery, and grand daughter of Princess Dolgorouki of the elder branch which died with her. The present Princess Dolgorouki belongs to the younger branch. The Countess Ida V. Hahn-Hahn was Madame Blavatsky's father's first cousin. Her father's mother married, after her husband's death, Prince Vassiltchikoff, General Fadeyeff, well known even to English readers, is her mother's youngest brother. She is well known to Prince Loris Melikoff, and all who were on the staff, or in society, when Prince Michael S. Woronzoff was Viceroy of the Caucasus. Prince Emile V. Sayn Wittgenstein cousin of the late Empress of Russia, was an intimate friend of hers, and corresponded with her to the day of his death, as has done his brother Ferdinand, who lately commanded some Regiment (Cossacks of the Guard I think), in Turkestan. Her aunt Madame de Witte, who like the rest of her family corresponds regularly with her, and indeed her whole family, are well known to Prince Dondoukoff Korsakoff, at present Governor-General of Odessa.*

I could add the names of scores of other Russian nobles who are well acquainted with her; for she is as well known and connected in Russia as Lady Hester Stanhope was in England; but I think I have said enough to convince any impartial person that she is scarcely the kind of woman likely to be an "unscrupulous adventurer."

Ladies are not generally prone to taking fancies to outside ladies; there is very commonly a little suppressed sex-jealousy of those especially who are cleverer than themselves; but Madame Blavatsky has lived for months at a time in my house, and is certainly one of the cleverest women I ever met, and yet all the ladies in my house have learnt to love dearly this energetic, crotchety, impulsive, self-devoted old woman. Any one may set her down as a mystic or a visionary, but no one who knows her can doubt her all-consuming faith in the mission to which she has sacrificed her life.

But, after all, can you rightly call people adventurers who not only make no money out of the cause they espouse, but, on the contrary, spend on it every farthing that they can spare from their private means? If not, then assuredly Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky are not adventurers, for to my certain knowledge they have spent on the Theosophical Society over £2,000 (two thousand pounds) more than its total receipts. The accounts have been regularly audited, printed and published, so that any one may satisfy themselves on this head.

But it will be asked what is this grand cause? It is the formation and development of the Theosophical Society, the objects of which, as stated in the published rules, are as follows:—

* From whom, moreover, a fortnight ago, Mme. Blavatsky has unexpectedly received a most friendly and sympathetic private letter, the original of which has been seen by many friends whose testimony on the subject could easily be obtained, if necessary.—Ed.

First.—To form the nucleus of an Un'ersal Brotherhood of Humanity.

Second.—To study Aryan literature, religion, and science.

Third.—To vindicate the importance of this enquiry.

Fourth.—To explore the hidden mysteries of nature and the latent powers of man:

Now, these objects may be considered Utopian or visionary, but they seem to me innocent enough, and hardly the kind of objects that would satisfy unscrupulous adventurers.....

There are many other misconceptions involved in the article under reference, to which objection might reasonably be taken; but these are perhaps of less importance. All I desire now to make clear is that so far from being "unscrupulous adventurers," Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky are very worthy, unworldly, unselfish, pure-minded people, who are devoting their time, their property, and their lives to a cause which even, if Utopian, is unobjectionable, and may incidentally be productive (indeed, it already has been so) of much good.

I remain, yours obediently,

A. O. HUME,

Late Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Before this letter had time to get to London, the *Saturday Review* seems to have been addressed on the subject of its scandalous attack, by some champions of Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott in England. For, in the issue of September the 17th, it publishes the following explanation:—

"We have received a letter from a friend of Colonel Olcott objecting to some strictures which we lately made upon that gentleman and Madame Blavatsky as founders of the so-called Theosophical Society of India. Our remarks were based upon the published accounts of their doings, which struck us as bearing a suspicious resemblance to those of the 'spirit mediums' in Europe and America. We are quite willing to accept our correspondent's statement that Colonel Olcott occupied an honourable position in his own country and to believe that both he and Madame Blavatsky are credulous enthusiasts and not unscrupulous adventurers. When, however, people promulgate pernicious theories and adopt practices which, under another name, have been authoritatively pronounced illegal and mischievous, they must not be surprised if, in the absence of private information as to their biography, they lay themselves open to adverse criticism."

The passage above italicised shows the *Saturday Review* blundering in its facts again. But *apropos* to this unworthy onslaught it is unnecessary to go into the whole question. We will not discuss the point as to whether the theories which the *Saturday Review* erroneously conceives to be promulgated by us, would or would not be pernicious—if we did promulgate them, or as to whether the "practices" which are present to the cloudy understanding of our critics would be illegal, supposing us to recommend them. Eighteen centuries ago, Pliny and other magistrates have "authoritatively pronounced" the practices and theories promulgated by the early Christians "illegal and mischievous," and the followers of Christ were, no doubt, more than once accused of listening to, and believing in, the doctrines of an "unscrupulous adventurer." The *Saturday Review* has mixed up Theosophy and Spiritualism, two subjects in reference to the A B C of which in both cases it is absolutely in the dark, and has talked at them like a village scold in a passion. The blunders it makes on the questions it pretends to deal with, do not rise to the level of errors that can be refuted. Its remarks are all up in the air and mere idiotic nonsense.

