

GOD AND BRAHM.

A LECTURE

DELIVERED IN THE

BOMBAY CATHOLIC DEBATING CLUB.

BY THE

REV. L. MEURIN, S. J.

Bombay:

PRINTED AT THE "COMMERCIAL PRESS."

1865.

BOMBAY:—PRINTED BY DOSSABHOY EDULJEE.

GOD AND BRAHM.

GENTLEMEN,—It is not without a certain degree of apprehension, arising from a consciousness of the disadvantages against me, that I venture to come forward with my first lecture before so numerous and learned an audience. I have to speak in a foreign tongue, one that I had to learn in this country, where the multiplicity of languages renders the mastery of one rather difficult; I have to speak in a city, where the most extraordinary and unexpected influx of wealth has turned the minds of almost all its inhabitants towards temporal pursuits with such a vigour that the eternal truths seem to be completely thrown into oblivion; I have to speak among a people whose numerous varieties of national character and of religious persuasion has rendered them familiar with every kind of religious worship, and indifferent towards the all-important question, as to whether and where the only true one can be found.

2. These are certainly great disadvantages, but what surpasses them all, is the subject itself, I have chosen to speak of "*The Existence and Nature of God*," about which so much has been disputed and written philosophically and theologically; a subject of the deepest interest, so elevated, so sublime, that it proves a dreaded topic to all vitiated minds and hearts, but is a source of the most exquisite delight to all noble-hearted friends of truth, greatness and beauty; a subject, which, you will have no hesitation in granting, is of the highest importance, whether you consider its majesty, or the influence which it legally exercises over the whole life of the human race. Every one feels that his behaviour in this, and his happiness in the next world are not only influenced, but even wholly regulated according to his belief concerning the Supreme Being, and dependent on his duly serving and honoring Him, his Lord and Master, in this mortal life, which would be an utter impossibility if he be mistaken in the view he takes of His Divine Nature.

3. If we consider the worst of all opinions on this subject, we cannot but assert, that, supposing God did not exist and were not a just avenger of all misdeeds, the Atheist will indeed escape

all punishment in the next life, and the Theist will have lived a useless life of faith and self-denial, albeit full of a sweet, though mistaken hope of being eternally rewarded; but in the supposition that God does really exist, as in fact He does, the expectation of the Theist will not be confounded, whilst the terrible self-deception, in which the Atheist lived, according to his perverse natural desires and passions, will prove false and fatal to him throughout eternity. How unwise, then, is it to rely on the hypothesis of the non-existence of God, and thus to expose one's self to eternal damnation!

4. Turning from Atheism, that offspring of a corrupted heart and mind to any such mistaken views concerning the Divine Nature, as originate and back an undue worship, with which the Supreme Ruler cannot be satisfied, we assert not less distinctly, that they will prove equally fatal for all eternity, especially if we wilfully omit to make those enquiries about God and His nature, which reason directs us to institute. For what other purpose did God bestow on us the wonderful light of reason, if not principally to know Him from His creatures, and to investigate His nature? What, therefore, will the result of our life be, if we do not make a right use of that noblest of our faculties anent the most essential object, and do not exert our free will to live according to the decrees of our conscience, founded on the true knowledge of God? Eternal misery in the after-life, is the only true answer.

5. Behold now the idea which the Hindu Religion gives of God, and tell me, is it not essentially different from that of the Christian? And yet, there are not as many Gods as there are religions; there is not one God for the Christians, and another for the Hindus; God is but *one*, and most assuredly our divers opinions about His nature do not change Him, and do not make of Him different Gods for different nations. If these two religions contradict one another, it is clear, that one of them must be wrong. How lamentable, then, must be the lot in the other life of those, who follow a false religion, or do not take the trouble of inquiring sincerely after the true one, or prove too weak or too indifferent to follow it, when found, since the contrary course in this most important of all matters is an enormous crime!

6. But laying aside for the moment, these moral considerations, let us proceed to prove the existence of God. And if we endeavour to establish this truth by force of reasoning, it is more for the purpose of investigating God's nature, than of satisfying our need of a proof for His existence; for the persuasion

thereof is so deeply rooted in our hearts, that many philosophers have been induced to assert, that the existence of God is *naturally* known to man—an assertion which is true so far, that whosoever is endowed with understanding is capable of attaining this knowledge without great difficulty.

7. We say, then : “THE WORLD EXISTS.” Nobody can deny that we see the sun, the moon, the stars, and this earth with all that is upon it, that we touch our own hands, enjoy the fragrant scent of the flowers, the sweet flavour of the fruits, delight in the harmonious sounds of music—in a word : nobody can deny, that by our five senses we perceive the sensible world. Now our conscience tells us, without the slightest shade of doubt, that these our impressions are caused not by ourselves, neither voluntarily nor necessarily, but by the very objects, which strike our senses. Nothing, however, can act without existing ; consequently, the world exists.

8. This world develops itself in a constant movement, in a continual progress. Nothing in the world is immovable. Whether we consider the succession in time and space, or that of cause and effect, we must acknowledge that there is a succession, and that it is numerable ; generations, days and nights, as well as years and centuries, are capable of being numbered ; we count them. Now, if we go backwards in imagination, is it possible to conceive that these generations, these days or years, had no beginning, but exist from all eternity ? If this be possible, the task becomes difficult to prove the existence of God—of a God, above all finite beings, of an infinite God above all the world. If it be not possible for these successions to have come down from all eternity, the existence of such a God will be proved irrefutably.

9. We assert, therefore, and prove that it is against our natural reason to admit the possibility of an eternal world, subject to successions. If the world were from all eternity, the successions, through which it had to go, or at least, through which it could go, would necessarily be infinite in number. Were the number of its successions, let us say of its years, not infinite but finite, we could reckon backwards, and go up to its first year, in which case the world would have had a beginning. If the world be from all eternity, the number of its years must be numberless or infinite.

10. But an infinite number, can never be exhausted or gone through. For even if we should think away in retrogression and carry our imagination backwards through each century in one

single moment, and continue in our reckoning during the whole of an immortal life, we would notwithstanding *never, never*, be able to go through that infinite number of past centuries, through which the world is supposed to have actually gone, although we imagine thousands of centuries incomparably faster than the world is going through in the slow progress of time. If, therefore, it be impossible for us in all eternity to go with our thinking power in successive moments through the supposed past eternity of the world, it is necessarily *much more* impossible for the world to have actually gone through it. Consequently, if the beginning of the world or of time be thought away, its succession too is necessarily thought away. There is no succession without a beginning; no number without a unit, no thousand without one, no period without a commencement, no world without an origin.

11. A French Atheist, who, in order to do away with the importune idea of that Supreme Being, who punishes the wicked, pretended that the world itself was God in a perpetual development, was once asked by a child, which was the first:—the hen or the egg? The wise man was confounded and silenced. Had he said, the hen, the question arose, whence came the hen? Had he said the egg, he would have been asked, who made the egg? This is true philosophy, only converted into a popular form. In philosophical language we would say: *no effect without cause*. Such, in truth, is the general law of the world, that all living material beings of a species are linked together with their origin in a necessary succession. Take away one link of the chain that connects a certain tree with the one which flourished six thousand years ago, then the succeeding one will also vanish, and the whole following series becomes impossible. And now take away the *first* tree, and then the second, the third and the whole series, up to this certain one, becomes impossible. But if you say, that the series of trees is infinite, you do actually remove the first, the second and every numerable tree; and you are forced to admit that the whole series is an effect without first cause, or, what is precisely the same, without any cause whatever. To say that, however, would be very unphilosophical. In like manner it is wrong to assert that the whole series of all the beings existing in, and composing this world, exist from all eternity; for, it is equivalent to saying that there is a chain of effects without a cause. The world, then, cannot be from all eternity.

