

**THEOSOPHICAL MISCELLANIES,  
NO. 1. THOUGHTS  
ON THE METAPHYSICS OF  
THEOSOPHY, PP. 1-113**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649444298

Theosophical Miscellanies, No. 1. Thoughts on the Metaphysics of Theosophy, pp. 1-113 by S. Sandaram Iyer

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**S. SANDARAM IYER**

**THEOSOPHICAL MISCELLANIES,  
NO. 1. THOUGHTS  
ON THE METAPHYSICS OF  
THEOSOPHY, PP. 1-113**



---

IN this pamphlet is reproduced, in a slightly modified form, an address, delivered at the Tinivelly Theosophical Society, by Mr. S. SANDARAM IYER, the Secretary of that Branch.

Although very far from an exhaustive or faultless exposition of the momentous questions discussed, this address is yet considered of sufficient merit to warrant its reproduction in the present form, and the grant to its author of the Third Class Certificate of Merit of the Society.

Of course it is in no sense authoritative. It embodies a good deal that is substantially correct, but also a good deal that is more or less erroneous. Many of its arguments are crude and feeble, or clumsily stated, and it is still in many respects, despite much trouble expended in correcting it, palpably open to adverse criticism. It would, however, be impossible now to improve it materially without entirely rewriting it, and thus destroying its identity, which would be unfair to its talented and zealous author.

But although neither authoritative, nor by any means the last word that has to be said on this vast question, it is eminently suggestive, and will certainly furnish the great bulk of Theosophists with valuable ideas and abundant food for reflection.

BOMBAY :  
*December 1882.*

---

BP  
547  
29 1/2

96 - weekly Lib  
7-14-39  
No 1

## CONTENTS.

<i>Section.</i>	<i>Subject.</i>	<i>Page.</i>
1.—	The Metaphysics of Theosophy ...	13
2.—	Lead to a knowledge of the Unconditioned Truth ..	<i>ib.</i>
3.—	Ontology, how far possible and impossible ...	<i>ib.</i>
4.—	All manifestations of Cosmos can be generalized and interpreted in terms of Matter and Motion (or Energy) ...	14
5.—	Such a solution of the Problem of the Universe is insufficient, and Metaphysics must be invoked to complete it ..	<i>ib.</i>
6.—	Western Science may consider Nature completely explained by reference to Matter and Energy, and all necessity for a final cause obviated ...	15
7.—	But many fundamental questions as to both these supposed primates remain to be answered ...	16
8.—	And though the Scientific doctrine of Evolution is rational and incontrovertible these questions must be solved if it is to rest on a secure basis ...	<i>ib.</i>
9.—	<i>What is Matter?</i> ...	<i>ib.</i>
10.—	<i>Were its ultimate units homogeneous or heterogeneous?</i> The most eminent scientists held the former view, which moreover accords with our experience of the operations of Nature ...	<i>ib.</i>
11.—	Assumed original Heterogeneity is only another phase of the special creation dogma ...	17
12.—	It is based on the supposition that there are 64 or more distinct elements in Nature—a view not supported by spectrum analysis ...	<i>ib.</i>
13.—	All modern science is leading towards the Homogeneity of Matter ...	18
14.—	The doctrine of the Unity of Force tends to support this view ...	<i>ib.</i>
15.—	Scientific testimony to the Homogeneity of Matter.—Mr. Spencer, Professors Stewart and Tait, Professor Jevons, Mr. Jean Story ...	<i>ib.</i>
16.—	<i>Were the ultimate material particles of equal or unequal sizes?</i> Their equality demonstrated ...	19
17.—	<i>Were the ultimate Units of Matter of similar or dissimilar shapes?</i> Their similarity demonstrated ...	20
18.—	<i>Were these units of equal or unequal weight?</i> Their equality demonstrated ...	21
19.—	The evolution of Cosmos out of a chaos of such ultimate particles involves the gratuitous assumption of Inertia and Gravity ...	<i>ib.</i>