Anyhow, the age of the Inquisition has gone by. Now, every man has a right, especially under the British constitution, to his or her belief,—whatever it may be—without fear of molestation by either Church or State. Journalism, however, seems to stand on neutral ground. The god of most editors being "Mrs. Grundy's" opinion, and his prophet—subscribers, whose hobbies and prejudices have to be humoured—many journalists will rather forget they are gentlemen than fail to satisfy their readers. The *Saturday Review*, great and honourable a reputation as it has, deservedly for many reasons, was guilty of such forgetfulness in its impression of Sept. 3, and descended to the level—one cannot say anything more cruel,—of the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, which paper, though it copied the disgraceful abuse of the *Saturday Review's* first article, shamelessly forebore to reprint its subsequent retraction.

We have, however, to tender our best thanks to the *Saturday Review*. Its attack upon us has called out another defence. This once, it is the *Lahore Tribune* which raises its friendly voice:—

The *Saturday Review*, on a recent occasion, took the opportunity when reviewing a number of the *Theosophist* to attack Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott in the most unseemly manner, branding them amongst other things as "unscrupulous adventurers."

Now, bad as this was, some excuse may be made for the *Saturday Review*, since with the chronic ignorance of all Indian subjects which characterizes the European Press, the Editor may possibly have written in good faith and believed what he said.

But the *Civil and Military Gazette* deliberately republished this tissue of falsehood and libel, and, for the credit of Indian journalism, we should be glad to believe that the Editor was in a hopeless state of ignorance as to the real facts of the case, which alone could relieve him from the charge of bad faith that the republication here without comment of such outrageous statements must *prima facie* involve.

However, this is a question that we do not care to discuss further. There are, we fear, dirty corners in most earthly things, even in Indian journalism, and the less certain unsightly heaps are stirred, the less their emanations offend refined tastes.

Mr. Hume had written to the *Saturday Review*, pointing out that whatever view might be taken of the practicability of Colonel Olcott's and Mme. Blavatsky's scheme, they could not at any rate possibly be classed as "unscrupulous adventurers," and he had added the expression of his conviction, founded on long and intimate personal intercourse, that whether wise or foolish, of sober judgment or fanatics, the founders of the Theosophical Society were at any rate, thoroughly honest, sincere and well-intentioned, living pure and blameless lives and devoting themselves entirely and unselfishly to their cause.

In this verdict, every body who has watched the Theosophical movement will, we believe, heartily concur. There may be Brothers or there may not—they may be a reality or the creations, in all good faith of Madame Blavatsky's enthusiasm; this is not a point that can be argued in a journal like ours. But we cannot but feel that the whole tendency of this movement is to raise us in our own esteem, to awake "the pride of former days," and to drag us out of our long lethargy to the perception that in our own ancient literature, science and religion, there yet lurk "gems of purest ray serene," gems as priceless as any that glitter in the flashing coronet of Western culture.

Nor can we fail to realize that to this work the founders of the Theosophical Society, braving the sneers and calumny of all the self-sufficient disciples of Western science, relinquishing all that to most mortals makes life sweet, good repute, position, fortune, ease and rest, are unselfishly and, we fear, for the most part, unthankedly devoting themselves. Differ, therefore, as we may on other points, there are none of us who can be other than indignant at vile attacks on the personal character of Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, such as those embodied in the *Saturday Review's* article above referred to; and none but must feel a certain pride and pleasure in a temperate refutation of the worst of those slanders, such as Mr. Hume has furnished in his letter to the *Saturday*, and which our erring contemporary has at last had the grace to publish."

It appears, however, that defence notwithstanding, the *Civil and Military Gazette* has once more eased its vindictive feelings by an indirect attack upon us. This once, it comes under the safe guise of a letter written by a "European officer," and recently answered by Mr. Ross Scott, F.T.S., in the same paper. "*Spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas*" seems to be that un-Civil Gazette's motto, and it is with beat of drum that it spreads such news. Meanwhile the *Lahore Tribune* vents its indignation in the words that follow—"In its correspondence columns it published a letter the other day from, it says, a European officer, charging the above Society with disloyal motives. The wise correspondent even goes so far as to say that *Theosophists* were probably at the bottom of the riots at Multan (!!!) The *C. & M. Gazette* is a standing disgrace to the world of Indian Journalism."

AMEN! Could some of our Punjabee Brothers inform us by the way—(1) whether there is a lunatic asylum at Lahore and if the answer is in the affirmative, (2) whether that mad-house is furnished with cells and straight-jackets strong enough to hold "European officers" afflicted with such hallucinations, and editors capable of giving them room on their columns?

Again, the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* of 27th October contains a most friendly editorial in our defence, which we reprint further on. When the *Saturday Review* published its libellous and ungentlemanly attack on