12. To corroborate the same assertion with yet another proof, we say: if the world were from all eternity, its duration, considered retrogressively, would be actually infinite, illimited;

but taken progressively, it would be actually finite, limited: that is to say, it would at the same time be finite and infinite. This, however, is a most flagrant contradiction, and the world, therefore, cannot have existed from all eternity.

13. But we are here met with an objection. It is said, that likewise taken progressively, the world will have no end; its duration, then, is infinite on both sides. We answer, the world will never be able to go *through* the future eternity, but will always be only going on *into* the future eternity, pushing forward its actual end, called the present. The contradiction remains therefore: it would be actually infinite with respect to the past, but actually finite as regards the future and thus it is evident that the duration of the world would be at the same time infinite and finite. The eternity of the world is consequently sheer nonsense, an untruth, an open contradiction in itself. Finiteness and succession are opposed to infiniteness and eternity, and we must by reasoning evidently come to the conclusion, that the world cannot have been from eternity, but must have had a beginning.

14. If the world, then, had a beginning, it had it either from nothing, or from itself, or from another Being. But in the first place, not from nothing. To impart existence to the world, the nothing should first be something: being precedes acting. Nothing has no thing to give and cannot call forth a world into existence. Secondly—not from itself: nothing can make itself, for the reason just given: we must first be, before we can act. The world should have existed before its existence, to have been able to give to itself its own existence. The world, consequently, has been made by another Being.

15. And this Being has either existed from all eternity, or it has not. If not, it has derived its existence from another Being, and so on, till we come, for the above-exposed reasons, with all necessity to a first being, which had its existence from all eternity.

16. But (and this is an important consideration, one which leads us from the finite to the infinite, from the world to God,) we ask: if the world cannot exist from all eternity, on account of the successions to which it is essentially subject, how can any Being exist from eternity? It is in fact utterly impossible for us to go by succession through an infinite series of past years, though we should continue thinking in all eternity; if we, therefore, wish to comprise the whole infinite past duration, we are obliged to do so, not by adding numbers to numbers and succes-

sions to successions, but we must *span* the whole series *at once* in one only moment, in a moment, however, of a far superior kind, than that which is a part of a minute; in an *infinite moment*, which does not move from century to century, but remains in perfect tranquillity present to all ages, just as the central point in a circle to all the points of its periphery;—an infinite moment, we say, into which an infinite series of years is, so to speak, shoved together, just as we can imagine a long line contracted or shoved together into one single point, which point then comprises all the points of the line. In the same way this infinite moment comprehends in itself all possible moments from eternity down to now, and from now into all eternity. This infinite moment is the unity of all possible successions and durations. The past and the future, therein united, form a perpetual present. When we say—the *past time*, we pronounce the affirmation that something was, and the negation that it is still; and when we say—the *future*, we affirm that something will be, and deny that it is already. This infinite moment, while it keeps both these affirmations, repudiates the negations; in it the past time is *still* present, and the future is *already* present. There is no longer a WAS, nor is there a WILL BE, but only one perpetual IS.

17. This infinite moment has two qualities, the instantaneousness or momentaneity which excludes all succession, and the permanence or continuance which excludes all transitoriness. This infinite moment is therefore a *permanent moment* or an *instantaneous permanency*. This simple, indivisible, permanent moment, which comprises in itself in an eminent degree all possible time and unites the past and future to one only present, this everlasting NOW, this infinite duration wherein rest and motion are elevated to a unity of a superior order, is called *Eternity*. Eternity is not time but something infinitely superior to it. Eternity is tranquillity, quietness, peace. The Eternal Being does not progress in time, but He comprehends *all possible time simultaneously*; He is still present in the past, and is already present to the future; He is still present at what we have done yesterday, and is already present to what we will do to-morrow. A duration with a beginning and an end is called *time*; with a beginning and without end *immortality*; and without beginning and without end *Eternity*.

18. The Eternal Being is called God. To us He has given time and immortality in succession and mutability; eternity and immutability He has reserved for Himself. Eternity is God's exclusive incommunicable possession. God alone is eternal!

19. And He alone is *immense*. The idea of immensity is very similar to that of *eternity*. Eternity does not consist in an innumerable multitude of successive moments, but in the simultaneousness of all possible time in one singular everlasting moment. In like manner immensity does not consist in being present in a space which we conceive as being of an infinite extension in all possible directions, but it is the simultaneous indivisible presence in all possible places, in one singular omnipresent existence. As there is no time in eternity, so there is no space in immensity. As eternity is one single everlasting *Now*, equal to all possible moments, so immensity is but one single ubiquitous, omnipresent *Here*, equal to all possible places. Were God not immense, He would be capable of moving from one place to another; every movement implies change and time; He would consequently be neither eternal nor immutable. Time and space are created with and in the world; eternity and immensity are uncreated in God.

20. Eternity and immensity are infinite qualities. Now, it is impossible for an infinite quality to reside in a finite substance. Qualities result from their substance; how could they then be of a superior, infinitely higher order than the substance itself, whence they originate? *Infinity* then is another and not less exclusive quality of God, than eternity and immensity. And if we wish to understand thoroughly the meaning of *Infinity*, we must consider its essential difference from *Finiteness*. If we compare those finite beings which come within our experience, we at once discover a gradation, whereby the smallest are interlinked with the biggest ones. The little atom we remark moving about in a sunbeam that penetrates into a dark room, is not immeasurably distant from a mountain, nor from the world, nor from the whole universe as far as we can reach it. There is a gradation, a common measure, a comparison. But between the finite and the infinite there is no comparison, no measure, no gradation. We make a step from the smallest perceptible atom to the whole universe; but in face of the infinite the whole universe becomes less than an imperceptible atom; and should we heap millions of worlds on billions the whole sum would seem as nothing in comparison with the infinite Being. The finite has limits; the infinite has no limits; the difference, therefore, between them is similar to that which intervenes between *yes* and *no*. Nothing is between them: they are contradictory. The *indefinite* has movable limits; they can always be removed further, as is the case with numbers: there is no last limit, because

to every number you can add another one ; but it has its beginning, viz. the unit. And, it does not exist really in illimitedness, but whenever it exists in reality, it has a beginning and an end, like any number, be it written or thought. Things indefinite have an illimited power of growing, but are in fact always finite. The utmost that can be said of them is that they approach the infinite ; but they never reach it. Here is a block, over which beginners in philosophy are wont to stumble. When they are unable to perceive, or to assign a limit to a thing, (say, for instance, to time or space) they simply assert the non-existence of such a limit, and thus confound the infinite with the finite, though upon reflecting on the idea of the infinite, they are constrained to acknowledge that an indefinite thing (as time, space, number), is after all a contradiction to infinity and is only finite. Not to perceive the limit of a thing widely differs from the non-existence of any such limit. The word *finite* signifies the presence of a limit. Limit is a negation, viz. the negation that the limited object extends farther. To deny a limit is to deny this negation, and is consequently an affirmation. The infinite Being is that, which has no limit in its being, which consequently possesses ALL being. Infinity is plenitude in simplicity ; is all in one. It does, however, not consist of an aggregation of various perfections, of a composition of goodness, wisdom, justice, eternity, immensity, omnipotence, &c., but of only one most simple perfection, that comprises all possible perfections, in the same manner as eternity embraces all possible time, and immensity all possible space. If, therefore, eternity and immensity be infinitely simple and indivisible, God's infinite perfection is also absolutely simple and indivisible, so much so, that there is no essential distinction between His goodness and His justice, His truth and His omnipotence, indeed neither between any of His Divine attributes, nor between His attributes and His Divine substance. In other words : God's eternity is His nature ; His immensity is His nature ; His omnipotence is His nature ; His wisdom and goodness, His justice and mercy are nothing less than His divine nature itself. God's infinite perfection is consequently absolute *simplicity*.

