

The above statement is correct to our certain knowledge, as we were present when the examination of Lakshman Singh took place.

- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. H. D. Ghose, Hd. Master. | 5. Badar-ud-din Hd. Moulvi, Master. |
| 2. B. N. Bando, 2nd Master. | 6. Golab Singh, Master. |
| 3. Sunder Singh, 3rd Master. | 7. Lakha Singh, Master. |
| 4. H. C. Sen, 4th Master. | |

(Follow the signatures of 10 pupils of the 5th class.)

II.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "THEOSOPHIST."

I am a student but not a teacher as published by mistake. My letter to the THEOSOPHIST has been the cause of much excitement among the Christians, especially so in the case of the Revd. Mr. Newton, our Superintendent. But, before I proceed to tell you the result of the publication of my letter in your journal, I must say a few words by way of introduction.

A few days after I had sent the letter to your Manager, the Revd. Mr. Newton asked me to come to his place. He would, he said, administer to me the "antidote to the poison" (which I had sent for to America, viz.,—"Self-Contradictions of the Bible.") in the words of Mr. Newton and the two Christian masters,—the book which Baij Nath Bando, the 2nd master, and H. D. Ghosh, the Head Master, did not allow me to see, but taking it from the post peon gave it to the Revd. Newton. Accordingly I went to his house, when, instead of giving me the antidote, he pointed out certain contradictions mentioned in the book, and which he explained away at that time to my satisfaction. It was very kind of the Revd. Mr. Newton to give me the antidote before I had been allowed to partake of the poison, viz., to see the book which belonged to me, but was with Mr. Newton. The result was that I was persuaded by his arguments at that time to allow him to retain the work in his possession. But this fact, I am sure, does not help Mr. Newton to explain the behaviour of the 2nd Master in depriving me of my own legitimate property and which from the first they had no right to retain against my will.

And now to the memorable incident that took place after the receipt of a copy of the THEOSOPHIST by the Revd. Newton. It happened that the Revd. gentleman felt stung to the quick to find things published which he never dreamed would get abroad. On the 13th instant he came to the school, and, collecting all the students and teachers, he offered me certain questions to which I replied; but, as these questions were few and isolated, they did not elicit from me all the facts of the story. Having done this by way of strengthening his case, he read my published letter and asked me if I had written it. I admitted having sent the letter to the Manager.

After giving expression to much righteous indignation and enlarging upon the sin of exposing what they had done in the matter of my book, the Revd. gentleman suspended his judgment for one day. The result is that he has now suspended me from the school for one month, after which I shall be permitted to join on condition of my acknowledging in writing that all that I had written in my letter to the THEOSOPHIST was false. As this is a thing which I cannot and will not do at any price, the Revd. gentleman's sentence amounts to my expulsion from the school altogether.

This is the way in which they (the missionaries) seek to put a stop to the expression of any honest opinion in India. I am not sorry for the result, but I cannot help very much regretting that people should travel across half the globe to preach to us "heathens" of India the principles of a religion which they themselves fail to follow in practice. It is such men who are never tired of repeating—"Blessed are the meek for they will inherit the earth," but who find the precept so difficult to practise in life.

I am told that the Revd. gentleman has written you a long letter for publication and has got it signed by almost all the teachers and a few students. As I am ignorant of the contents of the letter, I can only bless the Revd. gentleman for his kind decision in my case. Though it has almost ruined all my prospects of education, and though I have sustained such a heavy loss at his hands, yet, I, a heathen of India, will always continue a well-wisher to the man who has been the cause of my ruin.—I am your most obedient servant,

LAKSHMAN SINGH.

Saidpuri Gate, Rawal Pindce, September 17, 1882.

"PSYCHOLOGY OF THE LAMP."

"*Humanum est errare*" is not sufficiently impressed on the minds of those who presume to judge of things which they least understand, and who, inflicting upon the public their crude criticisms as so many demonstrated truths, nevertheless brag of being sincere searchers after truth. Such persons being pre-eminently superficial, do not possess the required energy to patiently explore into the very depths of things; but after hovering over the surface which conceals the kernel, they walk off with the impression that it is all a shell. Oh! that such persons will not keep their (*such*) convictions to themselves! There is one advantage, though, of meeting with their like in Society. Their very awkwardness and bungling tend to strengthen the truth-searching minds of serious and honest souls. To them is due the credit for making our party strong, our opinions stronger, and our discoveries of truths—strongest.