the Theosophists, it must have little thought what service it was rendering us in turning attention to Theosophy. We ought really to feel grateful to the *English Review*. Instead of the hundreds of persons who were before aware of the existence of our society, thousands will now be filled with curiosity to know what, in reality, is this much abused body and what are the crimes which could have brought such a torrent of vituperation upon it...Interest will be aroused, and the society will grow in proportion to the violence of the abuse. In reference to the editorial we may remark that if not a little surprised to find one of the best London journals disgracing its columns with such a slanderous attack as that published in the *Saturday*, we were not at all astonished to see it reproduced in full in the *Civil and Military Gazette*. The action of the latter can only be regarded as natural and consistent with its usual policy. The *Saturday Review* can, the *Civil and Military* (as now conducted) cannot disgrace itself. Even after being forced to publish Mr. Hume's letter, protesting against the uncalled-for and libellous assertions, a few days later, the Lahore daily appeared again with an editorial which, under the mask of pretentious, heavy and as clumsy witticisms, was full of insinuations directed against Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky—every one of them being either a malicious innuendo, or an impudent untruth. In such attacks it plays a dangerous game, as aimed at us its sarcasms rebound and fall on itself. It pounces on Mr. Hume's kind and friendly remarks in defence of Colonel Olcott, and trying to be satirical asks, why to the epithets "pure-minded," "noble" and "self-devoted", Mr. Hume does not add "high-toned" when speaking of the American Colonel. Now, to hear the Lahore *Gazette* speak of "high-toned" suggests very strongly a Nicobar islander asking a European sailor why he does not eat with a silver knife and fork instead of using his fingers. The Punjab *Gazette* talking of what it has hitherto been as ignorant as a newborn babe of the elements of Euclid! It is truly too ridiculous. We have never known or heard even of a poorest Hindu editor of a third-class native paper who has been guilty in a whole year of such a number of gross vulgarities, and of such bad taste as the *Civil and Military Gazette* displays in any one of its numbers selected at random. It is this spirit of rampant sycophancy, of loathsome flattery and flunkeyism before every Anglo-Indian power, and at the same time its vulgar and brutal abuse of every thing and of all it thinks unable to defend themselves, that has given it the reputation it now enjoys throughout the Punjab and the N.-W. Provinces. Its sneers against the THEOSOPHIST are, to say the least, absurd. That our journal which has been little more than two years in existence and is devoted mostly to philosophical and mystical subjects, has contained at times, in Mr. A. O. Hume's words, "paragraphs utterly indefensible both in taste and tone" owing, for the most part, to our absence, is a fact which we sincerely regret. It was due to the desire of the managers to enliven its columns, full of very abstruse—hence, for some, rather too dry metaphysics—by reprinting scraps from American and even provincial English newspapers. This, however, only leaves the journal guilty of reprinting occasionally other people's vulgarities, not of filling its columns with original abuse and clumsy witticisms worthy, for the most part, of a mountebank at a country fair as is the case almost daily with the *Civil and Military*. We have never hesitated to admit the defects of our paper, and to gratefully thank every well-meaning, respectable critic who with courtesy points them out to us; but surely it is not the editor or editors—Heaven save the mark!—of the *Civil and Military Gazette* who can be considered capable of what educated people are accustomed to call fair and gentlemanly criticism. There are men to whom the instincts of a born gentleman are as foreign as the smell of a violet is to a negro's skin and as well expect kindness and decent language from a hackney carriage driver who believes himself cheated out of his full fare and knows there is a mile between him and the nearest policeman. Hence neither Colonel Olcott

nor Madame Blavatsky can be in any way the worse, either as private individuals or as editors of the THEOSOPHIST for being called "quacks," "impostors" and what not by the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore. Colonel Olcott, regarded in America and elsewhere as a gentleman by all those who know him, cannot feel hurt at any thing such a rabid, ill-conditioned paper can say of him; nor as one of the late editors of the *New York Tribune*, for years the well-known organ of Horace Greeley, can he feel dismayed by any opinion the editor of the said paper may express regarding him and his "tone." The conductor of the *Civil Gazette*, unaware that any thing he might say of the Colonel and of Madame Blavatsky, would only amuse them with a gallantry and courage for which he is so pre-eminently distinguished—goes on attacking a woman and a foreigner, whose peculiar and unpopular views seem to ensure him, as he thinks, perfect impunity. The too sanguine editor may, perhaps, at some time discover his mistake. Meanwhile, having, we are afraid, disfigured our columns too much already,—we do hope for the last time—with the mention of that very uncivil person, we close our remarks to give place to the editorial mentioned at the beginning of this article.

(From the *Anrita Bazar Patrika*.)

THE RUSSIAN AND AMERICAN FRIENDS.

It is all very well to talk of *Magna est veritas et prevalebit*, and so it doubtless does in the end, but most truths seem to take a very long time in establishing themselves, and there is probably no truth which will have to wait longer before it does prevail, at any rate with our European Aryan brethren, than this, that all wisdom and learning, science and truth, are not absolutely their exclusive birth-right. As matters stand, the placid self-complacency with which almost all Western minds contemplate their own attainments and the supposed folly, ignorance, and superstition of their Eastern representatives, would be really delightful, were it not indirectly productive of so much evil. So ingrained is this self-exaltation, that it is only necessary for any European, rending the fetters of hereditary prejudice, to discover and proclaim that there is something good, something of value, something desirable of attainment in our Eastern literature, science or religion for his fellows at once to brand him as fool, madman or rogue.

Let it not be supposed that we attribute to them in such cases any want of good faith—it is in all sincerity that like the Jews of old they ask "can any good come out of Nazareth?" Their self-esteem is so overwhelming, their satisfaction with their own limited materialistic knowledge so intense, that honestly and truly they cannot conceive any sane, sensible and upright man discovering anything good and still less anything better than what they already know—in either our literature, our science, or our religion.

It is well known that for some years past Col. Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, the founders of the Theosophical Society, have been zealously labouring to revivify our indigenous learning and to convince an age, oblivious of past glories, that good as might be in its way of modern Western physical science, there was a higher good, lying forgotten in our ancient Eastern psychical science.

These good friends of ours and of India actually persisted that there were things in our old Eastern philosophies not dreamt of by Western science, that there were truths, spiritual and scientific still extant, though almost forgotten amongst us, higher than any to which the materialistic West has ever attained, that it behoved us, the lineal descendants of the sages of old, the successors to their priceless lore, to neglect no longer their precious legacy, but rather by earnest study and patient investigations, to qualify ourselves to teach our Western masters, lessons higher, deeper, sterner than anything they have ever taught us.