21. Hence God is but *one*. To admit more than one God is quite against reason. Suppose there were two or more infinite Beings, they would not be distinguishable : they would be equally eternal, equally immense, infinitely and therefore equally wise, infinitely and equally powerful &c. Two equal drops of water can still be distinguished, because they occupy two different places ; but two Gods could not be distinguished one from the

ether, by the difference of the place they occupy, because each of them would be omnipresent. If we permit two equal drops of water to flow together, they would form but one drop, yet of double the size. Let us for an instant suppose that the two drops joined together would not form a greater bulk, but be of the same size as each taken singly: I ask, would we then be able to distinguish in that drop two different drops of the same size? No. The two drops would in every respect be equal to only one drop. In the same manner two infinite beings would not be more than one only, since it is the nature of the infinite to be incapable of either increase or decrease. It would therefore be very unreasonable to multiply the infinite: twice, thrice, a hundred times the Infinite is not more than once the same. Two, three or more Gods are then a plain absurdity; they would not constitute more than one only God. Mark well, that when we speak of the unity of God, we do not mean *that one* which is the beginning and unit of the numbers we make use of in computation; it is as much superior to all numbers, as eternity is to time, and immensity to space. The Divine Unity comprises all possible numbers and is of a superior order—it is the Divine Essence itself: God cannot be counted: God's time, space, number and perfection are all of an order, infinitely superior to our time, number, space and perfection. For His time we have the name eternity, for His space the word immensity, for His perfection, Divinity; but, for His number we have no proper word; we designate it by the term *Unity*.

22. God, being infinitely simple, cannot be material, His essence must be *spiritual* and in consequence intellectual. But His intellect being infinitely great must be as much above our intellect, as His eternity is superior to our time. God, therefore, knows everything that can be known, and knows it from all eternity, simultaneously, in one only all-comprising, infinite and immutable act of intelligence; so that whatever is to take place in the future, even that which depends on the determination of our free will, is known to Him, who lives already in the future, and who, by His infinite power of intelligence, knows with absolute certainty, what we, men, are capable of knowing solely by conjecture. Therefore, these determinations also, that our free will would come to under any other merely possible circumstance, are fully known to God, and this knowledge forms an integral part of the foundation of his divine Providence. Such is the infinite power of the divine intellect, that it reaches its object immediately, without any intermediate cause, and has it present to

itself from all eternity. For, the smaller is the cognoscitive power of a being, the greater is the medium it requires for its cognitions; the greater the former is, the smaller is the medium needed: God's intelligence is infinitely great, consequently He needs an infinitely small, *i. e.* no medium at all. He knows everything immediately by the sole infinite power of His intellect.

23. With understanding, a will is essentially connected to complete the relation between the intelligent being and the object of his perception. There is, therefore, also a *will* in God. But this Divine will is again infinitely superior to any created will. It is unalterably determined from all eternity, because it is incapable of new determinations, which would suppose new illustrations or considerations of the Divine Intellect. God's existence is necessary, and His goodness is infinitely great: He therefore wills Himself necessarily, and loves Himself infinitely. No other being exists with necessity; hence whatever God wills besides Himself, he wills it with absolute freedom. He creates, if He wishes, when He wishes, and what He wishes; nothing can necessitate Him thereto, either from without or within.

24. And when He creates, He is not, like us, in need of a pre-existing matter as substratum or material cause, out of which He may form something—but his divine *omnipotence* is able to create something out of nothing. For, the smaller is an operative power, the greater is the substratum it requires to form anything; the greater the power, the smaller the substratum required. God's power is infinitely great; He wants therefore an infinitely small substratum to form anything, *i. e.* none at all. Hence flows the simple and reasonable truth: God created the world out of nothing. And, when we say, the world was created out of nothing, we do by no means aver that the *nothing* was its material cause; but, that it had no material cause whatever, having been called into existence by the mere will of its omnipotent Creator, who, having nothing at all before Him, willed and all things were, thereby producing them not indeed out of His own immutable and spiritual nature which is incapable of any change or finite emanation, but out of nothing, as it behoved His almightiness—a truth, which is the only possible solution of the question of the origin of the world; to the admission of which we are compelled already by the reasons above developed which clearly prove that the world, being subject to successions, cannot have existed from eternity, but must necessarily have had a beginning, which implies the succession of its existence to nothing.

25. Whatever is created by God is good. God is infinitely perfect ; His perfection is therefore absolutely exempt from all evil. Perfection, as the object of desire and will, is called goodness. Hence God is infinitely and essentially *good*, and goodness itself. He cannot, then, be the author of evil. Those physical evils, which are not simply the natural appendage of our limited being, can not have been introduced into the world but as a due punishment for the moral evil—sin, and are, as such, inflicted by the most holy and just God, not properly in the quality of evil, but as something good. The moral evil, which is no substance in itself but only an inversion of right order, can have had no other origin, but the perverse use of that free will, which the loving creator has in His benevolence and liberality bestowed on His intellectual creatures, in order first, to be loved and served by them rather voluntarily than necessarily or forcibly, for love is not satisfied if not loved freely in return ; and, secondly, to afford His creatures the possibility of gaining eternal happiness as a merit rather than as a mere gift ; for happiness is fully enjoyed only, when its object is not merely accidentally found or gratuitously received, but intentionally conquered and duly merited.

26. God, however, did by no means stand in need of our praise, love and service, or of the existence of any creature : possessing without rival His infinite and inamissible treasure of essential goodness, and loving Himself with an illimited love, He enjoys Himself and His immense perfections in an unbounded, ever equal and tranquil felicity.

27. It is therefore neither necessity, nor any selfish aim that could move His omnipotence to create the Universe ; but, because Charity is diffusive of itself, and God is Charity, He ~~wished~~ to bestow a participation of His unbounded happiness on creatures, capable of understanding and enjoying it. He created for that purpose intelligent and free beings, who might know Him and serve Him with free love, and thus deserve an everlasting participation of His supereminent celestial glory and bliss, or—if they, by their free will, should refuse to recognise and to adore Him, to be at least by their endurance of a never—ending punishment inflicted on them, an everlasting proof of His divine justice, which hates and chastises falsehood and sin not less infinitely, than it loves and rewards truth and virtue.

