



Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. II

APRIL 1931.

No. 4

THE WOES OF BIRTH

*If thou would'st reap sweet peace and rest,
Disciple, sow with the seeds of merit the fields of
future harvests.*

Accept the woes of birth.

—THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE

With striking simplicity the great Buddha advised : Cease from evil, follow the good—that is the Way.

In æsthetic grandeur Natarāja, the dancing Shiva, expresses the same message. His right foot is firmly planted on the dwarf-devil of mean passions and cunning lusts, his left is raised heavenward—this is the vision of perfect balance.

This simple truth, reiterated in a thousand forms, is accepted by everyone. Because of its ready acceptance there is a rush for some charm to kill the devil and at the same time to reach to God. If people waited to analyse

the implications of the simple truth, they would not fall into the pit of complex living.

One of the major illusions of aspirants to a better and nobler life is the notion that if they could free their minds of evil, illumination would be theirs. Its counterpart glamours another large class, who fondly hope that if their minds could but perceive the eternal verities their passions would not matter. The truth is otherwise : minds coloured by feelings cannot see realities ; purified passions alone cannot cause enlightenment ; only those minds freed from desires but fecundated

by universal ideas know and realize liberty in bondage, serenity in suffering, bliss in woe. There is no true liberty without the bondage of sacrifice, no true serenity without the suffering of compassion, no true bliss save in the woe of action.

The upward advance of the Soul is a series of progressive awakenings. The meaning of each awakening is most often missed. The foetus seeing the light of day does not understand the phenomenon and closes its eyes to the light. The suffering man similarly closes his mind to the lesson of his own experience. Is not this due to the foetus trying to perpetuate its own outgrown condition, and the sufferer attempting to go back to the state ere his troubles began? Memory plays a trick on us by bringing the message of the past which is dead, instead of that of the present which is alive.

Nature in us multiplies her peace and joy, but we view them with the dead eyes of a ghost and name them strife and suffering. We are blind to the process of progressive awakenings within ourselves. We see only Nature red in tooth and claw—her storms, her earthquakes, her blows that reduce to powder all our emotions and thoughts. We see only the stronger beast preying on the weaker bird. We speak only of the might of Nature who covers with her deserts of sand the wisdom of the dead sages. Children of mortality, we befriend material forces. We fashion ourselves in pain, learn to walk by falling, and

drift through life brooding on the dead past which casts a shadow—a shadow which we mistake for our goal and call Death, the only sure future. Live as best as you can while you may—be kind, gentle and merciful, be good and be true, for the hell-fires wait.

Nature without us as within us is young, is prolific, is bountiful—it ever begins. There are no ends, no nights, no deaths. We see, or should learn to see, a new beginning in every end. Each night but heralds the morn. Each death is but a new birth.

To cease from evil we must cease to dwell on the past. To follow the good we must follow the new man of the coming future. To mould the coming man is the only fit task in the present. The power to mould abides in the Eternal Now—the universal and the impersonal within ourselves.

To feel impersonally is to cease from evil. To think universally is to do good. The former crushes the egotism in us; the latter unfolds the conscious knowledge that all power abides in the Self.

To be impersonal we must practise asceticism which expands, not contracts. To become impersonal a mother should not kill her love for her own children but expand it to embrace all orphans, all children of humanity—that is the sure way of killing her selfishness.

To be universal we must practise ideation (this implies study and meditation) which focuses the universal in the individual. That ideation must not be diffusive, for that but dissolves the in-

dividual into the universal. By the former we conquer Nature; by the latter Nature conquers us.

To be impersonal we must cease to act personally toward separate individuals; we must continue to act with the due recognition of *all* beings. To be universal we must cease to rest, but find repose in action performed with a detachment that produces no reaction. Thus human souls enter the community of Super-human Souls—

Those who wear the Robes of Law, of Purity, of Sacrifice.

"The tears that water the parched soil of pain and sorrow bring forth the blossoms and the fruits of Karmic retribution. Out of the furnace of man's life and its black smoke, winged flames arise, flames purified, that soaring onward, 'neath the Karmic eye, weave in the end the fabric glorified of the Three Vestures of the Path."

Ah, how long shall the mysteries of chelaship overpower and lead astray from the path of truth the wise and perspicacious, as much as the foolish and the credulous! How few of the many pilgrims who have to start without chart or compass on that shoreless Ocean of Occultism reach the wished for land. Believe me, faithful friend, that NOTHING short of full confidence in us, in our good motives if not in our wisdom, in our foresight, if not omniscience—which is not to be found on this earth—can help one to cross over from one's land of dream and fiction to our Truth land, the region of stern reality and fact. Otherwise the ocean will prove shoreless indeed; its waves will carry one no longer on waters of hope, but will turn every ripple into doubt and suspicion; and bitter shall they prove to him who starts on that dismal, tossing sea of the Unknown, with a prejudiced mind!

MAHATMA K. H.

SELF-REALISATION

[**Hugh P.A. Fausset's** *The Proving of Psyche* has been discussed in most thoughtful circles in Great Britain and in the U. S. A. Its significance was well brought out in a remarkable article we published last July from the pen of Mr. D. L. Murray.

For his literary work Mr. Fausset has been known long, and his studies on Cowper, Tolstoy, Coleridge, John Donne, Tennyson, and Keats have gained much appreciation; he has also written and edited some notable volumes of verse.

The passage from literary ideation to spiritual practice must lead an honest thinker to Theosophy, and in Mr. Fausset we discern with gladness such quickly unfolding Theosophical tendencies. In this article our readers will find numerous Theosophical ideas very admirably expressed. **THE ARYAN PATH** offers a hearty welcome to Mr. Fausset.—EDS.]

In his interesting article on Gandhi in the January number of **THE ARYAN PATH** Mr. Cole makes a very typical confession, typical because it would, I feel sure, find an echo in the minds of most practical Westerners to-day. He writes,—

As I read Gandhi's account of his inner life, I found this theme of self-realisation jarring on me again and again. I wanted him to care for truth and justice, for which he was ever ready to spend all that was in him, for their own sake, or for the sake of human happiness in general, or indeed for any reason other than the reason he gave. What, I felt again and again, could his self-realisation matter? Why could he not stop thinking of his own soul, and lose himself in the things he was striving for?

Mr. H. G. Wells confessed to a very similar feeling when he wrote that "the religious life, its perpetual self-examination for sin and sinful motives, its straining search after personal perfection, appears in the new light as being scarcely less egotistical than a dandy's".

The "new light" to which Mr. Wells refers is presumably the light of natural science, which by its laboratory methods for discounting personal prejudice has certainly encouraged within narrow limits a helpful habit of disinterestedness. The scientist, in short, tries in his researches to exclude, so far as he can, his own desires, tastes and interests, and if he seeks self-realisation at all, it is only as a precise calculation. That at least is the scientific ideal, although the well-known dogmatism of scientists in the past might seem to belie it. And the failure of the scientist to live up to his professed ideal was of course inevitable. For human beings are something more than measuring machines, and just because the personal will and feelings were forbidden entrance to and denied meaning in the temples of Science, they asserted themselves the more in the open forum. *Even Sir James Jeans, to take a recent example, being a pure mathematician, inevitably*

draws God in his own likeness. The externally effected impartiality of the laboratory worker, therefore, does not necessarily involve true disinterestedness. Instead of perfecting the self through self-discipline and fulfilling it by self-surrender, the scientist merely excludes for temporary convenience those forces and faculties in himself which might disturb his purely mental precision. But a truly disinterested vision can only be won by bringing all the forces and faculties of being into harmony both with one another and with the Mind of Life, with that Creative Reason, which, while it underlies and mysteriously informs the phenomenal world, transcends it too, existing in its own right and acting according to its own inherent laws and spiritual logic. And the ideal of "self-realisation" which jars so on Mr. Cole is simply a striving to achieve this unity. The phrase excites the modern Westerner's suspicions for another reason than that it runs counter to his scientific prejudice. Western civilisation came near to destroying itself sixteen years ago because for three centuries it had stressed with ever increasing emphasis the virtues of individualism. It had made the self-regarding impulses the basis of its life and its endeavour, and the European war merely exposed more nakedly than before a state of conflict and acquisitiveness which for years had drained the life of nations, societies, and individuals.

It would be too much to say

that the West has learnt its lesson, although its increasing desire to learn from the East is one among many hopeful symptoms. But it has at least awoken to the dangers that threaten any society, as they do any individual, in which the lust of self-seeking is allowed to dominate. And it is natural that such a convinced Socialist as Mr. Cole should be particularly suspicious of any attitude which suggests an unhealthy preoccupation with the self. For him in fact Gandhi's "self-realisation" is tiresomely egotistic. And this is necessarily so because the very word "self" has for his Western ears a stigma attached to it. Being ingeniously sure that "there is no God—in any personal sense, no divine guidance, no calling save the vocation that is in each man, no principle of unity in the world save the unity that is in the love and sympathy of one finite being for another," he cannot distinguish a striving to realise the "Supreme Self" from an indulgence of the local self. Of that Supreme Self we read in the *Gîtâ*—

The Self is friend to that self that has by self conquered self; but Self will be a very foe warring against him who possesses not his self.

And Gandhi's life, both in its victories and its defeats, can only be understood in the light of that text.

It cannot be denied that he who sets out to realise the "Supreme Self" enters upon a path fraught with dangers and delusions, of deaths and rebirths, such as the

man who merely accepts a finite world and devotes himself to its service can never know. For it is far easier to mistake the self for God than to realise the God within the self. Every Saint has fallen into this error and bitterly acknowledged it. And Gandhi, like Tolstoy, is no exception. "Exceedingly great," to quote from the *Gîtâ* again, "is the toil of those whose mind is attached to the Unshown; for the Unshown Way is painfully won by them that wear the body." To Mr. Cole, however, who professes no belief in "the Unshown" and is sure "there is no such thing as saving one's soul except in the sense of doing as well as one can the work in the world that comes one's way," those who are driven to devote themselves to self-purification are not working in any sense that he would recognise but only indulging in morbid introspection. Yet *the man who strives to spiritualise his being is striving to spiritualise the world*. For he is adding to the spiritual forces which by their subtle radiations determine the world's destiny.

And such work is no less selfless or calculated "to swell the sum of human happiness" than that of the social worker in the slum or the doctor in a hospital ward. Certainly every task to which a man devotes himself, inspired by faith and devoid of selfish thought or purpose, is a means of self-purification. For such a man is not tied by self-interest to the works which he performs, and so they do not fetter his soul but

are means by which he achieves union with the Soul of Life. And although Mr. Cole denies that there is a God, he unconsciously reveals his devotion to God in his championing of selfless service to humanity. What he fails to recognise is that such service cannot have any ultimate meaning, cannot indeed be truly selfless unless it be inspired by Deity. For there is no such thing as "the love and sympathy of one finite being for another". The moment one man forgets himself in love for another he has ceased to be a finite being. He has become a channel, imperfect though it may be, for infinite love, and by so doing he has entered on the path of true "self-realisation". But there are many milestones on that path, and Mr. Cole who would restrict all spiritual activity to the sphere of social service would do well to study the two forms of "Rule" laid down in the *Gîtâ*, the "Rule of Knowledge," and the "Rule of Works". The easier and doubtless the only one applicable to the majority of men and women at their present stage of development is the "Rule of Works," and it is this Rule which Mr. Cole, so far as we can judge him from his article, unconsciously follows himself. It consists in "doing as well as one can the work in the world that comes one's way" in a spirit of pure selflessness. And this, despite Mr. Cole's denial that he is religious, is a religious activity. For it makes of every act an offering of love, not merely to man, but to the God in man and

beyond him. But there are more advanced or God-intoxicated beings who may be called to a more stringent service. For these there is the "Rule of Knowledge," under which the devotee seeks by solitary meditation and self-discipline to attain to enlightenment and complete identity with the transcendent source of all being. To the active Westerner there seems something inhuman and even destructive in such abstracted isolation. Yet as Professor Whitehead has written,—

The great religious conceptions which haunt the imaginations of civilized mankind are scenes of solitariness: Prometheus chained to his rock, Mahomet brooding in the desert, the meditations of the Buddha, the solitary Man on the Cross. It belongs to the depth of the religious spirit to have felt forsaken, even by God.

And although such isolation is dangerous, it is doubtless necessary for certain souls and it involves a concentrated selflessness beyond the conception of the practical humanitarian. Such men, too, are not mindless of their fellows. But they recognise that their first task is to bring their individual beings into deeper unity with the Supreme Self. To the Westerner it may seem that the two Rules might in some measure be followed at the same time and Christianity which has combined the purification of self, both through solitary prayer and

through social works, has attempted this. Gandhi has done the same, and so far as he has failed, it is due not, as Mr. Cole suggests, to an unhealthy obsession of self, but to his impatience to champion social causes before his enlightenment, his "self-realisation" was complete. And *without such enlightenment, which can only come to him who strives to bring his personal self into perfect harmony with the Creative Spirit of Life, the humanitarian, despite his modern scientific equipment, is bound to err.* Moreover humanitarianism, uncentred in a divine principle, is ultimately meaningless. For ultimately and in his eternal uniqueness Man is alone with God. In Him he lives and moves and has his being, and into Him he dies. As Wordsworth wrote,—

Our destiny, our nature and our home
Is with infinitude, and only there.

And "self-realisation" is simply a deepening of that relation with the source and substance of all reality, without which a man is dead indeed. And although Mr. Cole has every reason to be satisfied with his own relation to life, it may be that the men who are to him so unnecessarily and tiresomely concerned with the saving of their souls are not more egoistic, but more spiritually sensitive than he.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

THE RELIGIOUS BASIS OF EVERYDAY CHINESE LIFE

[**Professor Kiang Kang-hu**, who is in charge of the Department of Chinese Studies at the Mc Gill University, Montreal, Canada, comes of a Mandarin family of Kiangsi. At the age of 16 in 1899 he was a selected student of the Peking Imperial Academy, where later he became Assistant Professor of Chinese History from 1905-1910. He was a founder and a leader of the Social Democratic Party in China in 1912-1913, after which he left his ancient land for the new world. There he became Instructor in Chinese and Lecturer in Chinese Culture at the University of California, receiving in 1923 the honorary Degree of Doctor. He has been serving the cause of Chinese Culture in the U. S. A., and is the author of 18 volumes in Chinese, 2 in Japanese, and 8 in English.