<i>Section.</i>	<i>Subject.</i>	<i>Page.</i>
20.—	Even with this assumption, more is required before a Cosmos can evolve ...	21
21.—	What is the Force of Gravity? ...	22
22.—	On the hypothesis that Matter is a dead or inert substance, then either, first, Gravity must be a physical existence, possess inertia, and be in fact also Matter; but then what moves its units? Or, if <i>they</i> are self-moved, why may not the Units of Matter be so likewise? ...	<i>ib.</i>
23.—	Or, second, Gravity must be a mode of Motion, which is irreconcilable with the facts ...	23
24.—	If Gravity be an inherent power in Matter, then Matter will not have inertia and cannot be "dead" ...	24
25.—	Whence is Gravity? Two scientific theories ...	<i>ib.</i>
26.—	The Corpuscular Conflux Theory. Objections ...	<i>ib.</i>
27.—	The Corpuscular Efflux Theory. Objections ...	25
28.—	This theory equally fails to explain Repulsion, and is untenable ...	<i>ib.</i>
29.—	The simultaneous action in Matter of Attraction and Repulsion ...	27
30.—	Western Science fails to explain this mystery—Dicta of noted scientists on the subject—Herbert Spencer, Hudson Tuttle, Balfour, Stewart and Tait, Ernst Hæckel, Tyndall, Huxley, Jevons, Carlyle, Stoke ...	<i>ib.</i>
31.—	As a fact, despite tall talk, Western Science leaves all fundamental points hopelessly involved in utter mystery ...	31
32.—	Yet the scientific materialist ridicules all who contend for an intelligent final cause, as fascinated by mystery ...	32
33.—	Physical Science presents Force to us only as Motion, but is dumb in regard to the Motor, which our Philosophy declares to be THE ETERNAL BEING. <i>ib.</i>	<i>ib.</i>
34.—	Many modern Philosophers are, however: drifting to this same conclusion, as may be gathered from passages quoted from Herbert Spencer, Maudesley, Winslow, Brittan, Comte, Carlyle, Tyndall and Hæckel ...	33
35.—	Still many men of the highest culture cling to Atheism—this partly explained by quotations from Bacon and Cox ...	35
36.—	But the main causes as naively confessed by Professor Tyndall are the morbid delusions of a sickly intellect, for which the best cure is a course of Theosophy ...	36
37.—	Is Matter Eternal? First, has it existed from all Eternity? If so, did Matter begin to move in time, or has it moved from all Eternity? ...	<i>ib.</i>



<i>Section.</i>	<i>Subject.</i>	<i>Page.</i>
38.—	If Matter began to move in time, then has there been a time when Force failed to act upon Matter? Reasons for holding that Force (and its effect, Motion) must have been coeval with Matter ...	37
39.—	But has Matter moved from all Eternity? Reasons for holding that the Motion began in time ...	38
40.—	It follows that Matter has not existed from all Eternity ...	40
41.—	This may be proved another way ...	40.
42.—	Will Matter exist throughout all the future Eternity? No! Having begun in time, it must end in time. Matter can only be the outcome then of something preceding it, <i>viz.</i> , the Cosmic Forces, which are only kinetic modes or affections of the one Eternal Potential Force. Matter is not Eternal ..	42
43.—	The non-eternity of Matter may be otherwise inferred. Energy and Matter are the sole constituents according to some scientists of the visible universe. Owing to the constant deterioration and dissipation of Energy, the universe they hold will ultimately become one huge cold inert mass, and so continue for ever more,...	43
44.—	But Cosmic decay cannot stop here; the molecules of the mass will cease to attract each other; then the Atoms composing these will do likewise, and molecules cease to exist, then the ultimate particles of Matter will do likewise; the Atoms will cease to exist, and Matter will have disappeared out of the Phenomenal Universe ...	44
45.—	Doubtless this will not happen the first time the entire Universe agglomerates, for by this very agglomeration sufficient heat will be generated to start Matter on the evolution of a new Universe, but after each successive collapse the reaction will be feebler and feebler, and ultimately Matter must disappear ...	46
46.—	It may be urged that Gravity is not one of the correlated Forces, hence need not degrade, and hence inter-molecular attraction need never cease. The highest authorities—Faraday, Hudson Tuttle, Stewart and Tait, Winslow, Grove, Tyndall, &c—hold that Gravity is one of the correlated Physical Forces, and indeed it is impossible to conceive its isolation. So Gravity, and with it Attraction and manifested Matter, must ultimately disappear ...	47
47.—	The convertibility of Gravity into other Cosmic Forces may be otherwise inferred ...	49
48.—	Nothing in the foregoing to be construed as ignoring the conservation of Energy. Force will disappear	