28. How sublimely grand and terribly weighty is not then the truth of what we said at the very outset, that the everlasting state of our future happiness or unhappiness depends on our knowing and freely serving the one only true God ! We shall

be eternally unhappy if we do not, and eternally happy if we do acknowledge and serve the only one true God, the God of our human reason and heart, the one only living God, the pretermundane and supramundane God, the most perfect Being, who possesses in His eternity all possible time in one only ever-enduring moment; in His immensity all possible space in one only indivisible all-pervading presence; in His divine goodness all possible perfections in one only absolute simplicity; in His omnipotence all possible power in one only all-overcoming might; in His divine life all possible activity in one only unalterable tranquillity; in His divine wisdom all possible knowledge in one only all-seeing act of intelligence; in His beatitude all possible happiness in one only full and undiminishable enjoyment of His infinite, eternal, immense, all-wise, omnipotent, tranquil and majestic Divinity!

29. If such be the Nature of God, the Supreme Being of the Hindu religion, Parabrahm, cannot be, and is not the true God, but only a philosophical fiction, the erroneousness of which must appear by a simple application to it of the proofs, by which the existence and nature of God have been just established.

30. Before entering into this consideration we state that we would at once implicitly and conscientiously submit to the doctrines of the Hindu system, if their source, the Vedas with some other poetical and philosophical works, could be proved to be, what they pretend to be, a revelation or inspiration of God, or, at least, to have been written with His assistance, which would entitle them to a claim of divine infallibility, and demand from us an unconditional belief. For, God is the eternal Truth, and cannot deceive nor be deceived; hence, if it be established that He has spoken, it becomes absolutely certain that what He has said is infallibly true.

31. Do, then, the Vedas and the other works alluded to, for instance, the Bhagavad-Gita, really possess such a divine authority? They themselves do not prove it, nor do their commentators take the trouble to do so. If those books related probable and uncontradicted historical facts, we would believe them, as much as we do any other historical book, but if they teach a religious system, and, in doing so, assert their divine origin, we cannot accept this their testimony in their own favour, because it is a begging of the question: let them first prove that this their assertion, in so important a matter, is not an imposition. If then the Vedas possess no intrinsic proof of their

divinity, which are their proofs from without? There are no historical documents whereby to ascertain, by whom, when, where, under what circumstances, they have been composed; and by what event, say, by what miracle or fulfilled prophecy, God may have testified that He himself is their Author. Nothing can be alleged but their antiquity, which, however, is no proof of their divinity, and was certainly no proof at all when they first appeared. The religious writings of other peoples are not of a much latter date, if not anterior to the Vedas, they, consequently, would have the same right to prove their divinity by their antiquity. But since they teach tenets contradictory to those of the Vedas, the asserted divine origin of at least all but one of them is necessarily a falsehood. How can God, the eternal Truth, reveal contradictory doctrines? It is evident therefore, that we cannot admit the antiquity of the Vedas as a proof of their divine origin. Their authority, then, is manifestly built on a marvellous credulity.

31. Not only is there no evidence in favour of the divine origin of the Hindu religious system, but there are also irrefutable proofs of its erroneousness. We shall not be so inconsistent as to base our proofs on the Bible, or any other authoritative source, but, as we have done throughout the whole of this Essay, exclusively on our human reason, which is the only, but also unexceptionable common ground, on which we and our Hindu opponents can stand, and must stand, if we really wish to come to a mutual understanding. Whoever would reject this primary foundation of all truth, would not only shamefully deny and betray that noble faculty, by which he is essentially elevated above the animals and constituted a human being, but also render all science and even certainty quite impossible, and instead of building up a philosophical edifice, surround himself with utter ruin and desolation.

32. The Hindu philosophy teaches regarding the Supreme Being a doctrine which well deserves the following censure: "All men are vain, in whom there is not the knowledge of God; and who by these good things that are seen, could not understand him that is, neither by attending to the works have acknowledged who was the workman; but have imagined either the fire, or the wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the great water, or the sun and moon, to be the gods that rule the world; with whose beauty if they being delighted, took them to be gods, let them know how much the Lord of them is more beautiful than they; for the first author of beauty made all those

things. Or if they admire their power and their effects, let them understand by them, that he that made them is mightier than they. For, by the greatness of the beauty, and of the creature, the creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby. But yet as to these they are less to be blamed. For they perhaps err seeking God, and desirous to find Him. For being conversant among his works, they search, and they are persuaded that the things are good which are seen. But then again they are not to be pardoned. For if they were able to know so much, as to make a judgment of the world: how did they not more easily find out the Lord thereof?"

33. All the ancient pagan philosophico—theological systems merit the above stricture, but none so much as the Hindu doctrine, which is essentially a deification of the world. Instead of elevating themselves to the knowledge of a pretermundane God and a Creator, who is essentially different and distant from His creatures, the Hindu philosophers have given to the abstract substance of the Universe, that is to say, to the union of the essences of matter and spirit, the incommunicable name of God, calling this philosophical fiction of theirs the Supreme Being, Parabrahm.

34. If we believe the Hindu system, we are forced to say, that the whole Universe, both matter and spirit, must be reduced to Brahm, as their common principle, their material as well as efficient cause. Matter (*vyakt*) must be understood to be a development of its essence (*avyakt*), and the spirit, which pervades the Universe to be either indivisible, which we would call the universal vital energy of nature: or divisible, viz. the individual souls. Both, if reduced to a superior unity, are called the Supreme Spirit or Brahm, *i. e.* the essence of spirit, which in union with the essence of matter forms the Supreme Being, Parabrahm, or simply Brahm, who possesses then within himself the essences of both spirit and matter, by the junction of which, he produces the Universe, which, accordingly, is in itself nothing but an illusory appearance, whilst Brahm is the only really existing Being. Brahm is, therefore, nothing else than a personification of the substance of the Universe, which, as such, is thought to be alone really existing, permanent and unchangeable, whilst his evolutions, the visible Universe together with his illusory or unreal existence are changeable and transitory. This Supreme Brahm receives then the title and adoration of God. The aim of his endless evolutions is the final re-absorption of the emanated Universe into his essence. To these philosophical conceptions, which evidently do not elevate them-

seives above a simple defecation of the world, the Hindu philosophers, who were poets as well, made many mythological additions, for the purpose of explaining their ideas in a popular manner. Lest we should seem to have resumed the Hindu philosophical Theology less exactly, we deem it proper to substantiate this brief sketch by quoting a few passages from the Bhagavat-Gita, the Vedanta, and the Vedas, as given by Colebrooke and Thomson.

35. Krishna (according to the Indian mythology the eighth incarnation of Vishnu) identifies himself in the Bhagavat-Gita with the Supreme Being, for he always uses the first person, whenever he intends to speak of the Supreme Being. Thus, for instance, he says: (Ch. XV.) "The place, to which those who go return not, is *my* Supreme Dwelling." "I am celebrated in the world and in the Vedas as the highest person." "*I alone* am to be known by all the Vedas." (Ch. XIV.) "He who worships *me* with religious and exclusive devotion, when he has overcome the qualities, is fitted for the existence of the supreme spirit. (Ch. VIII.) "If thy heart and mind are turned to *me*, thou wilt doubtless attain (after death) to me alone. By thoughts applied to diligent devotion, and turned to no other object (than me), meditating on the Supreme Divine Person, one goes to him." (Ch. V.) "I am the great Lord of all worlds." (Ch. VII.) "There exists no other thing superior to me." (Ch. X.) "Arjuna spoke to Krishna: thou art the Supreme Universal Spirit, the Supreme Dwelling, the eternal person, divine, prior to the gods, unborn, omnipresent, Creator and Lord of all that exists! God of Gods, Lord of the Universe!"