We take pleasure in welcoming a Chinese scholar among our contributors.

—EDS.]

The Chinese people in general are perhaps less formally religious than any other nation, and fewer Chinese belong to any particular sect, but the tenets of many religions form the substratum of their everyday living to an extent difficult for the westerner to grasp. The common beliefs in China are a mixture of different religions, especially of Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. These three have been so intermingled that they are indistinguishable to the common people. Many Chinese ideas and customs of everyday life are not of any one religion but are combinations of all three. To this mixed faith, which neither has a name nor is peculiar to a special sect, the majority of the Chinese adhere. Most Chinese revere equally Confucius, Lao Tzu, and Buddha, but they do not follow the teaching of any of these as a religion. The Chinese scholars follow Confucian doctrines in social and family relations, practise Taoist principles in private life, and

attend Buddhist services on the occasion of funerals or birthdays. They find no conflict among them, but feel them appropriate and harmonious. This is the very spirit of Chinese civilization.

Among these three religions, as probably among all religions in China and in the Orient at large, is a common belief in the Law of Causality. They all hold that any and all actions, manifested or otherwise, will surely bring back, either directly or indirectly, their reactions, favourable or unfavourable. As a general rule these reactions are recognised as corresponding to and in accordance with the original actions. So the Chinese proverb says: "When we plant melons, we reap melons; when we plant beans, we reap beans." Because many conflicting causes interact to produce various effects, however, the result may appear contrary to what is expected, so another proverb says: "Flowers may fail to bloom when we intentionally plant the seeds, while willow trees may grow up

when we unknowingly cast a branch."

The fundamental law of cause and effect is, however, undeniable, as applied not only to the material world but also to the mental and spiritual worlds, not only to abstract forces but also to individual conduct and the affairs of actual life. This law is called in Chinese *Yin Ko* (cause and effect) or *Pao Ying* (response or compensation). We should never doubt the law and never murmur against anything that happens in life.

It is explained in the Confucian classics as follows:

Accordance with the right is good fortune; the following of evil is bad: the shadow and the echo. (*Book of History*, Part II, Book II, Chapter 5)

On the good doer all blessings are sent and on the evil doer all miseries." (*Book of History*, Part III, Book III, Chapter 8)

Since Confucianism emphasizes family relations, its explanation of the law of causality, in its exceptional and seemingly contradictory cases, is that both cause and effect are hereditary through generations; so the response or compensation of our doings may come, instead of to ourselves, to our offspring, and that which we now receive may be from the results of the doings of our forefathers.* "The family that accumulates good deeds retains surplus blessings; the family that accumulates evil deeds retains surplus miseries." (*Book of Changes*, Diagram 11).

The Taoist philosophy taught

that "Calamity rests upon happiness and happiness underlies calamity" (*Tao Teh Ching*, Chapter 58). And, according to its masters, nothing is real and nothing matters much in the eternal life. We should remain always indifferent toward any cause or effect. Let nature do the work and everything takes care of itself. But they do believe in the law as it is described by Lao Tzu thus: "Heaven's net is vast, so vast. It is wide-meshed, but it loses nothing" (*Tao Teh Ching*, Chapter 73). The Taoist religion seeks the prolongation of life physically as well as spiritually and holds also the spiritual existence after physical death, when the law of causality will act upon the spiritual being.

Buddhism, like many other Oriental religions, teaches reincarnation. What we do not reap in this incarnation we shall certainly reap in the next or some distant future incarnation. This gives us some hope, and it explains the law of causality. The Chinese generally accept reincarnation quite simply as a fact. It is an essential feature of their composite philosophy.

Confucius and Lao Tzu are too dignified for home worship. Sakyamuni, Amitabha, and Kuan Yin are the common objects worshipped at home, aside from the ancestors and the kitchen God (*Tung Chu Ssu Ming*). We should notice here that the ancestor worship is a Confucian practice, the kitchen God is a Taoist in-

* This refers to what in Theosophy is named "Family Karma".--EDS.

vention, and others mentioned are Buddhist deities. So every Chinese family actually performs the rites of the three different faiths. The Three Lucky Stars (*San Hsing : Fu, Lu, and Shou*) and the Eight Genii (*Pa Hsien*) of Taoist origin, the eighteen Arhans (*Lo Han*) of Buddhist origin, and the twenty-four Examples of Filial Piety (*Erh Shih Ssu Hsiao*) of Confucian origin are all familiar subjects of Chinese art and literature.

The official sacrifice in every city to the city god, *Ch'eng Huang*, and in every village to the village god, *T'u Ti*, is a queer mixture of the three religions. Confucianism first spiritualised the earth and its sections, Taoist mysticism personified the individual gods of cities and villages, and Buddhist legends assigned to them their official functions in heavens and in hells. These gods in the unseen world correspond to the governmental officials in their respective ranks and localities. In the old holidays and on the first and fifteenth days of every lunar month, we still see big crowds coming from every corner of the country to worship in the temples. Before the Republic regime, local officials were required to be present there to lead the people in a ceremonial sacrifice.

Aside from religious belief, practical morality is taught at home and in the schools. Loyalty (*Chung*), filial piety (*Hsiao*), chastity for women (*Chieh*), and righteousness to all fellow men (*Yi*) are the four prime virtues of the individual life, while propriety

(*Li*), justice (*Yi*), incorruptibility (*Lien*), and sense of shame (*Ch'ih*) are said to be the four corner stones (*Ssu Wei*) of the nation.

Besides the Confucian and the ancient Taoist classics and novels which have great influence on moral life, both individual and collective, the most popular works in Chinese on religious and moral teachings may be grouped as follows: In Confucianism there are *Chin Ssu Lu* (Records of Immediate Thoughts), *Shen Yin Yu* (The Chanting Words), *Chih Chia Ke Yen* (Instruction of Family Administration), *Kung Ko Ke* (Classification of Virtuous and Vicious Deeds), all of the Ming Dynasty; and *Ch'uan Shan Yao Yen* (Important Advice on Moral Conduct) and *Sheng Yu Kuang Hsun* (Commentary on Imperial Edicts) by two emperors of the Ch'ing Dynasty. In the Taoist religion there are *T'ai Shang Kan Ying P'ien* (Supreme Laws of Cause and Effect) and *Yin Che Wen* (The Secret Virtues). Among Buddhist classics there are the Diamond Sutra (*Chin Kang Ching*) and the Heart Sutra (*Hsin Ching*), and a vulgar treatise of infernal conditions named *Yu Li* or the Jade Almanac. The last few on Taoist and Buddhist religions are more popular among the common people than any of the Confucian literature. It has been a custom for the local charitable societies to print and distribute these tracts annually to every family in the town and in the village. They are probably the best-read books

in China.

An ideal Chinese home is a large family with the parents and grandparents at the head, all brothers and their wives and children living together, each having a separate income, but each contributing a portion to the commonweal and all enjoying everything in the commonweal.

An ideal Chinese society would be one where the aged are respected, children are protected and educated, and the grown people properly employed; men and women discharging different duties, rich and poor receiving equal treatment, and virtue and knowledge occupying high social standing instead of force and wealth. In such an ideal society, people would value time more than money, attend more to self-cultivation than to social reform, seek mental contentment more than material comfort, and enjoy life instead of merely struggling for an existence.

Confucius's ideal society, "The Grand Union" (*Ta T'ung*) goes even farther, as he depicts:

Men do not love their parents only, nor treat as children only their own sons . . . They accumulate articles of value, disliking that they should be thrown away upon the ground, but not wishing to keep them for their own gratification. They labour with their strength, disliking that it should not be exerted, but not exerting it only with a view to their own advantage. In this way selfish schemings are repressed and find no development. Robbers, filchers, and rebellious traitors do not show themselves and hence the outer doors remain open and are not shut. (*Li Chi*, Book VII, Section 1)

This sounds very much like Plato's *Republic* or More's *Utopia*.

The Chinese have been taught to love their homes and their birth-places. Local patriotism has been highly encouraged. Most of the people do not care to travel and are content to live and die at home. Travel on vacations or for pleasure is new and uncommon to the Chinese. They travel only when it is necessitated by official or private business. Unless migrating with the whole family, the Chinese never like to stay away from the old home in their advanced age, and they often will that the body be sent to a clan cemetery in case of death. Even if they do live and die outside, they always go to the clubhouses (*Huei Kuan*) and are buried in the community graveyards (*Yi Yuan*) of their own local groups. Until very recently, provincialism has been stronger in every case than nationalism.

On the other hand, the Chinese are unaccustomed to national jingoism or to racial prejudices. They always tolerate foreign religions and approve of inter-marriage. Before the rise of the western powers, all foreigners in China were treated by the government and society equally with the natives. Confucian maxims taught them that "All under heaven is but one family" (*T'ien Hsia Yi Chia*), and "All within the four seas are brothers" (*Ssu Hai Hsung Ti*). The Chinese are the most cosmopolitan people in the world.

KIANG KANG-HU

AN HISTORICAL STUDY OF METAPSYCHICS

ORIGINS—PSYCHICAL RESEARCH PRIOR TO 1875

[H. Stanley Redgrove, B. Sc., A. I. C., was introduced to our readers in April 1930, when we promised these two instalments. The first, published below, is necessarily a rapid survey, but the competency and the wide knowledge of the author has enabled him to present a well-connected whole. He has omitted to mention the remarkable and epoch-marking phenomena which took place at the Eddy Homestead, and which are described in *People from the Other World* by Colonel H. S. Olcott, who later became the President of the Theosophical Society. That volume has an especial interest for the survey undertaken in this article, since in it is given a "Bibliography of Spiritualism and the Occult Sciences" specially compiled and the number reached is 270, ranging from 1200 A. D. to 1875, and even at that it is incomplete, as Colonel Olcott points out.

In our following issue we will publish the second instalment entitled "Psychical Research since 1875".—EDS.]

In the case of some of the more specialised sciences, it may be possible to assign to each a definite year of birth; but with the older and more general sciences, such as chemistry, botany, zoology and mathematics, nothing of the sort is possible. Their origins lie in the prehistoric past.

In a sense, this is true also of that very young science, Psychical Research, or, as Professor Richet has aptly named it, Metapsychics.

From the very earliest times, metapsychic phenomena have occurred within the ken of mankind. Ancient history is full of incidents seemingly of this character, and practically all religions have their origins in miraculous events.* There is, however, little or nothing in the available records that can be considered to possess evidential value. Miracles were

blindly accepted as evidence of either divine or diabolic powers. The agency of such powers was universally considered as adequate to explain the occurrence of such happenings. They were never investigated in order to discover whether some quite naturalistic explanation would not suffice to account for them.

Indeed, if we go back far enough in the history of man's thought, the word "psychic" ceases to have any definite meaning. We reach the stage of primitive Animism, when natural phenomena of the most diverse character were thought to be the result of the intervention of spiritual beings in human affairs.†

The confusion in thought between the realm of matter and that of spirit, as we should now regard it, persisted in certain quar-

*i.e. personal experience in psychology; see *Is Theosophy a Religion?* (P. 8) by H. P. Blavatsky.—EDS.

† Our author is a little hasty in his deduction; let him examine the tomes of ancient India. All powers of body, of psyche, of mind, of soul, and of spirit are treated.—EDS.

ters throughout the Middle Ages and even beyond. It is particularly marked in the writings of the alchemists, who, believing that metals had souls like men, and regarding vaporous forms of matter as being of a quasi-spiritual nature (witness, for example, such expressions as "spirits of wine," "spirits of hartshorn," etc.) sought for the soul of all material things and the universal panacea to cure these ills of the common metals which prevented them from all being gold.*

In this connection, it is, perhaps, of interest to note that a few years ago, a case was made out by Mr. Foster Damon† for supposing that the alchemical writings of Eugenius Philalethes (a pseudonym for Thomas Vaughan, who was born in 1622) are concerned, not with experiments of a chemical character, but with those of a metapsychic one, there being evidence, according to this writer, for believing that Vaughan had discovered that marvellous substance "ectoplasm," the question of whose reality will be dealt with in the second part of this Study. I should hesitate, however, to claim Vaughan as an early psychical researcher. We are here in the domain of interesting speculation rather than that of indubitable historic fact.

The attitude of mind which

attributes the occurrence of all unusual happenings to either divine or diabolic agency was very prevalent throughout the Middle Ages.‡ In her sacraments and rituals, the Church claimed to possess a magic (although she avoided this term) which would bring mankind into the most intimate contact with the divine powers. Outside this magic, all other magic was of the devil. The atmosphere was not encouraging to psychical research, or, indeed, to any type of research whatever. It was too dangerous. Nevertheless, folk did experiment along traditional lines with various magical rituals; and, in spite of the general stupidity of these and the fact that the objective was rarely, if ever, the advancement of knowledge, but was more usually the satisfaction of some personal appetite, I must confess that my sympathies are with the witches and wizards of old who dared to defy the Church and to challenge her monopoly of magic.

We can, however, hardly claim them as psychical researchers. Still less can we dignify by this appellation those whose business was the searching out of witches and wizards on the Church's behalf.

Towards the close of the fifteenth century, the absurd *Malleus*

* They were not so far wrong either. In subsequent issues we shall publish some articles by the well-known authority on alchemy—Dr. Eric Holmyard.—Eds.

† S. Foster Damon: "The First Matter," *The Occult Review*, Vol. 35 (London, 1922), pp. 38-44—H. S. R.

‡ I am, of course, writing of what was taking place in the Western world. So far as India and the East generally is concerned I do not feel competent to relate the facts or rightly to evaluate them.—H. S. R.

*Maleficarum** was compiled by two inquisitors, specially delegated by Pope Innocent VIII to stamp out witchcraft in the Catholic world, and many quite innocent persons were tortured and put to death. Protestantism was no less relentless in its persecution of all those suspected to be engaged in magical practices of an unofficial character, and witchcraft persecution reached its apogee in the abominable activities of Matthew Hopkins in England in the years 1644 to 1646.