Can it be wondered at that at such audacity the European community stood aghast, or that they heaped upon the propounders of such a theory every injurious epithet of which their meagre vocabulary was master?

Spies, knaves, fools, impostors, cheats and what not, were amongst the titles so generously bestowed on them; an European police officer dogged their footsteps from Bombay to Meerut and back again; there was a general consensus that Government really ought to deport them; there was no language too severe in which to denounce them; but, as in the case of that "terrible curse" which has made the Archbishop of Rheims so famous,

"What gave rise, to no little surprise

Was that nobody seemed one penny the worse."

The fact was that as time went on, the pure, unselfish and self-denying lives led by the founders of the Society, gradually caused a change in even that bluntest of all evolutes, Anglo-Indian Public Opinion. It began to be realized, that though these people might be fanatics, and enthusiasts, no moral delinquencies could be laid to their charge, and, for some time past, except in a very few ill-conditioned second-rate prints, we have seen no unseemly abuse of either Col. Olcott or Madame Blavatsky.

People laughed at them and ridiculed their pretensions, but they had come round to feel that whatever the founders' qualifications for their self-imposed and vast task, they were at any rate honestly labouring and at their own cost, day and night, to achieve it.

Suddenly some scoundrel, we use the term advisedly, for the man who insults and maligns an innocent woman, from what he thinks is a safe asylum, is a scoundrel; some scoundrel, we repeat, obtains admission for an article in the *Saturday Review* abusing and vilifying both Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, asserting that both were unscrupulous adventurers, fit subjects to be dealt with by the Police, &c. &c. As soon as this article was noticed in India, a letter was addressed to the editor of the *Saturday Review* (which, despite the accidental appearance in its columns of this discreditable article, is a respectable paper), pointing out the erroneous and unwarrantable character of the assertions made. This will doubtless appear in due course in England, as the editor of the *Saturday Review* is presumably a gentleman, and the article is distinctly libellous, and with this refutation at home, the matter might have ended.

But as there is always some wretched dog that runs across the race course just when it "didn't ought," so there is always some journal found to republish any article conspicuous for bad taste or malignity, or, as in the present case, both, as no one else rushed forward to secure the plume fallen from the wings of the loathly vulture scandal, the *Civil and Military Gazette* boldly came to the front and reproduced the objectionable article in full.

It does not surprise us to perceive that on this the editor was called on to reproduce also the refutation of the original article that had been sent to the *Saturday Review*, nor, indeed, the article being clearly actionable, that he complied with the demand. In our next we hope to reprint this refutation (we will not disgrace our pages with the article that gave rise to it) which is well worth perusal, and perfectly conclusive.

Conclusive that is to say so far as it goes, for Mr. Hume, the writer of the reply in the *Review* only professes to show that Col. Olcott and Mme. Blavatsky are not "unscrupulous adventurers" but, on the contrary, love-worthy, and honest people, and this, no native of India, who has watched the gradual development of their scheme, will question.

But there are many other points in the article in the *Saturday Review* that we should like to see touched on, and many other gross misconceptions that we could have wished refuted.

Thus, the *Saturday* remarks that Madame Blavatsky's chief claim to attention, is the invention of a certain mystic brotherhood, which with the customary western assumption of omniscience, it sets down, being entirely ignorant on the subject, as a pure fiction.

Can anything be more absurd when there are hundreds and thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of us in India, who know that this mystic brotherhood exists, aye, and, have existed for thousands of years, who know the paths

by which men like ourselves rose to join that sacred fellowship, and who have more or less knowledge of the spiritual truths to which they have attained?

But the West can conceive nothing to be possible of which it is ignorant. It is unable to realize that Western intellect working along one line, the physical, has indeed in this made marvellous progress, but is yet grossly ignorant of the even more marvellous results at which Eastern minds, working for thousands of years along another line, have arrived. The blatant West has ever paraded every scrap of its so-called knowledge which deals only with phenomena, to which it has attained, but the silent East that deals only with noumena, that has grasped the only true knowledge, what we are, whence we come, whither we go, has ever veiled her attainments in sacred secrecy.

The men of the West are brave, energetic, practical and deeply skilled in physical science, but they are materialistic, ignorant of psychical science and the higher spiritual truths, and so steeped in self-conceit that they deem everything unknown or inexplicable to them, false or impossible.

It has been good for us that they have brought us peace, fairly good Government and their Western culture; but it is bad for us that they have in their blind contempt for all they do not know, trampled out or nearly so our national pride in that religion, science, and literature which we have inherited from a thousand generations and that by their materialistic Western system of education they have almost blotted out from our cognizance the higher and eternal spiritual truths that lie veiled in our ancient literature.

Be it so. All things in their appointed cycle. The sun is still there, though the earth turns away from him.

But are better times never to return? The night has been long and weary; will the dawn never come?

It may be but the dream of some few tired watchers, but to us it seems as if even now there were a glimmer in the East.....

MADAME BLAVATSKY AND COLONEL OLCOTT.

TO THE EDITOR "CEYLON TIMES."