36. This Supreme Being, then, Krishna, says: (Ch. VII.) "I am the cause of the production and dissolution of the whole Universe." (Ch. IV.) "Even though I am unborn, of changeless essence, and the Lord also of all which exists, yet, in presiding over nature (*prakriti* or *avyakt*) which is *mine*, I am born by my own mystic power (*maya*)." (Ch. VIII.) "The supreme universal spirit is the one, simple and indivisible, and *my own nature* is called Adhyatma (*i. e.* Supreme Spirit, Essence of Spirit.) The emanation which causes the existence and reproduction of existing things bears the name of Action. Adhibuta, (*Prakriti*, *avyakt* or essence of matter) is *my own indivisible nature*, and Adhidaitava (or highest God) is the spiritual person." (Ch. VIII.) "All worlds up to that of Brahmá (properly the first person of the mythological Triad; but here in place of the first person of the primitive Triad, viz. Surya, the sun,) are subject to return;

but he who comes to me has no regeneration. Those men who know the day of Brahma, which ends after a thousand ages, and the night which comes on at the end of those thousand ages, know day and night indeed. At the approach of (that day) all (objects of) developed matter (vyakt) come forth from the non-developed principle (avyakt or essence of matter.) At the approach of night they are absorbed into that (principle) called the non-developed. This collective mass, itself of existing things, existing again and again, is dissolved at the approach of that night. At the approach of day it emanates with necessity. But there is another invisible, eternal existence, superior to this visible one, which does perish when all things perish, called invisible and indivisible. This they call the highest walk. Those who obtain this never return. This is my supreme abode. But this supreme person, within whom all existing things exist, and by whom all this universe is caused to emanate, may be approached by devotion, which is intent on him alone." (Ch. IX.) "At the conclusion of a Kalpa (a day of Brahma), all existing things re-enter nature, which is cognate with me. But I cause them to come forth again at the beginning of a Kalpa. Supported by my material essence, I cause this entire system of existing things to emanate again and again without any power of their own, by the power of the material essence. Nor do these actions implicate me, who remain tranquil, as one unconcerned by them, and not interested by these actions. Under my superintendence nature produces movable and immovable things. By this means does the world revolve." "I am ambrosia and death, the existing and the non-existing," (spirit and matter).—"I am the soul which exists in the hearts of all beings, and I am the beginning, and the middle, and also the end of existing things" "I am that which is the seed of all existing things; there exists no one thing, movable or immovable (animate or inanimate) which is without me." "I have established and continue to establish all this universe by one portion of myself (by prakriti)." (Ch. XI.) "Arjuna (beholding the form of Krishna) spoke: I see neither end, nor middle, nor yet beginning of thee, Lord of All! of the form of All", "Thou All!" (Ch. XIII.) "He who recognises the individual existence of everything to be comprehended in one (Brahm) and to be only an emanation from it, he attains to the Supreme Being." (Ch. XIV.) "The great Brahm (here he is taken for essence of matter, a portion of the supreme being), is a womb for me; in it I depose the fetus. The production of all existing things is from it. Brahm is the great womb for

every form which is produced in any womb. I am the father which provides the seed." (Ch. XV.) "I allude to that primal spirit, from which the eternal stream of life emanates." "An eternal *portion of me* (the first kind of *purush* : the individual soul) having assumed (material) life in this world of life, attracts the heart and the five senses." "I enter the ground and support all living things by my vigour (the second kind of *purush* ; the vital energy of nature), and I nourish all herbs, becoming that moisture of which the peculiar property is taste. And becoming fire I enter the body of the living, and being associated with their inspiration and expiration cause food of the four kinds to digest. And I enter the heart of each one, and from me come memory, knowledge and reason." "These two spirits exist in the world, the divisible and also the indivisible. The divisible is every living being ; the indivisible is said to be that which pervades all. But there is another, the highest spirit, designated by the name of Supreme Soul (the third kind of *purush*, the Supreme Spirit is here meant), which as the imperishable master, penetrates and sustains the triple world."

37. The Vedanta teaches the same doctrine : " (God is that) whence are the birth and (continuance and dissolution of this world.)" "He wished to be many and prolific and became manifold." "He is the ethereal element (*acash*), from which all things proceed and to which all return." "He is the breath (*pran*), in which all beings merge, into which they all rise." "He is the light which shines in heaven, and in all places, high and low, everywhere throughout the world and within the human person." "While a man sleeps without dreaming, his soul is with Brahm." "This Universe is indeed Brahm, for it springs from him, merges in him, breathes in him : therefore, worship him." "Him, invariable, the wise contemplate as the source of beings. As the spider puts forth and draws in the thread, as plants spring from the earth (and return to it), as hair of the head and body grows from the living man, so does the universe come of the unalterable." "A person no bigger than the thumb abides in the midst of self" ; "the person no bigger than the thumb is clear as a smokeless flame, lord of the past and future, he is to-day and will be to-morrow ; such is he." "The living soul, rising from this corporeal frame, attains the supreme light, and comes forth with his identical form" (*i.e.* as Brahm.) "The distinction relating to fruition, discriminating one who enjoys and that which is enjoyed, does not invalidate the singleness and identity of Brahm, as cause and effect. The sea is one and not

other than its waters ; yet waves, foam, spray, drops, froth and other modifications of it, differ from each other." " An effect is not other than its cause. Brahm is single without a second. He is not separate from the embodied self. He is soul, and the soul is he." " As milk changes to curds, and water to ice, so is Brahm variously transformed and diversified, without aid of tools or exterior means of any sort. In like manner, the spider spins his web out of his own substance ; spirits assume various shapes, cranes propagate without the male, and the lotus proceeds from pond to pond without organs of motion. That Brahm is entire without parts, is no objection : he is *not wholly* transformed into worldly appearances." " The Universe is sempiternal and had no beginning in time." Ether and air are by Brahm created (*i. e.* produced out of prakriti, his nature) ; but he himself has no origin, no procreator, no maker, for he is eternal, without beginning as without end. So fire and water and earth proceed mediately from him, being evolved successively the one from the other, as fire from air, and this from ether." " It is by his will, not by their own act, that they are so evolved, and conversely, they merge one into the other, in the reversed order, and are reabsorbed at the general dissolution of worlds, previous to the renovation of all things." " Individual souls are, in the Veda, compared to sparks, issuing from a blazing fire ; but the soul is likewise declared expressly to be eternal and unborn. Its emanation is no birth, nor original production. It is perpetually intelligent and constantly sensible." " The soul is not of finite dimensions, as its transmigrations seemingly indicate ; nor minutely small abiding within the heart, and no bigger than the hundredth part of a hundredth of a hair's point, as in some passages described, but, on the contrary, being identified with Supreme Brahm, it participates in his infinity." " The soul is a portion of the Supreme Ruler as a spark is of fire. The relation is not that of master and servant, ruler and ruled, but as that of whole and part. In more than one hymn and prayer of the Vedas it is said : ' All beings constitute one quarter of him ; three quarters are imperishable in heaven : ' and in the Ishvar-Gita and other smritis, the soul that animates the body is expressly affirmed to be a portion of him." " In its primary or principle signification *pran* is vital action and chiefly respiration. This too is a modification of Brahm." " It is the supreme ruler, not the individual soul, who is described in passages of the Vedas, as transforming himself into divers combinations, assuming various names and shapes, deemed terrene, aqueous or igenous, accord-

ing to the predominancy of the one or the other element." "He framed bodies, biped and quadruped; and becoming a bird, he passed into these bodies, filling them as their informing spirit."