Nevertheless, out of the horrible records of the witchcraft persecutions, some interesting facts emerge. There was, for example, the practice of exploring the body of a suspected witch with a pin to find an insensitive spot. As a matter of fact, anæsthetic spots frequently occur on the bodies of hysterical subjects, and the phenomena of hysteria are of great importance for Psychical Research.

The atrocious excesses of Matthew Hopkins produced the inevitable reaction. Men began to refuse to believe in the existence of witches: they sought mental relief in a species of materialism.

A new spirit was abroad. It was the scientific spirit, and perhaps the work of no two men did more to foster its growth than that of Francis Bacon and that of René Descartes. Men began to

turn their minds from within to without, to the examination of phenomena rather than to unsubstantial speculation. In a sense, we may say of the seventeenth century that in it the scientific spirit was born, though I am by no means forgetting that so far back as the thirteenth, Roger Bacon had formulated, in opposition to the prevailing Scholasticism, the foundations of scientific methodology. Its birth was signalled by the granting of a Charter to the Royal Society by King Charles II in the year 1662—one of the most notable events in the whole of British history, even if it is not always recognised as such.

The members of the Society were full of enthusiasm for the Baconian method. They were eager to try everything by the touchstone of experience. Among them was Joseph Glanvill,† a broad-minded, brilliant and versatile thinker, and a master in the art of expression in his native language. He, in particular, interested himself in stories of witchcraft and other psychic happenings, and may justly be claimed as a psychical researcher—perhaps, indeed, the first man worthy to be so called.

Glanvill, assisted by Henry More, Robert Boyle and others, compiled a collection of well-authenticated psychic happenings,

* The work has been translated with an Introduction, Bibliography and Notes, by the Rev. Montague Summers (London, 1928). The translator claims "supreme authority" for this farrago of malicious nonsense. See also his *The Discovery of Witches* (London, 1928), p. 25.—H. S. R.

† For a full account of the life and work of this remarkable man see H. S. Redgrove and I. M. L. Redgrove: *Joseph Glanvill and Psychical Research in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1921).—H. S. R.

which was not published in its complete form until the year following his death, namely 1681, when it appeared under the title of *Saducismus Triumphatus*, several later editions being called for.

The most interesting and impressive of Glanvill's "relations" is the account of the so-called "Dæmon of Tedworth". This is a record of metapsychic happenings of the type now known as "poltergeist phenomena" occurring in the house of a Mr. John Mompesson, of Tedworth, Wiltshire. The phenomena consisted of various noises and the capricious movements of various objects without any ascertainable physical cause. Moreover, it appeared that the cause was an intelligent one, since answers were obtained to questions by means of a suggested code of knocks. Unfortunately, however, this line of experiment, which might have proved fruitful, does not appear to have been followed up. Unfortunately, also, most of Glanvill's stories are related at second hand: it was not then realised how unreliable human testimony may be.

Phenomena of a similar character occurred in the years 1716-17 in the Wesley's house at Eppworth when John Wesley was a boy at school. Some years later, John collected all available evidence concerning the matter and published an account of it in *The Armin-*

ian Magazine.* The story is of considerable interest, but the fact that Wesley's mind (unlike that of the sceptical Glanvill's) was of a credulous type, preferring supernatural to natural explanations for everything, tends rather to discount its evidential value.

It was the occurrence of phenomena of the same type at Hydesville, New York, U.S.A., in the years 1847-48, that laid the foundations of modern Spiritualism. But before dealing with these phenomena, some reference is necessary to the work of Mesmer (1733-1815). Mesmer's true character is difficult to estimate; but if he was in part charlatan, it is nevertheless true that he initiated the study of the phenomena now grouped under the term "hypnotism". This word was coined by James Braid (1796-1860), who rejected the theory of "animal magnetism" with its postulation of a "fluid" which passed from the operator to the subject.† Strangely enough, this earlier theory, however absurd it may now seem in the light of present knowledge concerning the power of suggestion over the human mind, would appear to have been in pretty close concordance with scientific views then prevalent concerning such other phenomena as those of heat, light and electricity, although it did not gain acceptance in the scientific world and served to retard the study of the pheno-

* For a full account see *The Eppworth Phenomena*, collated by Dudley Wright (London, 1917).—H. S. R.

† Braid's very important work on hypnotism, *Neurypnology*, was reprinted with a Biographical Introduction by A. E. Waite in 1899.—H. S. R.

mena concerning the reality of which there could be no doubt.

In connection with the study of "somnambulism" and allied phenomena, mention should be made of Frederica Hauffe, better known as the Seeress of Prevorst, whose case was closely studied by the physician and poet, Justinus Kerner.* During the years 1822-29, whilst more or less seriously ill, this extraordinary woman claimed to see and to be in communication with numerous beings belonging to the realm of departed spirits, concerning whom she made a number of remarkable revelations. Kerner asserts that on one occasion he saw a spectre, with whom the seeress was speaking, which "looked like a pillar of vapour, or cloud, of the size of a man".

Her utterances, however, attracted relatively little attention: the Hydesville phenomena, on the other hand, were epoch-making in their effects. By means of a code of raps, communication was established with the hypothetical spirit supposed to be the cause of the noises and movements. The spirit claimed to be that of a peddler who had been murdered and whose body had been buried in the cellar of the house. The cellar being dug up, a portion of a human skeleton was discovered.†

The phenomena seemed in some way to be associated with two

young girls, the Fox sisters, who were resident in the house, similar manifestations occurring in their presence when the family moved to Rochester. Tremendous interest and excitement was created. Here, by means of specially gifted persons, it seemed that an opportunity presented itself for communicating with the inhabitants of the spiritual world. One could, in a sense, be restored to loved ones, who, alas! were dead. The Fox sisters became professional mediums. Other folk discovered that they, too, possessed mediumistic powers, and Spiritualism not only spread like wild-fire through the United States, but made considerable progress also in Europe, taking upon itself all the characteristics of a new religion.

Some years later, namely in 1888, the Fox sisters "confessed" that the whole thing was a fraud on their part; but in the year following they formally repudiated this "confession," the incident serving to illustrate the mental instability which is typical of so many mediums, whose protestations of innocence and confessions of fraud (unless accompanied with verifiable details as to the manner of its perpetration) must alike be treated as worthless. In the case of the Fox sisters, the incidents accompanying the alleged confession are far more suggestive of a

* His work, *Die Seherin von Prevorst* (The Seeress of Prevorst), was translated and abridged by Mrs. Crowe (London, 1845).—H. S. R.

† This is the account given by Alfred Russel Wallace in *Miracles and Modern Spiritualism* (London, 1881), p. 147. I am not prepared to vouch for its accuracy. No doubt it was the account of what happened accepted by those who became converts to Spiritualism. Those who regard the "mediumship" of the Fox sisters as fraudulent will, of course, reject it as a fable.

—H. S. R.

"put-up job" than are those relating to its retraction.

Naturally the phenomena attracted the attention of men of science, though in most cases their attitude was hostile. Amongst notable, psychical researchers in the early days of Spiritualism special mention may be made of Professor Zoellner* in Germany, William Crookes† in England, and Professor Hare‡ and J. W. Edmonds,§ the last not a man of science but a noted lawyer—in the United States. Their work, however, is of unequal value. In these early days of psychical research, it was not clearly realised that a very special technique was called for in investigating the phenomena, and that even men of science, well trained though they might be in accurate observation, were not necessarily adequately equipped for the task. A case in point is provided by Professor Zoellner, who carried out a series of experiments with the medium Slade. Zoellner had formulated an interesting theory of the "fourth dimension" to account for certain supernormal happenings and devised some admirable experiments to verify its truth. None of the experiments succeeded, at any rate in the manner anticipated. But other and similar results were obtained, which Zoe-

llner considered adequate as a demonstration of his theory. Reading his book, I cannot help picturing a man, whose work had never brought him into contact with guile, a man almost obsessed with a brilliant theory, being easily tricked by the crafty Slade.

Crooke's experiments, however, are, in my opinion, of outstanding value; and the very title of one of his earliest papers on the subject, published in *The Quarterly Journal of Science* in 1871, "Experimental Investigation of a New Force," is indicative of the truly scientific spirit in which his researches were undertaken. That a hitherto unknown force manifested itself in the presence of certain individuals was demonstrated in his experiments with D. D. Home. Still more remarkable results were obtained in experiments with Miss Florence Cook, eventuating in the complete materialisation of a personality calling itself "Katie King". The evidence obtained by Crookes that "Katie" was not Miss Cook skilfully disguised should be read to be appreciated.

Of outstanding importance also is the Report of a special committee set up by the London Dialectical Society, published in 1871. This committee, which was composed of a number of distinguished

* See his *Transcendental Physics*, translated, with a Preface and Appendices, by C. C. Massey (London, 1880).—H. S. R.

† See his *Researches in the Phenomena of Spiritualism*, reprinted from the *Quarterly Journal of Science* (London, N. D.).—H. S. R.

‡ See his *Experimental Investigation of the Spirit Manifestations* etc. (New York, 1858).—H. S. R.

§ See the Memorial Edition of his *Letters and Tracts on Spiritualism* (London, 1874), also J. W. Edmonds and G. T. Dexter, M. D.: *Spiritualism* (two volumes, New York, 1854-55).—H. S. R.

persons, after prolonged investigation, found conclusive evidence for believing in the reality of a number of supernormal phenomena, including the movement of heavy objects without any ascertainable physical means, and the production, in a like mysterious manner, of noises, by means of which, through a pre-arranged code, intelligent replies to questions could be obtained.

Indeed, it would seem that those who patiently investigated

the subject were invariably rewarded with positive results, whilst those who pooh-poohed it rarely, if ever, had bestowed any serious attention to its investigation.

How difficult it would prove, however, to sift the wheat from the chaff and to arrive at any satisfactory explanation of the phenomena of Spiritualism and allied extraordinary happenings, further investigation alone was to show.

H. STANLEY REDGROVE

Theosophy can be styled the enemy of Spiritualism with no more propriety than of Mesmerism, or any other branch of Psychology. In this wondrous outburst of phenomena that the Western world has been seeing since 1848, is presented such an opportunity to investigate the hidden mysteries of being as the world has scarcely known before. Theosophists only urge that these phenomena shall be studied so thoroughly that our epoch shall not pass away with the mighty problem unsolved. Whatever obstructs this—whether the narrowness of sciolism, the dogmatism of theology, or the prejudice of any other class, should be swept aside as something hostile to the public interest.

—*The Theosophist*, Vol I.

HEAVEN AND HELL

[B. M. is an old-world man living by his old-world methods in our era. We are fortunate in having secured a few reports of his talks to his intimate friends. The *Bhagavad-Gîtâ* is the book he has mastered through long years of study and meditation; but further, having lived according to its tenets more successfully than is generally possible, his thoughts breathe a peculiar fragrance. The papers have been translated from the vernacular: it should be understood that they are not literal translations, and the translator has adhered more to ideas and principles than to words. Although B. M. knows English, his inspiration becomes impeded in employing that medium of expression and so he prefers not to use it. We think our readers will find real inspiration in this series.—EDS.]

“The gates of hell are three—desire, anger, covetousness, which destroy the Soul; wherefore one should abandon them.”

—*Bhagavad-Gîtâ*, XVI. 21

The ancients knew what we moderns are beginning to believe, that heaven and hell, Svarga and Naraka, are in ourselves. Religions have distorted the old truth and have made heaven and hell distant localities, instead of states of human consciousness, which they are. The Soul's imprisonment and its deliverance do not depend upon movements in material space, but upon motions in spiritual space *i.e.* on elevating or lowering the ideation inherent in our own consciousness.

When a man is in the slough of jealousy or despondency he is in hell; when his thoughts soar to visualise selflessness and compassion he is in heaven. The great Buddha reiterated the fact that this earth is the lowest of hells that our humanity touches. After-death conditions for most men who die natural deaths are pleasanter than are experiences in embodied life. We suffer here,

and dying *naturally* enjoy the reward of virtues practised, and are compensated for suffering according to the merit of each. It is the intuitive perception of this truth on the part of mankind which is responsible for the belief that death makes all men holy and pure. Death does not transform a sinner into a saint; but deprived of the possibility of committing fresh sins, he gets his due from the compassionate law of Karma, in such rest as he has himself merited.

These reflections will lead the student to perceive that each one is here and now in heaven or hell, according to the state of his thought-feelings. Our moods which come and go are but visible expressions of the inner states of our thought-feelings. In the same city dwell demoniacal beings and Divine Mahatmas; in the same village are to be found the idle and the industrious; in the same

family one is selfish and another thoughtful of all; nay, in the same breast surge the cruelty that destroys and the courage that succours. It is true that "each man his prison makes".

After death the state of the Soul is a continuation of its state as an incarnate being.

And yet each one of us should literally dread the hell-fire; most are ignorant that they are very near to it, and many burning in that pit are unaware of that fact.

The impure and wicked will not *go* to hell, they are *in* it. That is why they do not know the nature of action nor of cessation from action. The untruthful man is in hell already and his punishment begins the moment he is found out, and even before! Those who deny the existence of Soul or the Spiritual nature of this universe are in a hell of their own; and some such who are dependent on their corpus of flesh and blood and nothing higher and who advocate and practise sense and sex "enjoyment," die in hell, to be reborn here in hell again—"with natures perverted, enemies of the world they are born to destroy".

This sounds gruesome, because the idea is presented with some directness. Ponder over it in the light of the teachings of the *Gîtâ* and its accuracy will not be denied.

There arise the practical questions—how to get out of the hell in which one may find oneself, and also what would keep a man from

falling over the precipice into a fresh hell?

Krishna definitely states that there are three gates which lead us into hell: *Kama*-Passion, *Kro-dha*-Anger and *Lobha*-Greed. If we learn how to avoid these three we have turned our face heavenward. All mortals are afflicted, in small measure or great, with these three; without exception for any and every one these cause pain and suffering, in due course. We name pain and suffering as hell—they are not, for they are at once punitive and purgative. We are not in hell when we *suffer* from our lust and anger and avarice; we have passed out of hell into purgatory. We are in hell when we are lustful and angry and greedy. Hell's one characteristic is its power to cause forgetfulness, loss of memory, and the man in hell knows not that he is there. He is stunned by the blow which his own lust and anger and greed have given him; when he comes to life, that is, remembers his crime, he is out of hell.