Why are some people of Madras (vide *Philosophic Inquirer* of Madras, September 10, 1882.) against the "Theosophy of Colonel Olcott?" If they were Theosophists, would they not be only just swimming on the surface? We would offer them the following: If they scientifically present in their reply an explanation of the mysteries, then we will part with Colonel Olcott's Theosophism for the Theosophy of some of his Madras opponents. We start with a simile so that they may clearly comprehend it.

A lump contains some oil, the oil feeds the wick, *somebody* lights the wick, and there is a bright flame. When it is extinguished, the flame goes out, followed by a smoky train emanating from the still burning wick (burning without flame). This burning ceases next, followed by another short expiration of grey *gas*, leaving a charred wick, and oil (if it was not altogether consumed). How many principles are involved in this "philosophy"—the origin of "Karma," the relations between "Karma" and the independent actions of "Egoship;" the cause of spirit-and-matter mixture; and the host of other questions subordinate to this.

Camp Kibbahalli, Mysore Province, September 18, 1882.

II.

In the foregoing article, two different cases have been noticed, and these might now with advantage be a little expanded. It is no new thing that I say. The question is merely viewed from another side, and, as such, may help to refresh the memories of our readers and Theosophists.

Case 1.—If the flame is not suddenly extinguished, it will continue until all the oil is consumed, and the wick is in such a condition now that it is not fit to hold any more oil; and will reject it if any mere is poured in. The flame, left undisturbed by external agency, will consume the wick, and when fitting away, will have left behind but a rag burnt to sooty shreds. This may be compared to a natural death of old age. The after-effects are evidently the emanations, or accumulations in space—the result of the attachment of the flame to the congeries of hemp, oil, wick, &c. While alive, the colour, size, brightness, &c., of the flame and its after-effects must clearly vary according to local and atmospheric conditions; and so the affinities that a human entity creates for itself. I shall not here speculate further, but consider at once

Case 2.—This, if the flame is suddenly extinguished. A certain effort, a current of air is required, first to bend the flame, compress its size and finally to sever its connection with the wick. To put it plainly, the flame "struggles." What is left behind, in this case, is a stronger wick, capable of sustaining a flame, and as capable of getting saturated with oil. After the flame is blown out and disappears, followed by its trail of gas, the glare still lingers and with proportionate energy it still continues to draw oil, until finally the glare also disappears, leaving behind an imperfectly consumed wick and oil. Notice here, that while the glare still lingers, the smallest spark brought in contact with it, is eagerly and easily caught up, which is not so in case 1. This case 2 applies to untimely or accidental death; when, notwithstanding bodily death, the *Bhut* principles survive, some of which obsess sensitive human subjects. Of the different kinds of *Bhuts*, and the conditions which must determine their lingering on this earth, or going elsewhere, I am not prepared to speak of just now, as the subject is still hazy and confused in my mind. Still grand problems rise and can be solved with "the light of the lamp," before us. May not its philosophy be as aptly applied to man? Without the flame, the lamp and its appurtenances are of no use, and both lamp and its appurtenances are indispensable for the flame to manifest itself. So may not "Spirit, Soul and Matter" be indispensable to and unthinkable without each other? That it is more than that, much more complicated and subtle, does not preclude the comparison which has been made only to make it comprehensible to our criticizing friends of Madras, who think of applying the tests of gases to whatever our states may be at and after the crisis of death! Why should not even this comparison become suggestive and comprehensible? How can it be denied (*dogmatic denial* is not a *scientific negation*) that when the flame is extinguished there will always be following a transformation of the flame into gases and that the red glare will survive for some time after. If we are not fitted to suddenly become Occultists and Adepts in this life while as yet the flame of our life-lamp is

brightly burning within us, and that we are unable at will to light and to extinguish our Soul-wicks, still the philosophy stands true, and ultimately we "may" better perceive the realities; ultimately, I say, for only at, and after "death"—after the flame is gone, in the language of our simile—that we will have to admit and subscribe to the reality of the independent existence of gases and glare, if not of the charred wick.