38. It will be interesting to compare with the above passages some texts of the Vedas themselves, which after the explanatory portions of the Vedanta and the Bhagavat-Gita just given will be at once intelligible.

The eleventh chapter (Anuvāca) of the tenth book (Mandala) of the Rigveda, opens with two hymns relating to the emanation of the world from Brahmā. "Then was there no entity, nor nonentity: no world nor sky nor aught above it: nothing anywhere in the happiness of any one involving or involved: nor water, deep and dangerous. Death was not; nor then was immortality: nor distinction of day and night. But *that* (viz. the Supreme Being) breathed without affliction, single with Swadhā (or Māyā) (love, desire) her who is sustained within him. Other than him nothing existed, which since has been." "Darkness there was; for this universe was enveloped with darkness, and was undistinguishable (like fluids mixed in) waters: but that mass, which was covered by the husk* was (at length) produced by the power of contemplation." "First desire was formed in his mind: and that became the original *productive seed*, which the wise, recognising it by the intellect in their hearts, distinguish, in nonentity, as the bond of entity." "Did the luminous ray of these creative acts expand in the middle? or above? or below? That productive seed, at once, became providence (or sentient souls) and matter (or the elements.) Who knows exactly and who shall in this world declare, whence and why this creation took place?" "The gods are subsequent to the production of this world: then who can know, whence it proceeded? or whence this varied world arose? or whether it upholds itself or not?" "He who in the highest heaven is the ruler of this Universe, does indeed know; but not another can possess that knowledge!"

"What is this soul? that we may worship him? which is the soul? Is it that by which a man sees, hears &c. is it the heart? or mind? perception? memory? &c. All those are only various names of apprehension. But this soul consisting in the faculty of apprehension is Brahmā, he is Indra, he is Prajapati, the lord of creatures: these gods are he; and so are the

* Which husk? what was that husk?

five primary elements, earth, air, the ethereal fluid, water and light—these and the same joined with minute objects (horses, kine, men, elephants), whatever lives and walks or flies, or whatever is immovable (as herbs and trees): all that is the eye of intelligence. On intellect everything is founded; the world is the eye of intellect, and intellect is its foundation. *Intelligence is Brahm, the great one.*"

39. The 32nd lecture of the *white Yazurved* says:—"Fire is that (original cause), the sun is that, so is air, so is the moon, such too is the pure Brahm and those waters, and that lord of creatures. Moments (and other measures of time) proceeded from the effulgent person, whom none can apprehend (as an object of perception), above, around or in the midst. Of him, whose glory is so great, there is no image: he it is, who is celebrated in various holy strains. Even he is the God, who pervades all regions; he is the first-born: it is he, who is in the womb, he who is born, and he who will be produced, he *severally and universally*, remains with all persons. He prior to whom nothing was born; and *wha became all beings*, himself the lord of creatures, with a body composed of sixteen members, being delighted by creation, produced the three luminaries (the sun, the moon and the fire.)—To what God should we offer oblations but to him?—The wise man views that mysterious Being, in whom the Universe perpetually exists, resting on that sole support. In him this world is absorbed; from him it issues: in creatures he is twined and wove with various forms of existence." He "who views that being, he becomes that being, and is identified with him."

40. The *black Yazurved* may furnish the following instance of the Hindu Pantheism.—"That, whence all beings are *produced*, that by which they live, when born, that towards which they tend, and that into which they *pass: that is Brahm.*" And again: "I bow to Brahm! salutation unto thee, O air! Even thou art Brahm, present to our apprehension. - May that (viz. Brahm) preserve me: propitious be it!"

41. The *Samved* contains a long dialogue on the question:—What is our soul? and: Who is Brahm? Its purport is, that Brahm is the Universal Soul, not only *Heaven*, which is a splendid portion of the universal self, nor only the *Sun* that varied portion, nor only the *air* that diffused portion, nor only the *etherial element*, that abundant portion, nor only *water*, that rich portion, nor only the *earth*, that constant portion of the Universal Soul, for they are: heaven its head: the sun, its eye; the

air, its breath; the ether, its trunk; the water, its abdomen and the earth, the feet of the *Universal Soul*. "He who worships these beings as the *Universal Soul*, enjoys nourishment in all worlds." &c.

42. The *Atharvaved* says:—"The supreme science is that, by which this imperishable nature is apprehended, invisible, not to be seized, not to be deduced, devoid of colour, destitute of ears and eyes, without hands or feet, yet ever variously pervading all: minute, unalterable, and contemplated by the wise as the source of beings. As the spider spins and gathers back (its thread), as plants sprout in the earth, as hairs grow on a living person, so is this universe here produced from the imperishable nature. By contemplation, the vast one germinates; from him food (or body) is produced; and thence, necessarily, breath, mind, real (elements), worlds, and immortality arising from (good) deeds. The omniscient is profound contemplation, consisting in the knowledge of him, who knows all and from that, the manifested vast one, as well as names, forms and food, proceed: and this is truth."

43. And this is untruth. The Hindu Philosophers, ever rich and fertile in examples and similes, frequently explain the pretended illusoriness of this world besides the sole reality of Brahm by saying that all the wonderful stories which one tells of a great hero would prove false and illusory by the discovery of the sterility of the woman, whose son he is said to be. Brahm is to them the barren woman, and the universe with all its beautiful appearances is the unreal hero with his illusory deeds. We say better that the hero with all his achievements is not an illusion, but the assertions that he is the son of a barren woman, is a falsehood: not the existence of the world but that of Brahm is an illusion: the Creator of heaven and earth is yet unknown to the Hindus, who are still an idolatrous creature-adoring people. It is not very difficult to prove that Brahm is not God, and thus to show the erroneousness of the whole system, of the Hindus without resorting to the very easy task of ridiculing the absurdities of their abominable mythology, which is built on the foundation of their philosophy.

44. And, in the first place, it is a plain fact, that nowhere in their whole philosophy, do we meet with a true idea of the Infinite Being. Among the numerous and frequently splendid names and attributes of their Supreme Being, Brahm, some indeed seem to express the idea of an absolute Infinite Being; but on closer examination they are found not to elevate themselves above the finite.