Memory, then, plays a very important rôle. If we can always remember; if we do not lose our power to recollect; if every time we near the cause of passion-power-pelf we collect ourselves and exclaim "Get thee behind me," then in that process we purge ourselves and are ready to experience something heavenly.

Our deeds flow from our thoughts and feelings; the strength of will manifests according to the power of our thoughts and feelings; our motive is the hidden

spring of our ideas and emotions. Therefore, we must begin there—we must question the motive of every thought-feeling, every word, every deed. Selfishness of motive is the outcome of dwelling on petty, mean, low, commonplace thoughts. Such increase egotism and selfishness. As we dwell on great and noble thoughts, impersonal feelings, universal ideas, a

new force energises us, and this purifies our motives, gives them a new tone, a new direction. This leads to an inner conversion, and our outer life expresses the change for the better. Thus a man leaves hell behind, and entering heaven makes of earth a new place—no more a wilderness but a veritable Garden of Eden.

B. M.

My ideas of to-day and yours are tinged with those of youth, and we will thus forever proceed on the inevitable line we have marked out in the beginning. We of course alter a little always, but never until our old ideas are extended. Those *false* ideas now and then discarded are not to be counted; yet they give a shadow here and there. But through Brotherhood we receive the knowledge of others, which we consider until (if it fits us) it is ours. As far as your private conclusions are concerned, use your discrimination always. Do not adopt any conclusions merely because they are uttered by one in whom you have confidence, but adopt them when they coincide with your intuition. To be even unconsciously deluded by the influence of another is to have a counterfeit faith.

Spiritual knowledge includes every action. Inquirers ought to read the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ*. It will give them food for centuries if they read with spiritual eyes at all. Underneath its shell is the living spirit that will light us all. I read it ten times before I saw things that I did not see at first. In the night the ideas contained in it are digested and returned partly next day to the mind. It is the study of adepts.

Let no man be unaware that while there is a great joy in this belief there is also a great sorrow. Being true, being *the Law*, all the great forces are set in motion by the student. He now thinks he has given up ambition and comfort. The ambition and comfort he has given up are those of the lower plane, the mere reflections of the great ambitions and comforts of a larger life. The rays of truth burn up the covers time has placed upon those seeds, and then the seeds begin to sprout and cause new struggles.

—W. Q. JUDGE

AL-HALLAJ, MYSTIC AND MARTYR*

[Dr. Margaret Smith is a well-known authority on Islamic subjects. Her *Rabiā the Mystic* has been spoken of highly. Our readers were made familiar with her work in March 1930, when she wrote on "Persian Islamic Mysticism," and again last December when she presented "The Path according to Al-Hujwīrī". In subsequent numbers we shall publish her studies on "Abu-S'aid," on "Suhrwadi," and on "Al-Jili".

As our author points out Al-Hallaj proclaimed "ana-al-ḥaqq: I am the Truth," a fact clearly indicative of his concept of Deity as the Omnipresent and Omnipotent Spirit, not a personal, anthropomorphic, extra-cosmic God. Our readers will do well to bear this in mind while reading this article. Jalal-ud-din Rumi, himself a mystic, understood what was meant and in the fifth book of the *Masnavi* he says:

O prattler, Mansur's "I am He" was a deep mystic saying,
Expressing union with the Light, not mere incarnation.

And Rumi protested against Mansur's execution—

Whene'er an unjust judge controls the pen,
Some Mansur dies upon the gibbet then.

Mansur's experience of becoming one with Deity is the experience of the Yogi in Samadhi, of reaching mukti or emancipation.—Eds.]

al-Ḥusayn b. Mansūr al-Ḥallāj was born about 858 A. D. at Bayḍa in Fārs, in S. Persia, and one writer tells us that his grandfather was a Zoroastrian.† He spent his boyhood at Wāsiṭ in Irāq, and at the age of sixteen went to Tustar, where he became the disciple of Sahl ibn 'Abdallah Tustarī, for two years. Sahl, while asserting the supreme omnipotence of God, taught that man must make an effort to develop the inner life. The first step towards this was repentance; and for teach-

ing that repentance was a necessary duty—being apparently the first in Islam to do so—he was banished to Basra, whither he was followed by al-Ḥallāj. The latter, after making the pilgrimage to Mecca, returned to Baghdad, and associated himself with the Ṣūfīs there, and especially al-Junayd. This well-known Ṣūfī leader taught that the souls of the saints in a state of pre-existence had dwelt in the Presence of God, and that He was leading them through the transient existence of

* My references are to the text of the *Kitāb al-Ṭawāsīn*, edited by L. Massignon, Paris 1913; to the *Recueil de Textes Inédits concernant l'histoire de la mystique en pays d'Islam* (L. Massignon, Paris 1929—a collection of Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Urdu Texts); and to Massignon's *Quatre Textes Relatifs à al-Ḥallāj*. There are biographies of al-Ḥallāj by 'Aṭṭār and Jāmī.—M. S.

† This is interesting. A certain school of esotericists in India holds the view that the early centres of Sufi learning and labours received help from Zoroastrian scholars who worked secretly because of the religious persecution of their community. Will some Parsi scholar investigate and expound what influence Zoroastrianism exerted in the development of Sufi doctrines?—EDS.

this world back to that primeval state, when they would again dwell for ever with Him.

al-Hallāj studied with al-Junayd for a long period, living a life of severe asceticism. He then took a journey to Khurāsān, Sijistān and Kermān, and, returning to Fārs, began to preach in public, calling the people to God, teaching them the necessity for repentance, and for the offering of the self to God in prayer and renunciation, and telling of the gifts of God to His saints. Because he could read the secret thoughts of men and unveil what was in their hearts, as the wool-carder separates the grains from the cotton, he was called "the carder of consciences," "Hallāj al-asrār," and the surname of al-Hallāj remained with him. About 905 he went off on a missionary journey to India, Khurāsān, Turkistān and China, and earned the titles of the Intercessor, the Clear-sighted, the Ascetic, the Ecstatic. After this he went again on pilgrimage to Mecca, for the third time, and there spent two years in solitude. It was then that he felt he had attained to the mystic union and that the words which he spoke and the deeds that he did were not of himself, but that God was speaking and acting through him. He returned to Baghdad and settled down there, discussing with the Ṣūfīs and preaching in public.

In 913 he was arrested for preaching heretical doctrines and remained in prison for more than eight years, until his death in 922.

He spent the last night of his life in his cell, in prayer, and when his servant begged for a last word, al-Hallāj said to him, "If thou dost not enslave thy self, it will enslave thee." He was taken to the place of execution, scourged with five hundred stripes and his hands and feet cut off. Then he was crucified, holding intercourse the while, in ecstasy, with his Lord, and saying:—

O my God, I am about to enter into the abode that I have desired, and there to contemplate Thy marvels! O my Lord, since Thou dost manifest Thy love even to one who does Thee wrong—how then wilt Thou not manifest Thyself to one who is wronged thus for Thy sake?

On the morrow he was taken down from the gibbet and was heard to say with a loud voice, "What the true lover seeks is to be alone with the One." He was then decapitated and his ashes strewn upon the surface of the river. That night al-Shiblī, one of the Ṣūfīs, besought God, saying, "How long wilt thou slay Thy lovers?" and the answer came to him, "Until they find the price I pay for their blood." And al-Shiblī said, "O Lord, what is Thy blood-wit?" and God replied, "To meet with Me, and to behold My Beauty is what I give in return for the blood of My lovers."

‘Aṭṭār, the poet, speaks of al-Hallāj as "that Martyr in the Way of God, that Lion of the Thicket of the Search for Truth—that Diver in the Tempestuous Sea," and holds him up as a pattern of devoted love drawn by an irre-

sistible attraction to the contemplation of the Face of God; one who was rapt away into ecstasy by the flaming love which consumed him. While the doctrines of al-Hallāj were condemned by the orthodox, and the opinions of later Muslim writers concerning him have varied considerably, Sūfīs of the succeeding centuries saw in him a genuine theosophist, one who was intoxicated by his love of God to such a point of rapture that he believed himself to be united with the Divine Essence, and he is to be blamed only because, being entrusted with such high knowledge, he revealed to those unfitted to receive it, the mystery of the Godhead. By the mystic poets of Persia al-Hallāj was regarded as a martyr, whose passion for the Divine caused him to lay down his life in order that he might attain to perfect and abiding union.

al-Hallāj's doctrine of saintship, based on his own personal experience, is set forth in the *Kitāb al-Tawāsīn*, which takes its name from Tā Sīn, two mystic letters found at the head of certain Sūras in the Qur'ān. In al-Hallāj's teaching "Tā" signifies the Eternal Purity (Tuhūriya) of the Absolute, and "Sīn" His Everlasting Glory (sana). There are many other fragments of the writings of al-Hallāj, which also give an insight into his mystical teaching.

He teaches the transcendence of God, who is above all the limits of the creatures, existing as an Uncreated Divine Spirit.* In one of his prayers on the last night of his life al-Hallāj declared:

It is in Thy grace that we must seek refuge, and in the splendour of Thy glory, light, so that what Thou dost will, Thou wilt make to appear at the last. For it is Thou who art God in Heaven and God upon earth.† O Thou who hast set up the heavens and fashioned all forms, O Thou before whom substances are abased and that which is contingent prostrates itself—by whose decrees bodies are formed, and in whom judgments are formulated. It is Thou who dost manifest Thyself, visibly, when Thou wilt, to whom Thou wilt, as Thou wilt, as Thou hast manifested Thyself under the image of "the fairest form" (that of man), a form which contains the spirit, alone adorned with knowledge, eloquence and liberty, wherewith to witness to Thee.‡

God, then, he regarded as Pure Being, and the phenomenal world as simply the reflection of Being on not-being; He was "al-Haqq," the One Reality, the Creative Truth.

But while affirming the transcendence of God, al-Hallāj did not deny that He was accessible to His saints. From the statement, contained in the Qur'ān, that God had made man in His own image, al-Hallāj developed his doctrine of the creation. Before all things, before the universe was created or conceived of,

* Readers will do well to note the adjective "uncreated" implying ever-existing, the Hindu concept of Sat—the background of all manifestation, misnamed creation.—Eds.

† This is the doctrine of the two Selves—the lower incarnate, the Higher shedding its light on the lower from the inner depths of Being.—Eds.

‡ *Kitāb al-Tawāsīn*, p. 206—M. S.

God in His unity held ineffable discourse with Himself, and contemplated the splendour of His own Essence. That self-contemplation was Love, for al-Hallāj held that love was of the very essence of God, and in His perfect isolation God displayed His glory in Love. God then desired* to project outside of Himself, in order to regard it, this Love in Aloneness. He then looked into eternity, and brought forth out of nothingness an image of Himself, endowed with all His attributes and all His names: this image was Adam. His Divine look made this form to be His image unto everlasting. He saluted it, glorified it, chose it, and as He manifested Himself by it and in it, this created form became Himself, God manifested in human form.†

al-Hallāj, though he is frequently called a pantheist, is rather a panentheist; he would maintain not that all is God, but that all is *in* God, who is also above all. Adam was the primal type of man, created to be the manifestation of God, but others have this capacity within them. God created the human body, subject to the defects of a transient reality, and implanted within it the spirit, which is an immaterial principle. Man has, therefore, a double

affinity; being joined to a body with all its limitations, he allows himself to become a slave to matter, and to recede from the Divine, but at the same time, his body was destined to be a vesture for the Divine glory, and is a prefiguration of the real affinity which man has with God, and which he will experience if he becomes pure.‡ “He who is clothed with the garments of truth,” says al-Hallāj, “becomes the Truth.”

To al-Hallāj there were two natures in God, the Divine (lāhūt) and the human (nāsūt), a doctrine which he evidently took from Syrian Christianity, where these terms are used to denote the two natures of Christ. But al-Hallāj conceives of the “nāsūt” as the whole human nature, body and spirit, and the “Divine nature” can be united with the human only by a kind of “indwelling” (ḥulūl), which is really an incarnation of God in man. al-Hallāj sums up his doctrine of the creation, and of the possibility of this “indwelling” of the Divine in the human in his verses:

“Praise be to Him who revealed in His humanity the secret of the glory of His radiant Divinity,

And who then shewed Himself to His creatures in the form of one who came eating and drinking,

* Once again the Hindu and Theosophical doctrine: “Desire first arose in It” (Ṛgveda) of which H. P. Blavatsky says—“The earlier Vedic description of Kama alone gives the key-note to what he emblemizes. Kama is the first conscious, *all embracing desire* for universal good, love, and for all that lives and feels, needs help and kindness, the first feeling of infinite tender compassion and mercy that arose in the consciousness of the creative ONE FORCE, as soon as it came into life and being as a ray from the ABSOLUTE” (*Theosophical Glossary* “Kamadeva”)-EDS.

† *Kitāb al-Ṭawāsīn*, p. 129-M. S.

‡ This is the doctrine of Kumaras or Manasa-Putras descending to join the Lunar-Pitris ascending in the scale of evolution; or the Christian doctrine of the fall of angels; the Greeks taught this in the myth of Prometheus bound. See H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*, Vol. 11., pp. 475-505 and pp., 519-528.—EDS.