Is it true that the already "discovered" laws of nature must apply to the yet "undiscovered" laws? How can we prove this assertion before we know how to apply and make these laws dovetail together, and learn whether they agree or not; and what is more, before we have ourselves discovered these "undiscovered" laws? For aught we know there may be other laws, more general and comprehensive, to which the already "discovered" laws are subservient; and it is in this spirit that we should be "credulous" instead of remaining *unscientifically sceptical*. I am a mere tyro, but yet my soul's gates are not shut to receive truth wherever it may be found, and whatever source it may come from. You may call the residuo after the Spirit departs this frame, a ghost, a vapor, the reliquæ or anything you will. That does not interfere with the idea that it exists. And utterly ignorant of its nature, and the laws by which it abides, and lacking patience and the ability to investigate them for ourselves, to say that there cannot be possibly a kernel, only because we cannot break the shell and see its inside, is revolting to common-sense. Let "Free inquiry without prejudice" be our motto, lest we should be nailed to one fixed point, and doomed squirrel-like to be ever turning round the same circumference, within a given radius.

In all ages and at all times we find the current of ignorant opinion setting itself against new facts, and counter-running the torrent of progress to which finally it has to succumb. Every new fact discovered had at some time been cried down as "Humbug," and every science had to contend, at first, against such universal denunciation. Only read "Isis Unveiled" for instance. The Philosophy of Mesmerism, even Mesmerism itself, is for many still a "Humbug." Why? Because *they do not know what it is*; and the Occultism of some Theosophists is "Collusion." Why? Because *they cannot explain it otherwise*. We hope that the Theosophists, and their Founders, will only be the more incited to work in their labour of love by meeting with such opposition, such unmerited and unjust treatment at the hands of some Madras *Free-thinkers* and that in the end they will be able to write "Tekel" on all "Humbugs." If it can be proved that I have said anything wrong, I am open to correction even by my friends the *Free-thinkers*. Therefore do I boldly sign my name in full.

A. GOVINDA CHARLU,

Assistant Engineer, Mysore State Railway.

Camp Tiptur, Mysore Province, September 14, 1882.

IDOLATRY IN THE VEDAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "THEOSOPHIST."

With reference to the requisition of the correspondent of the *Arya*, published in the last number of the THEOSOPHIST, I quote below that portion of the Shâkha of Yajur Vêda which comprises the sentence under consideration, to enable him to interpret it. Besides this quotation, nothing need be said in reply to him. For, in my previous article on the subject, I have asked whether the Swamiji considered the sentence as a portion of the Yajur Vêda, besides proposing two other questions. I have, indeed, a strong inclination to submit a more lengthened reply; but I check that inclination, and would reserve my remarks until the discussion arrives at a stage actually calling for them, because whatever is inopportune said is also inappropriate, and, of consequence, undeserving of a space in the columns of the journal, for which legitimate demand is so large.

The quotation runs thus:—

दक्षमे अन्य आवा तु परान्यो वातु य द्रपः । यददो वातते
गृहे मृतस्य निधिहितः । ततो नाये हि जीवते ततो नाये हि भेष-
जम् । ततो नो मह आबह वात आवातु भेषजम् । शूर्भय्यो
भूर्नाह् देप्रण आयुं पितारिषत् । इन्द्रस्य ग्रहो सितन्वा प्रपद्ये
सगुः साश्वः । सह यन्मे अस्तितेन । भूःप्रपद्य भुवः प्रपद्ये सुवः
प्रपद्ये भू भूर्भस्सुवः प्रपद्ये वायुं प्रपद्ये नातो न्देवतां प्रपद्ये श्रमानमा
खण प्रपद्ये* प्रजा पत वृहन्न कोशं वृहन्न प्रपद्य ओं प्रपद्ये । अन्त
रिक्षम् उर्वन्तरं वृहदग्नयः पवता स्वययावातस्वस्या स्वस्ति
मान्तया स्वरत्या स्वस्ति मानसानि । प्राणापानी मृत्योर्मा पानं
प्राणापानी मामाहासिष्टमयिमेघां मयिप्रजां मयिग्निं स्तेजो
दधातु मयिमेघां मयिप्रजां मयिन्द्र इन्द्रियन्दघातु मयिमेघां मयि
प्रजां मयि सूर्गो भ्राजो दधातु ॥

* The sentence under consideration.