SIR,—In taking over the paragraph from the *Bombay Gazette* about Madame Blavatsky and myself, you have taken over at the same time that paper's remark "surely the status of both these notable Theosophists is capable of verification, and it is for the interests of both that it should be placed beyond all doubt or cavil by the production of 'papers' which would set the matter at rest for ever." And as your attitude towards ourselves has always been, so far as I know, one of self-respectful impartiality, I will do for you, what I have scorned and ever will scorn to do, for the bigoted editors who have been abusing us so shamelessly and without cause. I send you herewith for inspection a packet of original official documents, emanating from highly placed officers of the American War, Navy, Treasury, and State Departments to and about myself, which show that my personal, and official character at home, is without spot or blemish. They show that since my arrival in India, and down to a very recent date—only a few weeks, in fact—I have been doing favours for the State Department, the Quarter-Master-General, U.S.A., and the Smithsonian Institution, by the collection of information about commerce, Army Tentage, and Ethnology. I invite you to subject these documents to the closest scrutiny of Inspector-General of Police, the Queen's Advocate, the Bishop of Colombo, or any other public officer, or private analyst, who is supposed to be capable of selecting an "adventurer" at sight. Through the American Consul, the American Minister at London, or any other channel, you are at liberty to inquire into my 'status' and my services to my country during, before, and since the war. These papers show that I have been associated on public committees and on terms of perfect equality, with the most eminent of American Statesmen (includ-

ing the late President Garfield), merchants and bankers. If you will take the trouble to have enquiry made, you will also find that as a lawyer I have had such great clients as the Corporation of New York City, the N. Y. Stock Exchange, the Mutual and Equitable Life and Continental Life Insurance companies, and the Gold Exchange Bank, and Panama Railway Co.; and that in the year 1870 I was retained by the New York representatives of the United steel-manufacturers of Sheffield to proceed to England and adjust a very large customs revenue claim laid against them by the U. S. Government. But I will not enter into a catalogue of the easily-found proofs that go to show that the vile and libellous epithet of "unscrupulous adventurer," flung at me by the *Saturday Review*, is as little applicable to me as to any man living. The last thing desired by the enemies of the Theosophical Society is—I most sadly affirm—that the status of its founders "should be placed beyond all doubt or cavil." The sole weapon they can use against us is slander and ridicule, and they neither want our characters cleared, nor will publish the facts. Take, as an example, this very libel of the *Saturday Review*. The editor printed it on the 3rd of September, without a scintilla of evidence before him that was prejudicial to our good name. On the 17th of the same month he published a retraction confessing that the remarks "were based upon the published accounts of their doings, which struck us as bearing a suspicious resemblance to those of the 'spirit mediums' in Europe and America." Upon such warranty as this one of the first journals of England did not hesitate to brand an innocent lady and gentleman with the most opprobrious of epithets! I have just made a flying visit to the Madras Presidency to organize a new branch of our Society. On the day of my arrival at Tinnevely, the Missionary presses at Palamcottah issued a pamphlet entitled "Theosophy," without imprint or any other sign of its origin, which was simply a republication of the *Saturday's* libel, and an equally discreditable one by the *N. Y. Times*, based upon a letter I was falsely alleged to have written to a gentleman at New York. The Missionaries had not the honesty to print the *Saturday's* retraction after the libel, for that would have defeated their object. And rightly suspecting that their indecent pamphlet would be flung in the face of their colporteurs, the latter were ordered to say at every Hindu residence where a copy was left, that it was "sent with the compliments of Mr. Soondram Iyer"—the Secretary of our new branch. I need not comment upon such conduct, for I am addressing a British audience....

Pardon, I pray you, the length of this letter. I have for months, in silence and disgust, allowed the poor creatures who delight in slander, to send broadcast their wretched seed, for I have always been taught by the lessons of history that such seed, being steeped in the acrid juices of falsehood and malice, will rot in the ground, enrich the soil for its reception as you may. I firmly believe that a pure and honest life is its own best shield; and that as time wears on and the results of our labours in India and Ceylon show themselves, the eternal law of compensation will vindicate the reputations of Madame Blavatsky and your obedient servant,

H. S. OLCOTT.

Colombo, 31st October, 1881.

At the same time that our President—who, for a period of nearly three years had abstained from answering his calumniators, wisely treating the anonymous, cowardly slanders with the contempt they merit—was penning the above; and while numerous letters of congratulations from Hindu correspondents and messages full of enthusiasm and gratitude from our Tinnevely Theosophists were pouring into our office, there appeared a new proof of the insatiable malice of our opponents. That malice and the bitterness of their hatred of the Theosophists have finally reached that degree of blind fury that vitiates the most ordinary perceptions. To lie

openly and in the most impudent, shameless manner has become their last expediency. When our readers will have noticed the Official Report of Tinnevely Branch which follows the present, and a few articles from other correspondents, they will be able to judge for themselves. In a letter from an unknown Tinnevely correspondent of the *Madras Standard* the following truthful statement is given:—"The natives of this place" writes the informer, "are very sorry for all the hubbub and commotion caused by the arrival of Colonel Olcott, the Theosophist, among them. *The Branch Society—the members of which invited him here—were very disappointed in their expectations. They now call him 'IMPOSTOR AND PRETENDER'*—to use their own words".....!!

By this time our "Branch Society" will have read the above statement. We all sincerely hope our Tinnevely Brothers will not refuse themselves the satisfaction of pointing out publicly to the "Tinnevely correspondent of the *Madras Standard*" that the greatest "impostor" is that man who, taking advantage of the voice of the press, imposes upon the public bare-faced LIES under the guise of news; "that the term 'pretender,' is to be applied only to individuals of his stamp, who *pretending* to the name of a "correspondent" have a right but to that of a "penny-a-line" slanderer, whose lies would disgrace any respectable paper. A very reliable organ—as a source of information—is the *Madras Standard*—we see!

DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR,
Joint Recording Secretary,
Parent Theosophical Society.

TINNEVELLY THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

THE SECRETARY'S REPORT.