Obedience to the will of God will necessarily be expressed in the service of man. Speaking of the qualities of the mystic al-Hallāj says: "He is one whose heart is possessed by a piety well-pleasing to God: he concerns himself only with the future life, he cares only for God—he weds only with good actions." We have a story of his rebuke to a co-religionist for abuse of one who was not of his own faith, to whom al-Hallāj said, "Judaism and Christianity and Islam and other faiths have different titles and are called by different names, but their aim is the same, not different."* This story shews a spirit of toleration rare in his time, and a sense of the claim of all men upon their fellow-men. His charity extended even to the animals, and we are told how a disciple went out to the desert in search of al-Hallāj, and found him there with a starving dog. al-Hallāj bade the man bring him food, and the disciple went back with a couple of loaves, with which al-Hallāj fed the dog, and then gave his attention to the man's request. He devoted many years of his life to the winning of souls to God, and in his teaching he gave much prominence to the virtue of charity in the widest sense of the word. One of his last prayers, at the place of exe-

cution, was for those who were about to take his life:

These servants of Thine, who are gathered here to take my life, out of zeal for Thy religion, and to win Thy favour, forgive them and have compassion on them, for if Thou hadst not concealed from them what Thou hast revealed to me, they would not have done what they have done. And if Thou hadst hidden from me what Thou didst hide from them, I should not have suffered this affliction. Praise be to Thee in whatsoever Thou dost, and glory to Thee, whatever may be Thy will.†

By humble obedience to the Divine Will, and by love to God and man, the mystic could pass along the Way of Purgation, and become cleansed from the hindrances to that indwelling of the Divine in the human, the union of the soul with God, which was the aim of his quest. al-Hallāj was asked once who was the true lover of God, and he replied, "the true lover of God is he who rests in nought, and gives to none other a thought from the moment when he sets forth to seek until he hath found what he sought."

Swift for Thy sake I sped o'er land and sea,
And clove a way through wold and steep,
heartfree
And turned aside from all I met, until
I found the shrine where I am one with Thee.‡

When the Uncreated Divine Spirit becomes united with the created human spirit, the two natures dwelling in one shrine, then the saint becomes the living and personal witness of God.§

* *Kitāb al-Ṭawāsīn*. No. 53—M. S.

† "Quatres Textes" 52—M. S.

‡ Tr. R. A. Nicholson—M. S.

§ To paraphrase this in terms of what H. P. Blavatsky calls the ten fundamental propositions of the Oriental philosophy, the third of which runs thus (*Isis Unveiled*, 11. p. 587): "Man is also triune: he has his objective physical body; his vitalizing astral body (or soul), the real man; and these two are brooded over and illuminated by the third—the sovereign, the immortal spirit. When the real man succeeds in merging himself with the latter, he becomes an immortal entity."—EDS.

When that shrine has been emptied of self, then it can be filled with the fullness of the Divine Unity. The mystic union, to al-Hallāj, is a reality; he speaks of it thus in some of his mystic verses:

Thy Spirit is mingled with my spirit;
 as the wine is mingled with pure water,
 And if anything touches Thee, it touches me.
 And lo! in every case Thou art I.*

This mystic union does not mean the disappearance of the human soul, but its sanctifying resurrection; the total renunciation of itself by the soul leads to its immortality by God. al-Hallāj said:

When God desires union with one of His servants, He opens to him the door of remembrance of Himself, and then the door of proximity to Himself; then He makes known to him the doctrine of the Unity,—then He takes him into the abode of His own Unicity, and there reveals before him His Glory and His Beauty. And when that servant's gaze falls upon the Divine Loveliness there it remains; the servant passes away from self and abides in God.†

When God has penetrated the human soul, the personality becomes defined and reaches its perfection, and the saint has the right to say "ana al-ḥaqq," "I am the Creative Truth,"‡ the supreme word in the Hallajian mysticism. It is the statement of the saint who knows himself to be deified by the Divine Spirit, to be the Witness chosen by God to represent Him to the world. So al-Hallāj says of himself, "I am Thy actual witness; Thou dost recog-

nise my essence as the Supreme Essence—Thou hast taken my essence to serve Thee as a symbol among men." Therefore he said to his generation "If you do not recognise God, at least recognise His signs. I am that sign, I am the Creative Truth."§

In this saying al-Hallāj summed up his whole mystical theosophy. He was the first among the Ṣūfī mystics to give precise expression to the ideas about the nature of God, and the conception of a reciprocal relation between the finite—the human, and the Infinite—the Divine, with which his predecessors among the Ṣūfis had concerned themselves, but which they had not been able to formulate into a definite doctrine, or at least, had not dared to make accessible to all. The teaching of al-Hallāj, then, is the affirmation of an experimental mysticism which is to be helpful to all who are fitted to receive it, a mysticism based upon repentance, renunciation of the world, and the offering of the self to God. Its aim is the mystical union of the soul with God through love. In this union, the personality of the saint persists, perfected and deified, and the union is effected by the "indwelling" of God in man, so that the saint can say, as al-Hallāj said—and paid with his life for his boldness—"I live, yet not I, but God liveth in me."

MARGARET SMITH

* *Kitāb al-Ṭawāṣīn*, p. 134—M. S.

† *Recueil*, p. 68—M. S.

‡ The saying for which al-Hallāj is famed, and for which he was accused of blasphemy.—M. S.

§ *Kitāb al-Ṭawāṣīn*, p. 51—M. S.

REINCARNATION IN ENGLISH POETRY

[**Philip Henderson** who is rapidly making his mark among men of letters has already written in this journal on Indian and Chinese poetry.

Not a few people were surprised when E. D. Walker wrote in *The Path* a series of articles on the subject of this present one, which developed into the well-known *Reincarnation: A Study of Forgotten Truth*, first published in Boston in 1888, by Houghton, Mifflin and Co.; therein some forty poets were quoted. To-day even E. D. Walker would surely be surprised at the almost universal acceptance of the doctrine, in one phase or another.

In addition to poets quoted by Mr. Henderson, the theme has been dwelt upon by Kipling, Andrew Lang, H. W. Nevinson and many more, especially in America.

The more the idea is understood and applied, the sooner the Way to Contentment, which is Enlightenment, will be entered upon. On the mind which dwells upon Reincarnation the great Truth dawns—

Ye suffer from yourselves. None else compels,
None other holds you that ye live and die
That which ye sow ye reap. See yonder fields!
The sesamum was sesamum, the corn
Was corn. The Silence and the Darkness knew!
So is a man's fate born.

In 1889 H. P. Blavatsky wrote (*Lucifer*, Vol. IV, p. 188): “If the doctrines of Reincarnation and Karma, in other words, of Hope and Responsibility, find a home in the lives of the new generations, then, indeed, will dawn the day of joy and gladness for all who now suffer and are outcast.”

Never the spirit was born ; the spirit shall cease to be never ;
Never was time it was not ; End and Beginning are dreams !
Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit for ever ;
Death hath not touched it at all, dead though the house of it seems !

The Song Celestial.

The belief thus sublimely formulated in the *Gita* has been for many years past implicit in the work of Western poets.

It is true that its presence in their work has, until more recent years, been more like a seed germinating and spreading its subtle roots through the mind than a belief shaping and dominating their whole vision as in the East—more like an undercurrent of

dream, from time to time glimpsed and remembered, but kept in abeyance by custom and environment. But all through the nineteenth century, poems were being written that reveal the hauntings of this belief, until in America Emerson and Whitman made their powerful contribution to spiritual thought and openly affirmed their faith in the soul's indestructibility through reincarnation.

Through their influence and the great revival of interest in Oriental thought in England under Sir Edwin Arnold and others, the translation of the Indian scriptures together with the impetus given by W. Q. Judge, "A. E." and the Irish Literary Movement, the belief gradually took a firmer hold upon the Western mind—until to-day it is triumphantly voiced by John Masefield, England's Poet Laureate, as his *Creed*.

I held that when a person dies
His soul returns again to earth,
Arrayed in some new flesh disguise.
Another mother gives him birth.
With sturdier limbs and brighter brain
The old soul takes the road again.

Such was my own belief and trust,
This hand, this hand that holds the pen,
Has many a hundred times been dust
And turned, as dust, to dust again ;
These eyes of mine have blinked and shone
In Troy, in Thebes, in Babylon.

All that I rightly think or do,
Or make, or spoil, or bless, or blast,
Is curse or blessing justly due
For sloth or effort in the past.
My life's a statement of the sum
Of vice indulged, or overcome.

He concludes :

So shall I fight, so shall I tread,
In this long war beneath the stars ;
So shall a glory wreath my head,
So shall I faint and show the scars,
Until this case, this clogging mould
Be smithied all to kingly gold.

Here, indeed, we have the final statement of a belief that was merely a flitful haunting, glimpsed in moments of intuition, to such men as Rossetti, Browning and Francis Thompson. Nevertheless, the latter wrote with every appearance of certainty in his *Night of Foreboding* :

All dies :
Lo how all dies ! O Seer,
And all things too arise ;
All dies, and all is born ;
But each resurgent morn, behold more near
the Perfect Morn.

Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote in a moment of exultation in his *Chambered Nautilus* :

Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll !
Leave thy low-vaulted past !
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outworn shell by life's unresting
sea !

The idea of the body as the soul's temporary mansion, common as it is, has inspired some of the most sublime poetry. Thus Wordsworth in his *Ode to Immortality* envisages the soul descending from the bright realms of eternity to take on fleshly shape. And as the souls in Plato's *Phaedo* before entering life drink the waters of Lethe, or forgetfulness, so to Wordsworth—

Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting,
The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar :

But in limiting a soul by an earthly body the remembrance of what went before need not be lost. He sees man as

Thou, over whom thy Immortality
Broods like the Day, a master o'er a slave.

Well known as the poem is, it cannot be quoted too often. It is indeed one of the most glorious in the English language, more true in its vision than the vast structures of the yet theologically-crabbed Milton. But two centuries earlier than Wordsworth, Edmund Spenser, the Platonist, is still more explicit in the statement of his belief in the working of karmic laws. In one of his hymns he writes :

So every spirit, as it is more pure,
And hath in it the more of heavenly light,
So it the fairer body doth procure
To habit in, and it more fairly dight
With cheerful grace and amiable sight:
For of the soul the body form doth take:
For soul is form, and doth the body make.

Before Spenser this clear-sighted belief had, since the Greeks and Romans, been involved in the obscurity of the Middle Ages, and after him it lapsed again until, during the nineteenth century, chance sights or sounds or the falling of a certain light once more began to open doors in the memory, revealing in a lightning flash obscure and scarce-known depths of the soul. Thus Rossetti writes in his *Sudden Light* of such a moment of intuition:

I have been here before,
But when or how I cannot tell:
I know the grass beyond the door,
The keen sweet smell,
The sighing sound, the lights around the shore.
You have been mine before—
How long ago I may not know:
But just when at that swallow's soar
Your neck turned so,
Some veil did fall—I knew it all of yore.

Thus, too, W. E. Henley, looking at a Toyokuni colour print of a lady "flowing-gowned and hugely-sashed, with pins arow," glimpses something of a previous life in Old Japan. He has forgotten, he says, what part he took in that life—

Child although

I have forgotten clean, I know
That in the shade of Fujisan,
What time the cherry orchards blow,
I loved you once in Old Japan.

.

Dear 'twas a dozen lives ago;
But that I was a lucky man
The Toyokuni here will show:
I loved you once in Old Japan.

Again "A. E."—George Russell—in a moment of deeper memory in his *Babylon*

To-day was past and dead for me,
for from to-day my feet had run
Through thrice a thousand years to walk
the ways of ancient Babylon.
On temple top and palace roof
the burnished gold flung back the rays
Of a red sunset that was dead
and lost beyond a million days.

The wave of phantom time withdraws:
and that young Babylonian maid,
One drop of beauty left behind
from all the flowing of that tide,
Is looking with the self-same eyes,
and here in Ireland by my side.
Light of my life in Babylon,
but Babylon has taken wings
While we are in the calm and proud
possession of eternal things.

Browning's philosophical poems are permeated with the idea of reincarnation, and, as in *Paracelsus*, he was continually guessing at some previous existence:

At times, I almost dream
I too have spent a life the sage's way,
And tread once more familiar paths.
Austin Dobson, too, begins his poem *To Myrtalé* with:

Myrtalé when I am gone,
(Who was once Anacreon)

and concludes it by asking his friend to enshrine "these annals of my heart," his poems, and to label them "Ashes of Anacreon".

But if after ages of forgetfulness, the men of the last century were only glimpsing at an inner truth lost to their fathers, the poets of to-day, to take only those of England and America, are stating their belief in reincarnation more and more clearly, heralding the renaissance of an ancient knowledge. We have already instanc.

ed Massfield. Even in the work of such a sceptic as Rose Macaulay there is that strange poem *The Door*, where, as the poet watches her friend standing the other side of a bonfire, a door of vision opens on to the past and she recognises the witch that was burned at that place centuries ago:

Through eddying wreaths I saw your eyes
Narrowed as if you were
In mirth or pain, or sharp surprise,
Or fear too keen to bear.

The hazel leaves had a sob and a thrill
As if they watched men die;
And the centuries tumbled at the shrill
Sharp, long-forgotten cry.

The lit leaves cracked, the flame put out
A quivering glutton's tongue;
The cruel beach-trees pressed about
To see you burn so young.

The red fire leapt and lit your face;
I wanted—you were so white
To have come once more to the ancient

place
Of red pain and black night.

Clifford Bax's *Traveller's Tale*, a long philosophical poem, is pregnant with the idea of reincarnation, and James Stephens, another Irish mystic, in his poem *The Soul*, has built a very monument to immortality:

Fast not, nor pray! But only know,
He is—I am—And all is done!
The Deed of Time is finished! Lo,
Thy self to Thine of self art won!
Thou shalt not seek, nor have reply
For Thou Art That in blink of eye.

Thou know it all! 'Twas hid within
Thy Memory! Call but to mind
This—that Thou Art, and Death, nor Sin,
Soul conquer Thee again! Nor bind
Thine action! Nor make Thee seem
A Dreamer, lying in a Dream!

—lines which recall the "Birthless and deathless and changeless"

condition of the spirit, the "End and beginning are dreams" of the *Bhagavad-Gita*.

But out of America, the home paradoxically enough, of a new materialism, it would seem that new spirituality, founded on the essentials of ancient belief, is coming to birth. The movement began with Whitman when he committed to *Leaves of Grass* the triumphant consciousness summed up in the line—

I am an acme of things accomplished
and I an encloser of things to be.

He felt himself—

Aged beyond computation, yet even
new, ever with these mighty laws rolling.