As to the advertisement by Mr. Mathuradas Lowji, alluded to in the article under reply and in the note which you have kindly appended thereto, I promise to undertake the task as soon as his acceptance of my proposal is communicated to me through the THEOSOPHIST.

In connection with this subject, allow me to say that, after satisfying Mr. Mathuradas Lowji that idolatry is sanctioned by the Shastras, I would proceed to show, with some system, that it is supported by the Vedas, and, further, that the *Superior Hindu Idolatry* is but philosophic, and its practice thoroughly wholesome, and highly beneficial in several ways.

Yours fraternally,

D., F.T.S.

October 11, 1882.

A NATIONAL FUND FOR THE STUDY OF SANSKRIT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "THEOSOPHIST."

I subjoin copy of my letters to the Viceroy and the President of the Educational Commission, and beg to urge upon all our Theosophists this golden opportunity of taking charge of the education of their countrymen, and acquiring their legitimate influence with the Government and the nation. I have requested the Educational Committee, *i.e.*, the Theosophists, of the Hindu Sabha, to take charge with me of the Madras Presidency College in terms of my recommendation to the Government Education Commission, and I expect Local Branches and other associations to similarly take charge of other Colleges and Schools. This move and the scheme of Local Self-Government, and my intention to move the University Senate to patronize Sanscrit literature more than is done at present, will relieve "Re-awakened India" of having a distinct National Fund raised by subscriptions. I protest against any one conducting a School who has no faith in Soul and Spiritual Progress.

A. SANKARJAH, F.M.U., F.T.S.,

President Founder, Hindu Sabha.

Trichoor, September 2, 1882.

To the PRIVATE SECRETARY to H. E. the Viceroy.

DEAR SIR,

I have your kind reply to my letter on the national grievance of closing educational and official distinctions to the Vernacular-educated natives of India. Probably the enclosed copy of my letter to the public will make my meaning clearer. It is two years since the Middle School Test superseded the general Test Examination in this Presidency, and therefore even Vernacular examinations for clerkships are not held. Supposing such examinations to exist, I may yet say that preference under the existing spirit of exercising patronage will be given to those who pass only in English. Surely it is demanding Utopian loyalty and contentment on the part of 250 millions of the Aryan race with a literature Vedic, Scientific and Puranic, with kingdoms in the past and in the present administered by Kings, Dewans and Judges not educated in English (Poonnah of Mysore did not know English, and Rajah Sir Dinkar Row, K.C.S.I., does not know it), to ask them to be content with Vernacular clerkships. Are persons fit only to be Vernacular clerks fit under the most highly appreciated Resolution of the Vice-Emress to be entrusted with local self-government? I am a Bachelor of Arts, a Fellow of an University and the Naib Dewan of a state. My colleagues in the Sabha are Graduates, Deputy Collectors, Sub-Judges, &c. The Sabha is open only to English educated Hindus; for, with the advice of my friends, Civilians, Missionaries, and Military Officers, I have come to the conclusion that English should be the common language of all Provincial and Imperial associations in India, but that it should serve in regard to the Vernacular Literature the same purpose which the Latin did in enriching European Literature. Sanskrit will continue to supply all *words*, and English, Historical, Legal, and Scientific *matter*. The exclusive patronage of English educated natives and indirectly teaching them to despise the Vernaculars and Vernacular scholars are neither in the interests of the people nor in those of the British Government, which is a God-send to India. It will be an ever memorable stroke of statesmanship if University honors are thrown open to the Vernacular Scholar, and official appointments up to Rs 500.

I beg you will be good enough to lay this and the previous letter before His Excellency, and favour with commands

Your most obediently,

A. SANKARJAH, F.T.S.,

President Founder, Hindu Sabha.