<i>Section.</i>	<i>Subject.</i>	<i>Page.</i>
	out of the concrete, but only to be stored up in the abstract Universe ... ..	50
49.—	Resuming the foregoing, it may be fairly concluded that Matter is not Eternal ... ..	51
50.—	Many scientists concur in this view. Stewart and Tait, Jevons, Herbert Spencer, Crookes, and Clerk Maxwell quoted to this effect ... ..	<i>ib.</i>
51.—	The Problem of Force and Matter. Force can only be related in one of four different ways to Matter	
52.—	First, as a power extraneous to Matter—an hypothesis that cannot be accepted ... ..	<i>ib.</i>
53.—	Second, as a power inherent in, but distinct from, Matter—an equally untenable hypothesis ... ..	54
54.—	Thirdly, as a power inherent in, and <i>not</i> distinct from, Matter, which practically means that Matter is Force ... ..	56
55.—	Fourthly, as a function of Matter. This view is upheld by Hæckel, Bain, Tyndall and others, but this view is untenable; function is the phenomenal effect of Force—never Force itself. To call Force a function of Matter is to call the Cause the Effect, which is absurd ... ..	57
56.—	The only tenable solution is that Matter is Force, or more correctly one form or mode of Force ... ..	58
57.—	What is Force? Force is the intelligent primordial principle that <i>is</i> , and pervades all space and time	
58.—	Is infinite space <i>something</i> ? Yes! It <i>is</i> an infinite something, and, as can be shown, a positive infinite existence ... ..	<i>ib.</i>
59.—	Indeed, as may be proved in many ways, infinite Space is an infinite Plenum, the infinite intelligent principle ... ..	59
60.—	What is this Principle? Some say a Personal Deity, some an Impersonal Principle or Being ... ..	60
61.—	The Personal Deity Dogma involves grave difficulties	<i>ib.</i>
62.—	Especially in the relations of this Deity with Time, Space, Force and Matter ... ..	
63.—	The argument from design does not establish the existence of a Personal Omnipotent Deity—nay, the innumerable failures in design so palpable everywhere establish the conditioned and finite character of the intelligence to which that design is due ... ..	62
64.—	Moreover "person" involves "body," and "body," finity and relativity, so that no personal God can be what the ordinary Theist conceives his God to be ... ..	64
65.—	The alternative doctrine already supported by some of the more advanced modern scientists, like Hæckel, is Pantheism in the strictest sense of the	

<i>Section.</i>	<i>Subject.</i>	<i>Page.</i>
	word, and upholds an infinite substance as the Intelligent Potentio-Motive Force of the Universe	64
66.—	This Infinite Being may doubtless be said to be unconscious, incognizant, and unintelligent, but only in a relative sense, for, as explained, it is itself the consciousness, cognizance and intelligence of all things ... ..	65
67.—	It fills all space without break of continuity ... ..	67
68.—	It is a perfect eternal substance, the various modes of whose rhythmic automatic motion constitute the innumerable Cosmic energies, of very few of which Western Science has as yet any cognizance	69
69.—	Matter is first manifested in this perfect eternal substance as vortex rings therein, which constitute the particles of Ether ... ..	70
70.—	These vortex rings retain innate in them the mechanical forces of attraction and repulsion; other forces, undulations of the primal substance, of which these particles are a concrete mode, continue to act upon them, and the genesis of Cosmos commences ... ..	71
71.—	This genealogy of Matter is not opposed to the views of many eminent philosophers... ..	72
72.—	Most Theists and Scientists will, however, dispute it on various grounds, which however are not in the writer's opinion tenable ... ..	ib.
73.—	Further light is thrown by this view of the genesis of Matter on the question of its non-eternity, and the cyclic alternation of the evolution and involution of the Cosmos is explained by it ... ..	73
74.—	These alternations are only the Pralayas and Kalpas of the old Hindu Cosmogony ... ..	74
75.—	So the Infinite Potential Energy, the Kinetic Energy and Matter of the Universe which we have found to be scientific facts are only the Brahma, Ishwara, and Maya of this same Cosmology ... ..	ib.
76.—	Comparing the Cosmology of the modern science of the West with that of the ancient religion of the East, we find the latter far more comprehensive and more in accordance with the indisputable facts of the Universe ... ..	75
77.—	The Eternal Potential Force, Substance or Being, is the Alpha and Omega of Cosmos ... ..	78
78.—	Force, life, intelligence pervade all nature, but are not everywhere equally apparent to our limited faculties ... ..	ib.
79.—	Aggregates of ethereal particles, which exhibit even to our capacities the phenomena of life and mind, souls as we call them, are comparatively stable; aggregates of grosser particles which do not, to us,	