And to-day the tradition of belief is carried on by such moderns as Vachel Lindsay, Bliss Carman, Louis Untermeyer and Don Marquis, becoming ever more closely woven into the texture and fabric of their thought. Thus Lindsay in his poem *The Chinese Nightingale* shows us an old Chinaman in San Francisco listening, as he hears the washing, to the song of the nightingale, symbolising the voice of his soul. As the nightingale sings, the Chinese lady who was his lover in ages past reappears to him and asks—

Have you forgotten
Deep in the ages, long, long ago
I was your sweetheart, there on the sand
Scorn-worn beach of the Chinese land
and his soul, the nightingale, answers:

Life is a loom weaving illusion, . . .
I remember, I remember . . .
and over and over again he repeats—

One thing I remember:
 Spring came on forever,
 Spring came on forever,

As Carman sings of the
 ending and progress of the soul
 death in *Triumphalis*:

Then from the mould again,
 Springing disaster,
 Spring shoots unfold again,
 Follow them faster
 Out of the drear domain
 Of dark, defeat, and pain,
 Following the Master.

Thou shalt take heart again,
 No more despairing;
 Play thy great part again,
 Loving and caring.

Merriam in *How Much of*
Head asks:

At great struggles was I felled,
 What old lives I laboured long,
 Was given a world that held
 Meadow, butterflies and song?
 Ah, what cleanings and what fears,
 At countless raisings from the dead,
 Could see her, touched with tears,
 Bow the little weary head.

On Marquis overhears the
 tales of other lives and, recalling
 things of former bodies, recog-
 nizes his indissoluble karmic link
 with them and feels the unalte-
 ring law of retribution shaping
 his destiny:

Things I never wrought I must still atone,
 Money pay for them that I have not slain.

Dust that was flesh of mine moulders in many
 a tomb,
 Grown that were flesh of mine circle me here
 in the gloom.

I have heard cries through the night in a
 tongue I cannot speak,
 And they knocked on my heart and blanned
 my clock,

What is my life the more?—the visible life
 that seems,
 Or the hours when I drift at the whim
 Of a shade through the hurrying brouse of
 dreams.

Thus the testimony to the great revival of belief in reincarnation could be prolonged for many pages more, and anything like a full list of quotations would need a book rather than an article, where space is limited, to contain it. But enough has been said to indicate the growing influence of this belief on the modern mind. Its presence has indeed always been perceptible in the work of many poets, whether as a mere inkling or, as with Massfield and Whitman, a firm and settled conviction. But to-day, when the influence of narrow theological dogma is so much less and the popular mind is in many quarters turning with dissatisfaction from the established church, the way is once more open in the West for the belief in reincarnation to claim its ancient dominion.

PHILIP HENDERSON

STRAY THOUGHTS ON EASTER

ARE NOT THE GOSPELS PAGAN ?

[A Native of India submits for the consideration of Christians some views which, though not unfamiliar to students of comparative religions and to mystics, are generally unknown.]

On the subject of the Cross as a universal symbol, our readers' attention is invited to H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*, II, pp. 553-562.—EDS.]

During the Easter holidays the Universal Christ will be crucified again—perhaps with a little more intensity than usual. He has been nailed to the Cross these two thousand years, since the greater part of Christendom visualises the Crucifixion only, and worships the Death of the Saviour. It is incapable of understanding the Resurrection. Children and parents at home, pupils and teachers at school fully recognize how Jesus came under the law and along with two thieves was executed according to the then prevailing custom. That to them is an historical fact. The other—the event of the Resurrection—is not a living reality; it is a myth, a beautiful myth, a myth with a message, but a myth all the same. And those who like to think of themselves as practical people desire to profit by the *lesson of history*. Such people also let the myth give to them a little of its refreshment and exaltation once a year—by remembering it and then forgetting it. This may sound sarcastic. The writer only feels sad and articulates these thoughts in all seriousness.

The reaction from the belief in the Bible as the Holy Word of

God is seen in the view that it is an interpretation made by religious recluses who were devoid of any historical sense and ignorant of the elementary knowledge of science. The Higher Criticism bridges these extremes. Its most valuable help to Christendom in the reorientation of religious outlook has been the death-blow it has delivered to the church dogmas. While the Higher Criticism has dealt justly with the church interpretation of the Bible, it has been more than a little neglectful of, and unfair to, the poets whose works grace the pages of the New Testament. It is still fashionable to class together the poetry of the Gospels and the dogmas of the churches. There is not any great attempt to distinguish between the Gospels as history and the Gospels as myth. The truth of the prosaic facts of history is recognised, but the view is not generally accepted that a truth of equal if not greater value may be enshrined in the poetic myths. How many would concede that the life and labours of Jesus, recorded in the Gospels, are written in a cipher, and written not for the purpose of imparting historical

information but in the hopes that certain suggested spiritual verities may inspire, and may become subjects of study and of contemplation?

Those who are familiar with the old Eastern method of composing myths see in the Gospels that device at work. How did the ancient historians, who were poets and seers, reason? In this wise:—What value has any historical fact if it be not endowed with its spiritual message and its *universal* application? Is there any event, purely realistic in the material sense, without its soul and its romance? Are not all world-circumstances but shadows of spiritual happenings? And therefore does not true realism belong to the Spirit-World, ours being the world of shades? Consequently is it not true that history is not a document of mundane facts but a drama of supermundane forces projecting itself in the world of human beings? Would we not be false to our vocation if we chronicle but the puppet-show of mortals without disclosing the hidden purpose?

Not only Dravidian and Aryan, but also Buddhistic literature show unmistakable marks of this view. Its influence on the Gospel chroniclers must be taken into account. That influence was perhaps personally exerted by the disciples of the Thera-Puttas, the Buddhist Missionaries who left their country in the reign of Asoka and whose effort made an impress in Egypt, Greece and Judæa. Is it not possible that the writers of the Gospels

were among those who were brought up in the Asiatic tradition and who employed the Asiatic technique in dramatising the life-events of Jesus?

This digression gives the opportunity to express a hope that at least a few Christians may re-read the Gospels from the old oriental point of view. Professing atheists, destructive anarchists, proud disbelievers, as well as interested politicians, like those of Bolshevik Russia, have pressed into their service the findings of the Higher Criticism. Why should not, then, mystics and idealists make full use of another aspect of the Higher Criticism in the cause of a truly moral renaissance? Study of the Higher Criticism reveals a constructive side which if properly investigated and meditated on would deepen the religious outlook. We should not permit the work of the Higher Criticism to stop at the death of separative creeds; we must utilize it and lead it to bring to birth a cosmopolitan, a catholic, a universal Religion capable of binding the different races of men into a splendid Brotherhood. Padris cannot use that weapon which the Higher Criticism has unearthed, for then they would drive the last nail into the coffin of church, mosque and synagogue. View the Gospels as an attempt at giving a Christian shape and form to certain *universal* truths which inspired the entire pagan world at one time, and which fell not only into disuse but also into misuse. The universal character of these spiritual verities indicates

the grand possibility of once again uniting peoples by the bond of faith—belief illumined by reason and knowledge. Read the Gospels as Christian translations of universal facts of mystic experience, and their lack of the historical and scientific sense will no longer be an obstacle.

Christendom interprets the Gospels as the life-story of a unique Being. No one was born as Jesus was born; no one taught as Jesus taught; no one died as Jesus died. Human intelligence revolts against this view, especially when it perceives the uniformity of Nature, the infallibility of her laws of sequence and succession. Suppose Christendom were to awaken to the fact that such uniqueness is a fiction which cunning has imposed as a fact on credulity!

How many Saviours can we not name who at birth were threatened with death (yet always escaped) by an opposing power, call it Kansa or Mara or Herod? All of Them were tempted, persecuted and finally said to have been murdered; then They all descended to the Nether world, Naraka, Hades, Hell to save the Souls of the damned. On Their triumphant return They all became transformed into Gods. Then They were given the epithet of *Soter*—Saviour. Such is the biography of Tammuz, of Horus, of Atys, of Memnon. The poets who composed the Gospels “plagiarized” the old pagan stories, just as Shakespeare “plagiarized” his plots, characters and incidents. Political Imperialism

compromising with religious fanaticism nailed Jesus to the Cross like a criminal—but is that the Cross to which the Gospel poets refer? No. Their vision discerned the Real Immortal Cross, the symbol of the Mysteries in Greece, in Egypt, in Persia, in our India—the Mystery of Vithoba at Pandharpur, and that even more ancient one of Vishvakarma, the Divine Carpenter, who sacrificed himself to HIMSELF.

The Mystery of the Cross or the Sacrificial Death has two aspects:—(1) The great cosmic event, the descent of Deity, or Avatara—Incarnation of the Word-Verbum-Logos, or Sabda-Brahman in Sanskrit; and (2) the great human event, the Ascent of the Conqueror, man become the Super-Man, Jivan-Mukta, the *Life-Saviour*. In the human kingdom there is a continuous descent and ascent, crucifixion and resurrection of the Christ in man. Among the Immortals from age to age—yuge-yuge—cycle by cycle, there is a Descent of Righteousness so that man may rise, abandoning the heresy of separateness, into the Kingdom of the Living sending forth the cry—“O God, my God, how thou dost glorify me!”

“Blasphemy,” thunders forth the orthodox fanatic, and by no means is he dead. “Arrant nonsense,” asserts the scientist, though nowadays he is hesitant to do so publicly. “Superstition, beautiful superstition, I grant,” cries the man or woman who finds good in all things—religion, science, art—and is the all-potent compromiser,

"It is a fact, for thus have I heard," repeats the lover of Religion but not religions, the seeker of the verities of Soul-Science, the student who compares ancient and modern philosophies and extracts the essence from them all.

Let the Christian turn Pagan. Then he will see the greater than historical truth of the Crucifixion Myth. Then he will begin to worship the Resurrection. He will

learn that nobody died or need die for him. *Crucifixion being a Process of Life is universal and omnipresent.* The Cross in Nature is the Tree of Life on which the flower of Resurrection blooms and bears the fruit of Ascension. Within the fruit is the Seed of Supreme Life, that is, of all Divine Incarnations, which we Hindus call the Bij which is Maha-Vishnu.

A NATIVE OF INDIA

The *Sanctum Sanctorum* of the Ancients, *i.e.*, that recess on the Western side of the Temple which was enclosed on three sides by blank walls and had its only aperture or door hung over with a curtain—also called the *Adytum*—was common to all ancient nations.

Nevertheless, a great difference is found between the secret meanings of this symbolical place, in the esotericism of the Pagans and that of later Jews; though the symbology of it was originally identical throughout the ancient Races and Nations. The *Gentiles*, by placing in the *Adytum* a *sarcophagus*, or a tomb (*taphos*), and the solar-god to whom the temple was consecrated, held it, as Pantheists, in the greatest veneration. They regarded it—in its esoteric meaning—as the symbol of *resurrection*, cosmic, solar (or diurnal), and human. It embraced the wide range of periodical, and (in time) punctual, *Manvantaras*, or the re-awakenings of *Kosmos*, Earth, and Man to new existences; the sun being the most poetical and also the most grandiose symbol of the same in heaven, and man—in his re-incarnations—on Earth.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine*, II. 459

VEDIC CHRONOLOGY

A CASE FOR 11,000 B.C.

[**Professor S. V. Venkateswara** of Mysore University is pushing the Vedic era to a period which will not be readily assented to by the dogmatic belonging to more than one sphere of modern knowledge. Our author, however, is fighting his fellow Orientalists, among whom he is a shining light, with their own weapons and the case he has made out is unanswerable. Fresh enquiry may push the era further back, and if teachings of the ancient Esoteric Doctrine are studied, surprises will be in store for our learned author himself. The article examines Vedic Chronology from three points of view; we wish the talented Professor had added in his astronomical examination the consideration of the origin of the Hindu Zodiac. Also, we think the time is overdue to examine critically some of the old myths and find their historical significance, and use them in fixing Vedic ages. Thus, for example, when did the Great Deluge, so fully described in the eighth Adhyaya of the *Satapatha Brahmana* occur? Interested readers will find a wealth of material on both these items (the Aryan Zodiac and the Indian Flood) in the two volumes of *The Secret Doctrine*.—EDS.]

Much has been written on the chronology of ancient India based on a study of the Vedic texts. But western scholars who studied the subject in the critical and scientific spirit were unfortunately imbued with the false deductions which Archbishop Ussher had drawn from the Hebrew records. Repercussions of Ussher's work are visible in the writings of our earliest Orientalists like Sir William Jones and Charles Wilkins and Max Müller, who was undoubtedly prejudiced by the theological atmosphere of Oxford. To them the world was created in 4004 B. C. and Noah's Deluge was in 2349 B. C. It was therefore unthinkable that the Vedic Aryans could have entered India before about 2000 B. C. The detailed artificial chronology based on this belief was built up by Max Müller and is clung to tenaciously by the living writers of his school. How potent his influence has

been, was clear when scholars like Prof. Keith interpreted the names of Vedic Gods and heroes appearing in the inscriptions of Western Asia, belonging to centuries eighteen and fourteen B. C., as relics of the Aryan march into India. They were thus impelled to bring the beginnings of Vedic culture further down within a measurable distance of about 1200 B. C. The obsession by a time-honoured prejudice in the matter of chronology blinded them to such obvious facts as the mention of the Himalayas in those inscriptions, which points *inter alia* to a migration not eastwards to India but westwards from this country. If any other evidence were needed in favour of a revision of Vedic chronology, we have it in the excavations in the Indus valley which take us back to the fifth millennium B. C., as shown in the January (1930) number of this Journal.

It is agreed upon among scholars that there are different chronological strata in the vast collection known as Vedic literature. The Rg-veda is the earliest, and of its hymns those embodied in Books 2 to 7 form the earliest stratum, those in Books 8 to 9 are later, and in Books 1 and 10 the last. The data of the Yajur veda in its various recensions are of a later date than those of the Rg-veda, and those of the Atharva veda are still later in the existing form although they embody some primitive beliefs and practices. The student of ancient chronology will have to bear these facts in mind before he considers the main data which help to decide the cultural epochs of the vast Vedic Age.

These data can be brought under three main heads: (1) those that are inferable from a comparative study of languages; (2) those pertaining to the relations of Vedic with other peoples, and (3) those pertaining to Astronomy.

PHILOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

Western savants have generally been inclined to swear by the philological evidence. Some of them have drawn parallels from the evolution of modern languages and supposed short periods as similarly sufficient for early linguistic evolution. But it would be idle to deny that the evolution of the common wheel took ages in

the ancient evolution of technique, whereas the transition from rude to advanced forms of the steam-engine has taken years rather than ages. So the time taken for Homeric to develop into Alexandrian Greek or for Pāṇinian Sanskrit into that of Patañjali, while it helps to fix the stages of development, is no criterion for fixing the period of time taken at each stage. The attempts to fix "the Upper Limit to the Date of the Rg-veda" whether at 2000 B. C. or 1200 B. C., on the strength of the philological evidence alone, are really endeavours to build on quicksand. It is interesting to notice that modern opinion is veering round to this view. As Mr. Charles Johnston* has put it, so far as positive evidence goes, Max Müller might just as well have written 20,000 B. C. as 2000 B. C. Verily it is time that Vedic scholars address themselves "to extricate the chronology of India from the confusion into which it was thrown by the school of 4004 B. C."

It is accepted by all philologists that Slavo-Lithuanian forms a transition between Indo-Iranian on the one side and Græco-Latin on the other. But it is not widely known that the Tocharian language is nearest both to Lithuanian and Sanskrit, and that Nasili in Cappadocia is Aryan in inflexion and "incorporating," that is, Dravidian in structure. It was the language of the Hittites (after

* In his review of my book *Indian Culture through the Ages* in the *New York Times Book Review*, (March 24, 1929). Also in his admirable article "Ancient and Modern Thinking" in *The Atlantic Monthly* of New York.

1500 B. C.). The discovery of these two languages has given a shock to the classical division of the *centum* group of the West from the *satam* group of the East, based upon an original supposed Central Asian home. For Tocharian texts discovered in Chinese Turkestan show that the language is of the *centum* not *satam* group. It discloses a series of peculiarly European words at the same time and its grammatical forms show affinity in some cases to Celtic and Italic, in some others to the Slavonic, and in some to Armenian as against the Celtic. Its vocabulary is Græco-Sanskrit. It would be clear on a close examination that Armenian and Lithuanian disclose Vedic as distinct from later Sanskritic forms in some cases, as in the use of *k* for *p* and *j* for *y*. One has to be reminded that we likewise have *k* for *p* in the ancient Vedic forms (e.g. *anushtuk* and *anushtup*), and that even in later Sanskrit and Prakrit we have the corruption of *y* into *j* (*yadu* and *jadu*).

A few mistaken assumptions of philologists may be mentioned, as they would help in a reconsideration of the question. It is alleged that there is in Sanskrit no name for fish or even for the sea. But a whole hymn of the Rg-veda is given to fishes and their moanings when caught in a net (R. V. VIII. 67). *Samudra* denotes the sea undoubtedly in several passages in Books 8 and 10 and possibly in Book 7 (e.g. R. V. VIII. 6, 4; 92, 22; R. V. VII. 33, 8). It is sometimes argued that animals

like the bear and the wolf and trees like the beech and the birch are indigenous to the temperate zone and above all to Europe, whereas the lion, the tiger and the palm-tree are characteristic of Asia. Such arguments stand in need of revision making due allowance for differences in climate and in the distribution of land and water in the historical areas through the ages.

RELATIONS OF VEDIC WITH OTHER PEOPLES

The earliest portion of the Rg-veda shows that Agni was the most important of the aspects of divinity included in the Vedic pantheon, and that Soma and lastly Indra succeeded in prominence as the times rolled on. Some hymns also definitely declare these facts. One in the latest portion of the Rg-veda (x. 124) has it that "Agni, Soma and Varuṇa must give way. The power goes to another. In choosing Indra I give up the father with whom I have lived many years in friendship."

In the inscriptions of Asia Minor where the Vedic Gods are mentioned we find Agni conspicuous by absence and Indra assigned a prominent place with Varuṇa and the Nāsatyas. The supremacy of Varuṇa, according to the evidence of comparative mythology, represents a later stage of socio-moral and spiritual evolution, as that of Indra does in the light of these texts. It would thus be clear that Aryanism in Western Asia represents a later and not an

earlier stage in the development of Vedic religion.

A still earlier stage and epoch of time is represented by the mention of the horse in a Babylonian tablet of 2100 B. C. as the "ass from the East" or the "ass from the mountain". It is well-known that Gandhāra was the home of the Aryan steed from Vedic times onwards. There are numerous terms corresponding to the various classes of horses even in the earliest Vedic texts. In the third millennium B. C., too, we have clear evidence of the tripolic culture of South Russia marking the march of Indo-European tribes westwards.

These pieces of evidence seem to indicate waves of migration from western India westwards. Clear evidence of this is furnished in at least one hymn of the R̥g-veda where Saramā is referred to as one of the agents in the spread of Indra worship westward beyond the Rasā river into the regions of Western Asia (R. V. x. 105). Along with this may be considered still earlier passages which mention that Indra and Nāsatyas were regaling themselves in strange lands (R. V. VIII. 4,2). Perhaps the earliest hymn mentioning a westward migration from India is R. V. VII. 6,3.

Western traditions are also in conformity with this view. The Phœnicians, for instance, started from the Persian Gulf and spread along the Arab coast to the Red Sea, finally establishing themselves on the coast of Palestine. Magle-

mosian culture worked its way westward as shown by the march of the hunting dog, just as the knowledge of the bow and arrow shows the spread of Mediterranean and Azilian culture northwards. The indebtedness of Egypt to Sumeria in the earlier millennia is now generally accepted. The Sumerians are distinct from all other races in Western Asia, which probably points to their migration from the East.

Earlier cultural strata than the Indra-Nāsatya are indicated by Soma worship and its migration. The Aryans were in this period in the region of the seven Punjab rivers, and branched off into Indian and Iranian. It is well-known that the Iranians, the ancestors of the Parsis, were using the Soma juice and that there is no word for Soma in any other branches of the Indo-European family of languages. The Persian name of the river Arghandab on which modern Kandahar stands is Harahvati, which certainly corresponds to Sarasvati in the heart and centre of Āryāvarta. The Indo-Iranian struggle of this period was partly economic and partly religious, as shown by the prominence of the pastoral dog as against the agricultural bull, and of *asura* as against *deva*. It is natural that the Kandahar river should be styled Harahvati (with the Persian replacement of *s* by *h*) by people who were familiar with the Sarasvati in the region of the Seven Rivers (*sap-tasindhavah*) of which both the Veda and the Avesta are so full.

The bulk of the earliest hymns of the R̥g-veda are to Agni who in some of them is also stated to be the earliest God worshipped by the ancestors of the hymnists. There are numerous words for Fire in the Indo-European languages and most of them are discoverable in the Vedic :—*Ignis* (Lat.) and *ugni* (Lith.) compare with *Agni*, *atar* and *hearth* with *atri* (*atrium*), the fireplace with *pura* (*purohit*); Greek *hestia* (Latin *vesta*) with *Vastoshpati*, and Latin *tapor* with Sanskrit *tapana*. It appears therefore that Agni worship prevailed among the Aryas before the epoch of the branching off of those whose languages are Indo-European. It would appear that the Aryas were in this epoch not in the Punjab as usually supposed but in the region of the Jumna, the Sarasvati and the Indus. It is significant that the list of rivers given in the R̥g-veda enumerates them from the Jumna to the Rasā—in regular order from east to west not from west to east. The Bharatas were in this region, whence India came to be known as Bhārata-varsha through the ages.

ASTRONOMICAL EVIDENCE

The astronomical data may now be examined, beginning with the latest and most certain references. The Jyotishavedanga contains a certain and clear reference connecting the beginning of the year with the constellations. The winter solstice was then marked by Śravishṭha or Dhaniṣṭha, *i. e.* the Delphini. This refers to about 1400 B. c.

The Upanishads belong to an earlier age than the Vedangas, and we find in the *Maitrāyaṇī Brāhmaṇa Upanishad* (I. 4) the Pole-star described as Dhruva *i. e.* fixed. Jacobi argues that this term could have been applied only to Alpha Draconis, and this was approximately at the pole of the equator at about 2800 B. c.

In the Brāhmaṇas are still earlier references. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (IV. 4) says that the year began in the night of the full moon of Phalguni (Beta and Delta Leonis), and that the sacrifices began on that day (v. 1). We have a similar reference in the *Taittirīya Samhitā* (VII. 4) to “the mouth of the year as the Phalguni full moon”. The date arrived at is 3870 B.C. But the latter passage also mentions that the full moon in Chitrā marked the beginning of the year. The winter solstice was here about 6200 B. c.

Astronomers like the late Mr. J. R. Kaye have doubted whether there could be a knowledge of the equinoxes used for chronological record as early as the Vedic texts. But we have a passage in the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* (III. 10, 4) containing a description of the two halves of the year starting with the equinoxes. “Expand with the day and contract with the night; expand with the night and contract with the day.” Mr. Kaye says that the word *vishuvat* used for equinox is found only in modern works. Here he is misguided, for the term is found even in the earliest stratum of the R̥g-veda (VI. 58, 1) “Oh Pūshan!

one arm of yours is white and the other dark. But two days have the night and day of equal length." This was an ancient and well known Vedic passage, as is shown by its appearance also in the Yajur vedic texts (*e. g.* T. S. iv. 1, 11). The *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* which quotes this passage adds a comment (T. A. i. 2) that the reference is to the year (*samvatsara*). It would be clear now that the equinoxes and the calculations of time based on equinoxes were known in India from the earliest Vedic times.

In at least one passage I find clear and definite reference to the fact that the year commenced with the equinox in Vedic India. The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* (i. 2, 3) clearly has it that the Divākīrtiyam hymns were sung during the period of the equinox: "As the two sides of the roof are equal and are built on either side of the central pole, so the two halves of the year join at the equinox (*vishuvan*) when the Divākīrtiyam hymns are sung."

Similarly, it was thought by scholars that the Chaldeans had knowledge neither of the tropical year nor of the precession of the equinoxes. But Jeremias has recorded that the Babylonian calendar was periodically rearranged with reference to the position of the vernal equinox. "While the vernal equinox in Assyrian times was in the Ram, plenty of observations took place before the first dynasty of Babylon when it was

in the sign of the Bull, and one at least that on the so-called Astrolabe when it was in the sign of the Twins." (Olmstead: *History of Assyria*, p. 593). This is quite natural, as it has been shown in my last article* that India was in contact with pre-Sumerian culture in the fifth millennium B. C.

Some scholars who have used the astronomical data of the Vedas for chronological purposes do not seem to have considered these data with reference to the context. Those already cited from the *Taittirīya Samhitā* make it clear that the reference is to the winter solstice. T. S. vii. 4,8, has this passage: "If the *gavām ayana* sacrifice is started on the full moon of Phalguni, the central day of the sacrifice would witness the outburst of the rains. It is therefore desirable to begin the sacrificial session at the full moon of Chitrā instead." The *gavām ayana* was for a whole year (*samvatsarāya*). It is therefore clear that the sacrificial year began at the winter solstice, so that the summer solstice should come six months later.

It will be obvious that one must decide from the context whether the year began at the winter solstice or the equinox. In fact the *Garga Samhitā* is recording an old tradition when it says that the year began at a certain point for ritualistic purposes and at another point for calendrical purposes.

By all accounts the month of mārgaśīrsha is *āgrahāyana*, i. e.

*THE ARYAN PATH, Jan. 1930, pp. 14-15—EDS.

witnessed the beginning of the sacrificial year. It has been taken as referring to the autumnal equinox, thus arriving at the date 4000 B. C. But the sacrificial year began with the winter solstice, as already mentioned. The date is thus pushed back to the eleventh millennium B. C. Similarly the heliacal rising of Sirius (R. V. I. 105,11) has been referred to the vernal equinox. But the context

shows that there was a downpour from the sky (*yahvatīrapah*). The reference is therefore to the summer solstice, which would yield us again the eleventh millennium B.C.

This conclusion is warranted by calculations as to the precession of the equinoxes and the consequent shifting of the seasons, at the rate of 71.633 years for each degree or nearly 955 years for each nakshatra.

S. V. VENKATESWARA

The *Vedas*—on the date and antiquity of which no two Orientalists can agree, are claimed by the Hindus themselves, whose Brahmans and Pundits ought to know best about their own religious works, to have been first taught orally for thousands of years, and then compiled on the shores of Lake Mānasa-Sarovara (phonetically *Mansarovara*) beyond the Himalayas, in Tibet. When was this done? While their religious teachers, such as Swami Dayanand Saraswati, claim for them an antiquity of many decades of ages, our modern Orientalists will grant them no greater antiquity in their present form than between 1,000 and 2,000 B. C. As compiled in their final form by Veda-Vyāsa, however, the Brahmans themselves unanimously assign 3,100 years before the Christian era, the date when Vyāsa flourished. Therefore the *Vedas* must be as old as this date. But their antiquity is sufficiently proven by the fact that they are written in such an ancient form of Sanskrit, so different from the Sanskrit now used, that there is no other work like them in the literature of this eldest sister of all the known languages, as Prof. Max Müller calls it. Only the most learned of the Brahman Pundits can read the *Vedas* in their original. It is urged that Colebrooke found the date 1400 B. C. corroborated absolutely by a passage which he discovered and which is based on astronomical data. But if, as shown unanimously by all the Orientalists and the Hindu Pundits also, that (a) the *Vedas* are not a single work, nor yet any one of the separate *Vedas*; but that each *Veda*, and almost every hymn and division of the latter, is the production of various authors; and that (b) these have been written (whether as *sruti*, "revelation," or not) at various periods of the ethnological evolution of the Indo-Aryan race, then—what does Mr. Colebrooke's discovery prove? Simply that the *Vedas* were *finally* arranged and compiled fourteen centuries before our era; but this interferes in no way with their antiquity. Quite the reverse; for as an offset to Mr. Colebrooke's passage, there is a learned article, written on purely astronomical data by Krishna Shâstri Godbole (of Bombay), which proves as absolutely and on the same evidence that the *Vedas* must have been taught at least 25,000 years ago. (See *Theosophist*, Vol. II., p. 238 *et seq.*, Aug., 1881.)