45. Brahm, the *efficient* cause of the universe is not eternal. The formal notion of eternity consists in the simultaneousness of all possible time in one permanent moment, which excludes all possibility of successions. (Nos. 16 & 17). Now not only do we not find the least idea of this eternity in Brahm, but on the contrary his total subjection to time defined in the most express terms. Not only the universe but even the gods who emanated from him, have only a certain lifetime; that of Brahmá, for instance, is, by a most arbitrary calculation, computed to consist of 155 billions, 520,000 millions of years, during which period the Universe is said to emanate and re-enter 36,000 times; of Indra* the Sanchya Philosophy says: "Many thousands of Indras and of other Gods have passed away in successive periods, overcome by time; for time is hard to overcome." These Gods, it is true, are considered to be, like the universe, only transitory emanations from Brahm, the Supreme Being; but, it is evident, that these supposed emanations must and do implicate Brahm in successiveness and time. The denial of an implication, quoted above from the author of the Bhagavat-Gita, regards, as the context shows, the meritoriousness of those actions, by which the emanations are effected, but not their succession in time. The Vedas have it in express terms: "*first* desire was formed in his mind, which *became* the productive seed"; "*he became* all beings"; "*by* contemplation the vast one germinates"; "*the world was (at length) produced by the power of contemplation*"; and the Vedanta confirms this process: "*He wished to be many and prolific, and became manifold*"; Now, Brahm's contemplation, desire and evolution are evidently following one another in successive moments, not only in a logical but in a really temporal order. If one would deny this, he would be obliged to submit to the consequence, and to affirm that all and each of the evolutions of Brahm took place from all eternity. But, to think a world, and much more so many worlds, as existing from all eternity, is an absolute absurdity. (No. 10.)

46. Moreover, Brahm's contemplation, desire and evolution should of necessity have taken place repeatedly. Even Brahmá's lifetime is finite, and many Brahmás must have passed away, like the philosopher Gautama's "many thousands of Indras."

* The *elementary Triad* was Sun, Rain and Wind; the *Vedic Triad*—Agni (fire), Varuna (water) and Vaya (air); the *Epic Triad*—Indra, Agni and Yama; the *Puranic Triad*—Brahmá, Vishnu and Shiva; the *Philosophical Triad*—the Creator, the Conservator and the Transformer.

How often, then, did the contemplations, desires and evolutions of Brahm originate and subside? Not an infinite number of times, because an actual infinite number is a contradiction in itself (No. 10.); a finite number of times, then? but this does not solve the grave and—for the Hindu Philosophers—indissoluble question: What was Brahm engaged in doing from all eternity, before he began to contemplate, desire and evolve himself? If he existed without these internal acts, they are adventitious, and the transit from his inactivity to his activity is already a proof of his subjection to time. If he existed with them from all eternity, his evolutions must have taken place from all eternity, and consequently be not only infinite in number, but also simultaneous from all eternity, which has been proved an impossibility. Again, we ask, how quick or slow was Brahm in contemplating, in desiring and in evolving himself at length? How much time passed away ere this *at length* (which the sense of the above quoted text requires) came to pass? If an *infinite* period of time, we say, that that time cannot have already passed, and the *at length* cannot have already gone by;—if a *finite* time, Parabrahm did not exist from all eternity, and is consequently created by another being. It is evident, then, that such a succession of acts in Parabrahm bears repugnance to the idea of an infinite eternal Being. These difficulties are not shared by the theory of Creation, where God does not evolve himself, but by his sole omnipotence creates all things out of nothing, and in and with them likewise time and space to which he is nowise subject, but beyond which He exists from all eternity, happy in himself. The subjection, then, of Parabrahm, as the efficient cause of the Universe, to time, proved by the successiveness of his contemplations, desires and evolutions and the repetitions of these internal acts of his, renders him a temporal and consequently a finite Being. Parabrahm is not eternal, and therefore not God. If he is at all anything, he is a mere philosophical abstraction of the created essence of the Universe, considered in its evolution into individual beings.

47. We arrive at the very same result, if we consider Brahm as the *material cause* of the Universe. It is evident that *Brahm is not absolutely simple*. We need not insist on that glaring absurdity of the Vedas, to wit that, "All beings constitute one quarter of him; three quarters are imperishable in heaven"; for, we believe, that neither do the Vedas insist upon, nor the subsequent philosophers maintain such a

ridiculous description of the Divinity ; but we refer to the repeatedly proffered assertion of Krishna, that the material essence (prakriti) is "his, is cognate with him, and one portion of himself" as well as the spiritual essence (Adhyatma) which is also called "his own nature" and "an eternal portion of him"; and we quote also the Vedantic effatum, that "the soul is a portion of the supreme Ruler, as spark is of fire," and that other: "the relation is not as that of master and servant, ruler and ruled, but as that of whole and part." No further explanation is necessary to enable one to perceive how greatly a doctrine of this nature is opposed to that absolute simplicity, which is a necessary quality of God. (No. 20). Parts can be taken from a material substance, but never from a spiritual one ; and above all, God is not a composite Being.

48. You may, however, object to this by saying that the essences of matter and of spirit do not properly form two portions in Brahm, but are united in him as in a superior unity, which is simple in itself, and of which these two essences are only subsequent developments. But the reply to this objection is obvious : first, the essences of matter and spirit have nothing in common, that could stand as their superior unity and origin ; and, secondly, no philosopher has ever spoken of the essence of an essence. Hence it is utterly impossible to make Brahm the common material cause of both the essences of spirit and matter. These two essences can with propriety enter into a substantial union, without confusion or commixtion, as they do in man, whose nature alone is a composition of spirit and matter, but can never constitute such a union as to form one only simple and unmixed substance. The union, therefore, of Prakriti and Adhyatma makes Brahm a composite being. Hence, Brahm is not simple, and consequently not God.

49. Moreover, if Brahm be God and infinite, his evolutions must also be infinite ; for they proceed either from the whole substance or solely from a part of it ; if from a part, he is again a composite, and consequently not an infinite being ; if from the whole, the evolved being too is necessarily infinite ; for the material cause and its effect are always and must be in proportion ; and there is no proportion between the infinite and finite. The world is, however, not infinite, and consequently neither is its material cause. Brahm, then, is either finite, or he is not the material cause of the Universe. The numerous examples adduced by the Hindu Philosophers in support of their theory indicate a very material representation of this divine evo-

lution : the spider's thread is a material secretion from its body, hair is as well a natural production from the matter of our body, as plants are of the earth, ice is substantially water, turds milk, a spark fire, foam, spray, drops and waves are finite parts of the finite sea. None of these similes are conclusive.

50. If Brahm be infinite, he is also immense ; his evolutions, then, must also be immense, because immensity is essentially indivisible and simple ; but the world is not indivisible and simple, not immense, and, hence, not an evolution of the immense Brahm ; or, if it be his evolution, Brahm himself is not immense. The immensity and simplicity of the Infinite Being do not admit of any but an infinite, immense and simple evolution. Such an evolution, however, cannot take place in a way adopted to form a second infinite Being (No. 21), but it may constitute a relation only within its one indivisible nature. But no such thing is taught of Brahm and his evolutions.

51. The Infinite Being is manifestly also immutable ; the mutability, therefore, which we observe in the universe cannot reside in Brahm, if he be infinite ; nor in his evolutions, which should be equally infinite and immutable. Which is therefore the finite and mutable subject of all these changes, since Brahm alone is said to exist ? From all this it is evident enough that Brahm, if taken as the material cause of the finite, composite, limited and mutable universe, is neither infinite, nor simple, nor immense, nor immutable, nor—in one word—God. He is decidedly nought else than the abstracted substance of the material and spiritual universe.

52. But again we are met by an objection, and in the opinion of the Hindu philosophers, by a very serious and insurmountable one. They say : " Two substances cannot co-exist in the same place ; hence, since the Supreme Being exists with all certainty ; the universe has no real existence, and is not a real evolution from Brahm, but merely an ideal or illusory one : it is a dream of Brahm."