Having invited Colonel H. S. Olcott, President Founder of the parent Theosophical Society to visit and lecture at Tinnevely, and he having kindly consented to our request, the Colonel, accompanied by a delegation of several Buddhist members of the Colombo Theosophical Branch Society, left Ceylon on the 21st ultimo and landed at Tuticorin on the following day. The whole Hindu community of that seaport was assembled to receive the Theosophists. Staying there the whole of that day, the President lectured in the A. V. School on "The Civilization that India needs." Both Natives and Europeans crowded the hall to suffocation. The Theosophists left Tuticorin on the next day by the morning train for Tinnevely, where they found the platform and the railway grounds as well as the roads near it, thronged by people eager to see and welcome our President. In the crowd, 5,000 men strong, appeared the most educated and intelligent of the native community to greet him. It was a rare and grand spectacle, indeed. "The American Pundit" delivered three most interesting and instructive lectures, two in the Hindu College and one in the large temple of our town. Numerous audiences, comprising the most learned and influential Hindus, gathered each time to hear him, cheering and applauding the Colonel throughout. Unfortunately for the Tinnevellians, his stay with them was limited to only four days. Owing to his numerous engagements at Ceylon and much to the regret of all the Hindus, he sailed back for that Island, promising us to return in January or February—with Madame Blavatsky that time.

During the Colonel's stay at Tinnevely, the Apostles of Christianity—true to their traditional customs—made themselves unusually busy in crying down Theosophy, and preaching to us "poor heathens" the logical and highly scientific doctrines of their Bible. At the same time, appeared a publication by the Padre under the shape of a small pamphlet containing two scurrilous libels about the Chiefs of the Theosophical Society—Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott,—one from the *Saturday Review*, and the other from the *New York Times*. I must not omit a very remarkable incident in connection with this publication, namely, that the Christian catechists liberally distributed the pamphlets among the people. *in my*

name, and with my best compliments to the people! Shame! Shame to them who resort to such dishonest and cowardly measures! Beyond this dastardly act of anonymous calumny no missionary of our place ventured to boldly come out and challenge the Colonel to a free discussion upon the authenticity of their facts, the characters of their prophets, the nature and fulfilment of their prophecies, or the divinity of their Christ. Nay worse. Not one of them had the moral courage to appear at his lectures though they were all invited to them! Is it their past experiences at Ceylon that, teaching them a sad lesson, has made them so wiser? Our Society has now decided to publish—with a Tamil translation appended to it, and in a pamphlet form—the letter addressed to the Editor of the *Saturday Review* by A. O. Hume, Esq., C. B., late Secretary to the Government of India, in vindication of the spotless characters of Madame Blavatsky and the Colonel, and his testimony showing the dignity and usefulness of the Society founded by them. We will also translate into Tamil the three lectures delivered here by Colonel Olcott. Fraternal greetings to all the Bombay Brethren.

S. SUNDRAM IYER, Secretary,

Tinnevelly Theosophical Society.

Tinnevelly, October 1881.

COLONEL OLCOTT AND THE TINNEVELLY THEOSOPHISTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MADRAS MAIL.

I.

SIR,—The letters in your column regarding Colonel Olcott's visit to Tinnevelly have attracted my attention. The following no doubt will be edifying to some of your readers:—

1. Colonel Olcott did not declare himself to be a Hindoo.

2. Colonel Olcott never said Buddhism was superior to Hindooism.

3. Colonel Olcott said not a word such as could betray even an inclination on his part to persuade the audience to embrace Buddhism.

4. A great deal, if not the whole, of what he said while addressing the public, was that Hindooism was a very ancient religion, and that his advice was "Dive and search deep—and you will find all that is wanted to convince you of the truth of that religion," or something to this effect.

5. Lastly, and not the least of all, the cocoanut planted by the Buddhists in the compound of the Tinnevelly temple (not in the heart of the temple as alleged by some of your correspondents) is still in existence, and in the same spot it was first planted, it has as good a thriving appearance as could be wished by the best of Colonel Olcott's friends. This is a stubborn

FACT.

II.

SIR,—The account of Colonel Olcott's visit to Tinnevelly, given by your Tinnevelly "Native Christian Correspondent," is one tissue of misconceptions and misrepresentations. For, the Christian gentleman reports that the Hindus of this place feel disappointed and imposed upon by the Colonel! But, Sir, the truth is just the opposite. The Tinnevellians, who heard before so much of Colonel Olcott, and loved him so much, have now learned to respect and love him the more upon their personal observations of his deep erudition, extraordinarily instructive and impressive orations, soldierly and venerable appearance, and pleasing deportment. The educated Hindus are only in deep grief that he did not stay here longer. Your correspondent next proceeds to remark that some Native of Tinnevelly who translated into Tamil Colonel Olcott's lecture on "India; Past, Present, and Future," has, in his introduction to that translation, paid the founders of the Theosophical Society "unblushing adulation with flourish of trumpets!" Sir, I send you by this mail a printed copy of Colonel Olcott's testimonials. Please to peruse it through and see if the vernacular translator with all his "unblushing adulation," and with all his "flourish of trumpets," has yet done the American gentleman full justice. No; he has done but a part of his work; he has not wholly removed the veil from over the name of the Theosophist leader. These documents will testify to you that he is even something more

than a "Barrister," "a Colonel," "Special Commissioner of the War Department," "Chief Commissioner of Agriculture," and "Secretary to the National Insurance Convention." These certificates were printed in the form of a "supplement to the THEOSOPHIST" in January last; and circulated along with the theosophical organ throughout the whole world. And Madame Blavatsky is too well known now throughout the entire globe to require any notice being made by me. As regards the comparative merits of the religion, science, and philosophy renounced by Colonel and Madame, and those embraced by them, it suffices to say that those, who study Oriental and Western philosophies, &c., for truth's own sake, unbiassed by any race or creed, or party predilections, become ardent admirers and advocates of the former. The presentation of Koombham is simply a mark of esteem and salutation; and the receipt of it with respect is also simply a sign of returning the salutation. It is simple ignorance and absurdity, therefore, to suppose that this one of the Aryan ways of exchanging greetings, is an indication predictive of the coming rain. If any one deems it to be such, it is his own mistake; and he should lose no time to correct himself.