53. We must consider, however, that it cannot be but a truly infantile philosophy, which transfers the qualities of matter to spiritual substances—nay, to the Supreme Being himself. Extension is a quality which pertains exclusively to material substances. It would be most ludicrous to speak of a long, broad, thick, round or square spirit. All spiritual substances are simple without extension. Hence, there is not the slightest difficulty for a spirit to occupy a place in which a material body is already existing ; as is the case with our soul, which is a spiritual sub-

stance, and occupies the same place as our body, and not merely some vacant space within the frame of the latter. Beginners in philosophy are usually taught to distinguish the circumscriptive presence in space of a material substance, from the definitive presence of a spiritual substance. A body is wholly present in the entire space it occupies, and the parts in the parts, but a spirit is not only wholly present in the whole space it occupies, but also in its entirety in the single parts of that space. Thus there is nothing to prevent us from saying that two different substances, the one material, and the other spiritual, occupy one and the same place.

54. Much more must we reject the assertion, that God is subject to the laws and qualities of matter, He, who created matter, imposed on it its laws and endowed it with extension. There is even not the least contradiction implied, when we say, that God, the Immense, exists substantially in our soul, like our soul does in our body, and that, consequently, three different substances are present in one and the same place, viz. God, our soul and our body. It may be true that two bodies, on account of their extension, cannot occupy one and the same space, without blending together into a natural union, and becoming a third different substance, as oxygen and hydrogen constitute water; but it is most unreasonable to philosophize thus of spiritual substances, which are essentially simple and exclude extension.

55. It is therefore wrong to establish the axiom, that two substances cannot co-exist in the same place, as a general rule, applicable also to spiritual substances—nay to God himself; and much worse, and worthy of commiseration it becomes, if by virtue of that falsely applied principle, philosophers try to persuade themselves of the illusoriness and falsehood of the testimony which their five senses, their common sense, their self-conscience and their sound natural reason furnish them of the reality of the world around us, which, were it really a deception, would be an unworthy mockery, attributable to Brahm himself, since both the deceiver and the deceived are either mediately or immediately, but properly and essentially he himself. Philosophy is not learned and taught with the view to dispute the reality of the world away, and to imbue the imagination with marvellous fictions in high-sounding abstractions, but to give us a consistent account of the world, and to guide us by the light of reason to the true knowledge and love of God, our Creator.

56. In the supposition even that the world were only an *ideal* evolution of Brahm, a thought or a dream of the Infinite Being, one of these two consequences must inevitably follow: either Brahm thinks his thoughts or dream his dreams in a real succession, because his thought of yesterday is already gone, and that of to-morrow not come yet, and then he is not eternal, not immutable in his thinking, and consequently not God; or, that all which appears to us to be going on in successions, is in Brahm's thought, and consequently also in itself, really immutable and eternally simultaneous; so much so that we are in fact *in the same time* unborn and born, alive and dead, still in yesterday and already in to-morrow. That is contradictory. Brahm, therefore, is not God, or open contradictions are possible. Give up either Brahm or your reason!

57. Brahm is neither a perfect nor a happy being. For, he either is in want of those evolutions for his perfection and happiness or not; if the former, he was not always and is not always God, for he was not always and is not always evolved; God, however, is always and eternally perfect and absolutely happy; if the latter, there is no other reason for him to evolve himself but either necessity or his free will. If he be necessitated to these evolutions by any extrinsic power, he is not the Almighty God, since there is than a Being superior in power to him; if by an intrinsic power, his perfection would not be infinite, since it requires something finite as a complement; and if he evolve himself by his free will, he is beguiled by an inconceivable folly to torture himself or his evolutions by immersing a portion of his substance, viz. our individual soul, into the material body for the sole purpose of seeing it re-enter (*sic*) after many sufferings into his substance, there to lose its individuality, and to become again what it was before. If Brahm be necessitated to this aimless torture of himself or of his evolutions, he is not only not almighty but also very unhappy; if not, he is very foolish or merciless; in neither case is he the absolutely free, happy, perfect and benign God, i. e. no God at all.

58. Brahm is also guilty of our errors and crimes; for, if our soul be an emanation and portion of Brahm, and our bodies a part of the developed matter which is likewise a portion of him, and if on the other hand there be no doubt, that from an absolutely pure and perfect source nothing defiled, sinful and contradictory can be derived, who can deny the consequence, that all the blame and shame which human ignorance, weakness and wickedness deserve are to be laid to Brahm's account? It

is a vain excuse to attribute the fault not to Brahm but to the influence of the three qualities* on the human mind; because these qualities are said to derive their origin from nature, and nature from Brahm. When, therefore, nature is not stainless, Brahm is to blame; or from what other source does the evil quality originate, since nothing exists besides Brahm? The guilt is even doubled, because Brahm permits our souls, another portion of himself, and consequently himself, to be sullied by those qualities. No Hindu philosopher has as yet succeeded in clearing his God of this charge of guilt, and to solve the riddle of the origin of evil.

59. Whoever is not influenced by inveterate prejudices, worldly interests or sinful stubbornness, will acknowledge the ineluctable result of sound reasoning, that there is an infinite distance between Brahm and the true God; that Brahm is not eternal, nor immutable, nor simple, nor perfect, nor almighty, nor happy, nor holy, nor bearing the slightest resemblance to the God of our heart and our reason, but is hardly anything more than a personification and deification of the essence of the spiritual and material Universe, and that nothing is more justly merited by the Hindus than the abovementioned censure of the Wise Man, who accuses them of adoring the works of the Creator instead of the Creator himself, who is infinitely more beautiful than all that he has made.

60. The adoration of the creature is *idolatry*, the most horrible and debasing crime imaginable, the exposed refined philosophical idolatry certainly not less than its popular form, the gross adoration of the dumb idols of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, of their wives, Saraswati, Lakshmi and Bhavani, and of those abominable, and of the Divinity most unworthy incarnations of Vishnu into animals such as the tortoise, the fish, the boar, of the revolting Gunesh, and of the other superior and inferior criminal and immoral gods and goddesses. Their adoration and the popular belief in the ignominious and shameless fables, in which their thefts, incests, murders and other crimes are celebrated, are in the history of mankind and of civilization the most deplorable instance of human degradation. We do well to shed tears of commiseration at seeing the poor Indian people, otherwise gifted with many excellent and amiable qualities, plunged and kept in the depths of so appalling a darkness and illusion.

* The three Gunas are literally: reality, impulse and darkness; but philosophically goodness, badness and indifference.

When will the time come for them to shake off the yoke of their idols and to enter a new era of truth, civilization and freedom? When will they turn from the path of infidelity and flee from the danger of its eternal punishment in Hell, to embrace the truth of the only one God, the Creator and Ruler of Heaven and earth, the judge of the good and the wicked, the almighty Father who has created us out of love, in order to give us a participation of his divine bliss in Heaven, if we follow Him and adore Him alone? Then another nation will be gained over to God, and will extend to us the brotherly hand which it now refuses, remaining far from us in cold separation and blind hatred. What a happiness, were we allowed to witness that time and to see all men on earth bending their knees in adoration to the one only true God, our celestial Creator, and to see His name, honor and glory known and extolled throughout the whole earth, by all His children, our brethren, in sanctity and justice, from generation to generation!