Your correspondent next asks "what right the Theosophists in this town had to use their influence as Government officials to prevail on the temple authorities to receive Colonel Olcott as they did, &c.?" He knows not, poor friend, that Government officials are after all only men; and as men they have souls; and their souls, true to their intrinsic nature, do, like those of the other people who are not Government officials, aspire to progress, and thirst for salvation. It is no wonder then that those Government Officials joined a society as its members, which professes, among other things, "to explore the hidden mysteries of nature, and to develop the latent powers of man." The chiefs of the Theosophical Society being Europeans by nationality, and having renounced their religion &c., and Orientalized themselves, the Asiatics conceive great sympathy, love, and esteem for them. The authorities of the pagoda of Tinnevelly are Hindus, and, therefore, have joined of their own accord, but were not compelled to do so, others who are also Hindus like themselves, in giving the Colonel that enthusiastic reception he so richly deserves at the hands of all the sons of India. Besides, it is a custom continued from a long time since with the authorities of the Siva pagoda of Tinnevelly, and I suppose the same is the case also with those of all other Hindu temples, to receive every European visitor, officially or otherwise noted, with Thattumali Prasatham, and the elephants, paraphernalia &c., belonging to the temple. Why, then, is it necessary that they should be prevailed upon to do so by the official theosophists?

The correspondent next says that the cocoanut-tree planted in the pagoda yard "has been plucked up?" I really wonder at my Christian brother, for the tree does still, at this moment as I write this sentence, stand and thrive luxuriantly where it was planted; and is sheltered with two fences, one (the inner) of bamboo sticks, and the other (the outer) of prickly bushes. There grows, Sir, in the temple yard, that proud young tree. Further on, your informant observes that "the cocoanut-tree was planted by him, the Theosophist leader." It was not Colonel Olcott who planted it; but it was the Buddhists who did it, simply as a mark of respect to the Hindu community, and as a memorial of their advent to Tinnevelly. Colonel Olcott and the Sinhalese gentlemen told in plain language the immense crowd of more than five thousand people that thronged to hear the Colonel that evening, the object of planting it. Colonel Olcott visited, and will also visit, numerous towns and cities in America, Europe, and Asia; but surely he did not, and also will not, take along with him young cocoanut-trees to plant them in those places.

Your correspondent continues that the Tinnevelly Siva temple was purified after Colonel Olcott had lectured in it. This is true. But the ceremony of purification in this case must not be understood as having been performed out of disrespect or dislike to the Colonel, whom nearly all the Hindus of this place love as the very apple of their own eyes, but only as a mammoal, or customary work of the

priests attached to the temple. It is one of the duties of the temple-priests to make *punniyojanam* (purification ceremony) to the pagoda whenever Europeans visit it; and this they do quite automatically and indiscriminately in all cases, whether or no they are directed to do so by their authorities, and whether it is necessary or not necessary to do so in any particular case. Contingent charges are allowed on such occasions and the priests get money from the temple-cashier, and make expense of it at once.

Your correspondent concludes by saying that Colonel Olcott did not go to Madura from Tinnevely as he once intended, because he feared the American Missionaries at the former place would involve him in the 'tug of war.' Does he then mean that Colonel Olcott founded, for the first time, the Theosophical Society in Tinnevely in the month of October 1881, and had never been before abroad into the world in the propagation of theosophy? Does he not know that the Parent Society was organized in the year 1875 in New York, the metropolis of that very same country, from which the American Missionaries of Madura have come, in the midst of so many millions of Americans? Does he not also know that he bravely faced the enemies of Theosophy in various parts of the globe, and gloriously succeeded in organizing branch theosophical societies in many countries both in Christendom and heathendom? How many Americans, your correspondent thinks, are there in all in Madura? Ten thousand at the most. But these ten thousand Americans are nothing to one, who fought with success with ten millions of Americans, all enemies of theosophy, in America itself. Let your correspondent first read the history of the progress of theosophy, and then speak about the Theosophical Society and its founders. And I tell him now that Colonel Olcott went to Ceylon, not because he feared the Americans at Madura, but because he had so many engagements already made by him in Ceylon that he could not stay in Tinnevely for more than four days without prejudice to his promise to the Ceylonese. Yours, &c.,

SECRETARY, THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,
TINNEVELLY.

COLONEL OLCOTT'S BUDDHIST CATECHISM.

This little book is calling out many a valuable suggestion in the papers in connection with Buddhist philosophy. A correspondent writes in the *Ceylon Times* that he has received an English copy of "A Buddhist Catechism" by Colonel Olcott regarding which he wishes to make some remarks. "It appears," he says, "that it has been translated into Sinhalese, and that it has received the *'imprimatur'*, or rather sanction of no less a personage than the Venerable H. Sumangala, High Priest of Adam's Peak, and Principal of the Vidyodaya College. The expense of publication has been generously borne by a Sinhalese lady of rank, Mrs. Fredrika Cecilia Dias Ilangakoon of Matara, who, as the initials at the end of her name denote, is a fellow of the Theosophical Society. In this respect the Buddhist Theosophists of Ceylon may be congratulated on the rapid success of their propaganda, and it is said that the encouragement the leaders of the Society have hitherto received in this country has decided them in making Ceylon their Head-Quarters.* Be that as it may, there is no doubt that great efforts are being made by the energetic President in advancing the cause of Ceylon Buddhism, a Sinhalese journal called the "Sarasavisandaresa" has been started and is flourishing, and a "Sinhalese National Buddhist Fund" largely subscribed to by Buddhists of all classes and denominations throughout the country, is being formed for the purpose of establishing Buddhist schools and of promoting the cause of Buddhism in every practicable way.

This "brochure" is one of the first efforts of the President in this direction. It is, I presume, principally intended for the use of Buddhist schools and beginners in the study of Buddhist philosophy, although some portions of it, such as the questions included between Nos. 68 and 75, afford interesting subjects of thought for the philosopher and the Scientist. Whether the main doctrines of Buddhism are in accord with the results of the Modern Science or not, there is one salient feature in that system which must naturally attract the attention of the student, *viz.*, that its range of thought is so wide and comprehensive as to be capable of including within it and har-

monizing with it other schools of thought, divergent in some respects, but all converging towards the grand keystone of Buddhism—the universal law of nature. Viewed in this light, the Materialist and the Spiritualist, the Positivist and the Rationalist can all take their stand within the precincts of Buddhism; and while each is at liberty to pursue his own course of thought he has the pleasing satisfaction of knowing that the tolerant hand of good-will, fellow-ship and assistance, is extended to every one of them. I am myself inclined to believe with the Author of this little work, that "the signs abound that of all the world's great creeds, that one is destined to be the much talked-of Religion of the Future which shall be found in least antagonism with nature and with law," and am tempted to ask "Who dare predict that Buddhism will not be the one chosen?"

The Author modestly disclaims originality in the composition or matter of this small volume; although, in my opinion, the catechetical form in which the information is conveyed and the attempt at reconciling the main principles of Buddhism with the discoveries of Modern Science are new and striking features in a work on Buddhism. I do not wish to be hypercritical in looking over a work the object of which is in the highest degree praise-worthy; but as the Author himself has courted friendly criticism with a view to benefit thereby when preparing a second edition, I will make a few brief remarks in the hope that they may prove useful to the Author in a subsequent edition.

The answer to the 4th question.—"Was Buddha a man?" does not in my opinion convey a definite idea "in form a man; but internally not like other men." Now, what does 'internally' signify here? Does it refer to the mental and moral calibre of the great sage? If so, why not say so? The reference by footnote to the definition of "Bodisat" Question 72 does not elucidate the point. I would rather prefer an answer like the following:—"He was a man, but of the highest type and perfection among men."

Q. 7. It is doubtful whether Buddha's real name was Sidhartha Gautama. There are many grounds for supposing that his 'princely' name was Siddhartha* and that subsequent to his renunciation of the world he assumed the ascetic name of Gautama.

Q. 8. 'Maya,' and not 'Maia' was his mother's name.

Q. 35. *et sequor.* An important omission is made about this part of the narrative. Buddha's first ascetic teachers were two Brahmans, Atara Katama and Uddaka Ramaputta, who were followers of the Yoga philosophy and initiated Buddha in the mystic trances which the course of meditation prescribed in that system, was intended to produce. This incident in his ascetic life is especially mentioned by Buddha himself in the discourses wherein he narrates his ascetic career.

I cannot here refrain from quoting Questions 90 and 91 as the example of the racy and forcible manner in which the writer expresses his ideas:—

Q. 90. If you were to try to represent the whole spirit of Buddha's doctrine by one word, which word would you choose?

A. Justice.

Q. 91. Why?

A. Because it teaches that every man gets under the operations of universal law, exactly that reward or punishment which he has deserved; no more and no less. No good deed or bad deed, however trifling and however secretly committed, escapes the evenly "balanced, scales of karma."

Q. 98. I entertain a great regard for the wonderful learning and research of the High Priest Sumangala in all that pertains to Oriental literature, and especially for his deep insight into the contents of the 'Tripitiks,' but I must, with all due deference, beg to differ from him in his translation of the title of Buddha's first celebrated discourse—"Dhammacakka-ppavattana Sutam." The learned High Priest renders it—"The Definition of the Rule of Doctrine." Mr. Olcott must have felt some misgiving in adopting this rendering, as he is careful to inform his readers by a footnote that it is the translation of his friend the Reverend Prelate aforesaid. Now, neither the words of the title, nor the subject-matter of the Sutra will warrant the interpretation put upon it. Alabaster translates it as "The wheel of the Law." But this is not strictly correct either; for although 'cakka' may mean a wheel or discus, it is frequently the idea of Dominion or Authority which that symbol represents, so that "The Reign of Law" is the proper translation of the title, and one which fully harmonizes with the grand and solemn subject of which it treats,—the immutable, the inexorable Laws of Nature. I have no doubt that this small book will find thousands and thousands of eager readers, both in Europe and America.

Matara, August 1881.

A NATIVE.

* At Ceylon is one of our Head-Quarters, as it is proposed that we should have one, for every season of the year, at Bombay, Calcutta, Ceylon, and the N. W. Provinces.—Ed.

* Such is the claim of the Tibetan Buddhists. Savartha-Siddha was the Lord Buddha's name abbreviated to Siddhartha by his father, whose wish (artha) was fulfilled (Siddha).—Ed.