—*Theosophical Glossary* ("Vedas").

THE DISCOVERY OF THE SELF

An Essay in Religious Experience

[The first instalment of this psychological autobiography of **J. D. Beresford** appeared in our last number. In our next issue the series will be completed.

Confusion in self-discipline arises because it is not recognized that neither the discerning soul, nor the reasoning mind, nor even alluring passions, are produced by the body. Most generally the phrase "sins of the flesh" is taken to mean that the cause of mischief lies in the physical body. Theosophy teaches that that is not true. Our readers are invited to ponder over the following very illuminating passage from H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* (I. 260):—

It is not molecularly constituted matter—least of all the human body (*sthulasarira*)—that is the grossest of all our "principles," but verily the *middle* principle, the real animal centre; whereas our body is but its shell, the irresponsible factor and medium through which the beast in us acts all its life. Every intellectual theosophist will understand my real meaning.

The way to subdue the animal in us is not to wage an active war against it, which would give it the strength of attention and recognition. The right method of not giving way to it lies in the contemplation of the Divine Virtues and in the doing of works energized by them. These Paramitas or virtues are given in *The Voice of the Silence* as under:—

1. DANA, the key of charity and love immortal.
 2. SHILA, the key of Harmony in word and act, the key that counter-balances the cause and the effect, and leaves no further room for Karmic action.
 3. KSHANTI, patience sweet, that nought can ruffle.
 4. VIRAGA, indifference to pleasure and to pain, illusion conquered, truth alone perceived.
 5. VIRYA, the dauntless energy that fights its way to the supernal TRUTH out of the mire of lies terrestrial.
 6. DHYANA, whose golden gate once opened leads the Narjol [a saint, an Adept] toward the realm of Sat eternal and its ceaseless contemplation.
 7. PRAJNA, the key to which makes of a man a God, creating him a Bodhisattva, son of the Dhyanis.
- EDS.]

II

In my first article, I attempted to analyse a simple antinomy of the personality, the opposing laws or influences in the case described representing what I believe to be a fairly typical type of the Western European mind. The antagon-

ism in this instance lay between two only of the three forces which at a certain stage of spiritual development are in perpetual conflict. On one side I was aware of a very definite urgency from within, often resisted but never com-

pletely quelled, which reached out towards and recognised esoteric knowledge, idealised the principle of self-sacrifice, and, however vaguely, regarded Nirvana as the single goal worthy of attainment. (This element so far as it is recognised by psychologists is related by them to the unconscious, wherein it is so entangled with sexual and other bodily and mental influences that any fact of value which may emerge must be separated by the personal insight and knowledge of the student. Of the inexact sciences, psychology is, at the present time, one of the most obscure.)

The other side in the contest I am describing—a contest that has, for me, been essentially critical—was played by the reasoning intelligence. My intense curiosity concerning the origins of mankind, instigated in the first place by my rejection of the theory of special creation in favour of that of a gradual evolution, provoked a search that partly satisfied the mind, but not at all the spirit. Nor was there any change of method when this search for imaginative material out of which I might construct for myself a reasonable picture of the universe, turned, as it necessarily did, from biology to astronomy and physics. I had acquired in some degree the scientific habit of mind, and I now accepted as evidence only that which was capable, in so far as any fact is capable, of proof. Consequently when evidence of another kind was offered to me, such as a phenomenon that could

not be reproduced and tested by laboratory methods, my intelligence was always inclined to reject it.

Nevertheless, even in what I may term my most scientific period, there were indications of the other influence which should have warned me that I was treading the path of a dogmatism not less limiting to growth than that of the religion I had abandoned in my youth. I remember very clearly one example of this, which is worth reporting since it is fairly representative and has a certain allegorical value. I was talking with a friend, a very brilliant mathematician. We had been discussing the transition from the explanation of the movements of the planets and stars offered by Ptolemy's epicycles to that given by Copernicus and Kepler; and he with true scientific detachment remarked that the Copernican system was more acceptable inasmuch as it offered a simpler explanation of observed phenomena, and that other things being equal, the simple theory must, as a mathematical principle, always be truer in these matters than the more complicated. But, I then suggested, is it not possible that there may be still another mathematical explanation of celestial phenomena which would cover all the facts and might be even, in a sense, simpler still? My friend considered for a few seconds and then admitted that this was not inconceivable. And at that moment I had very much the same sense of release, of escape from

the bonds of dogma, that I had had when, so many years earlier, I had realised that the primitive beliefs of my early religious teaching were nothing but a hotch-potch of superstition—touched here and there by a truly savage ignorance—woven into and obscuring an ethical system which in itself was completely admirable. I had a sense of emancipation, of a power to choose, that I had been gradually losing. I saw in a flash the limitations of exact science, the undoubted fact that its instruments can measure only a particular set of phenomena.

The deduction from this piece of reasoning is of the first importance not alone in personal experience but as an allegory of very wide application; but before I come to that, it is necessary to consider the third element of the human trinity.

So far I have in this article treated of two forces only, because in my own case they appear in retrospect to have been predominant, but the contest between them is continually influenced, more in some cases than in others, by the third party in the senate, namely, the inclinations and reluctances of the body.

Now in the Middle Ages before the renaissance of learning that

was so strangely to affect the thought of the seventeenth century, the flesh with all its lusts and inertias was regarded as the chief enemy of religion. And since the mass of the people in Europe are still under the sway of medieval thought, we continue to find the desires of the body held up as the primary bar to spirituality; that this is true of those who permit themselves to be dominated by their carnal appetites, of whatever kind, I do not for a moment deny, but I do not propose to consider that in this place.*

For in this autobiographical résumé, the struggle with the flesh was not important, because I had already passed through it before the time of which I am now writing. This statement, however, must not be taken as implying that the struggle was ever a critical one. Everything depends, in this relation, upon the stage of development reached; and in these articles I am trying more particularly to address those who by this reckoning may be counted as approximately my own contemporaries. And for those I would note that in my own experience the chief danger is in the inertia rather than in the positive desires of the body,† in the turning away from conflict by using worldly

* May I refer readers, in this connection, to my Article on "Exorcising Evil" in the June number of THE ARYAN PATH, last year, with particular reference to the illuminating Note by "Asiatic" which follows it.—J.D.B.

† Desires of the body do not arise in the body; they manifest themselves through the body. Nay, more—passions and desires are not produced by the body, but, on the contrary, the body is due to the former. It is desire and passion which caused us to be born, and will bring us to birth again and again. Read this in the light of the passage quoted in our introductory note and the position will become clear.—Eds.

thoughts, interests, and satisfactions as an anodyne.

I come, now, to what I regard as the second stage of my own development, initiated some nine years ago. Looking back it appears to me as if various factors quite outside my own control were combining at this time to influence the future of my thought. I made, by accident, one or two new acquaintances who were strongly to affect my life. Chance, apparently, ordained that I should go to live again for fifteen months in London. And the combination of these accidents had, as I see now, a very powerful significance.

The first considerable influence was provided by my study of the Gourdieff teaching, called "The Fourth Way," then being expounded more or less privately in London by M. Ouspensky. I touched upon one or two of the methods advocated by this school in my article of last October, but as it is essential here to examine my own personal reactions, certain of those methods must again be referred to.

The chief of them in this relation was the implicit principle that before any progress can be made, the disciple must know something of himself, and the method employed was that of teaching him to take a new viewpoint. In Fontainebleau where Gourdieff himself had a school at that time, much attention was given to the breaking up of physical habits by various exercises and dances, but nothing of this kind was, to my knowledge, prac-

tised in London. The aim in both cases, however, was the same, for the command "Know Thyself" may be obeyed without any physical training, which is, in effect, but a side issue, however helpful it may be in some instances. The important principle taught, by no matter what means, is the perpetual watch upon the self. The disciple must train himself to self-scrutiny, not alone by introspection and an enquiry into his way of thought and life, but also by the cultivation of an increasing awareness of whatever he is doing however trivial. In ordinary life, the life of the world, we spend, consciously and unconsciously, various efforts towards the simplification of recurrent actions by educating ourselves in automatism, for which the body has a considerable natural aptitude. In the ordinary physical exercises—walking is one of the simplest examples—we pay little or no attention to the highly complicated series of movements involved, the series being accomplished by nerves and muscles that have been trained to its performance. Even in far more involved acts, such as reading aloud, it is possible with practice to delegate most of the work to the trained reflexes and permit the attention to wander.

Now this automatism, comparatively harmless in some respects, stultifying and regressive in others, can be brought into the sphere of consciousness, and the doing of that is an admirable exercise in the first stages of self-know-

ledge. Not only may the practice of self-observation, even of the physical mechanisms, help to cure foolish faults that have become habitual and sometimes definitely harmful, but what is still more valuable it gives the desiderated new view-point of the self.* In my own case I found that the development of this technique gave me a rapidly increasing realisation of the body as an instrument of the mind, a very delicate and sensitive instrument with methods and powerful tendencies of its own, but one that might be, (and sometimes actually is) subordinated to the control of the higher personality.

The next step, and a far harder one to make, is to raise this process to a higher level, and instead of watching and attempting to cure the automatisms of the body, to seek and eradicate those of the intellect. That step I cannot claim to have yet taken. I am still engaged in making it. But it is, I believe, essential to the discovery of the self, and the conflict that is the theme of this article could not probably, in any case, have been resolved in any other way.

It is necessary, however, before attempting any description of method in this connection, to con-

sider briefly the assumption involved. The suggestion made in the previous paragraph, and earlier in the article, may appear to be that the soul, the chief person of the human trinity, is able to operate with regard to the intellect in the same manner as the latter operates with regard to the body. But this is not true. Each of the three entities has its own mode, and they do not resemble one another. It is not possible, for example, by any simple act of will to bring the soul into judgment upon the mind. We may delude ourselves quite easily that this is being done, but what we are actually doing is setting two sides of the mind† in opposition in the manner familiar to everyone in ordinary life. This delusion gains force from the fact that in making this particular separation, we abstract from the personality all those ethical and, by common standards, praiseworthy elements that we presume are most representative of the Soul, and set up as an antagonist the less admirable inclinations as a figment of the mind and body. The result of this is a passing effect of righteousness, possibly a considerable elation of mind, but if the process stops at this point,

* This is nothing new, and in Indian Yoga literature is well known. The practice described by Mr. Beresford belongs to the lower Haṭha Yoga, dangerous to sense and balanced life. Both Eastern Occultism and Theosophy in teaching Rāja Yoga eschew such practices; the rules of this kingly science are to be found in *The Voice of the Silence*; its instructions are "for those ignorant of the dangers of the lower Iddhi" or psychic faculties of which there are two groups, one results from bodily practices, the other from mental and spiritual exercise.—EDS.

† Theosophy taught this ages ago and H. P. Blavatsky explained the doctrine fully and even simply in *The Key to Theosophy*. The two aspects of Mind, the lower and the higher are recognized, but beyond the Higher is Buddhi—Intuitive Mind, the Pure and Compassionate Reason, the Nous of the Greeks as distinguished from Psyche. Rāja Yoga deals with Buddhi-Manas or Nous, while Haṭha Yoga deals with Kama-Manas or Psyche wedded to body.—EDS.

little if anything will be gained. I must add, moreover, that in the earlier developments of consciousness, the result of this splitting of the personality into what may be called a moral and an immoral opposition, is liable to be quite definitely harmful, leading to all kinds of inhibitions, self-righteousness and unconscious hypocrisies.

In all this, I am not theorising but speaking out of my own experience in the hope that anyone who is following the same path as myself may gain his own experience rather more quickly than he would otherwise have done.* And by way of warning, I will give one example of the manner in which this opposition and splitting of the personality may lead to undesirable results. In my first article I referred to the religious ecstasies of my youth, and I may now add that these were counterfeited, all through my life, by the continual making of vows which arose from nothing more nor less than this assumption that my ethical tendencies represented far more than they in fact did represent. Such vows were, of course, quite useless. They had no effect other than that of temporary suppression of the self to which they were opposed, and were inevitably followed by a reaction. And what is desired is not separation but integration—a subject that must be reserved for my next article.

To summarise this stage of my progress in the search for the self, I must attempt some description of my state of mind before I entered upon the phase which followed. The sense of conflict was already leaving me. I was not yet able to reconcile the scientist's picture of the universe with that provided by the particular esoteric teaching I was then studying. The old separation in fact, still persisted to present science and religion as antinomies. But I had temporarily changed sides and saw life in terms of the spirit rather than in those of matter. And one effect, perhaps the most encouraging, was a feeling of increasing content. I was becoming less critical of my fellowmen, and in the process gaining self-confidence, approaching more nearly the mean between pride and humility which is the ideal state of mind for the student of wisdom. Naturally, in view of the fact that the critical conflict I have referred to was not as yet resolved, I suffered many lapses; but I was discovering a means to overcome those moods of depression in which life held no promise of satisfaction and the future appeared as an empty void. In those dark hours, I was now able, tentatively as yet, to hold myself still, inhibit the clamour of the mind, and realise, however faintly, the integrity of the self. Also, I was helped, now and again, by

* Theosophy says—"Beware, Do not experiment with dynamite without first acquiring *theoretical* knowledge of what you are about." Says *The Voice of the Silence* "To live to benefit mankind is the first step. To practise the six glorious virtues is the second," and the latter are given in the introductory note.—EDS.

something that was half dream, half vision at the moment of awakening in the morning; one of which messages—in Greek that I had to ask a friend to translate for me—cleared up a psychical “complex” of which I had not until then been aware.

Nevertheless, I might even then have relapsed again if another “accident,” (I cannot, myself, believe it to be such, but I do not wish here to beg so important a

question), had not helped me to take the next and most essential step. For personal reasons, which, because they very closely concern another person, cannot be given here, I had decided to abandon my study of “The Fourth Way”. I was already beginning to realise that much of its teaching was repugnant to me. Of the next step—in the next number of THE ARYAN PATH.

J. D. BERESFORD

SELF-KNOWLEDGE

The first necessity for obtaining self-knowledge is to become profoundly conscious of ignorance; to feel with every fibre of the heart that one is *ceaselessly* self-deceived.

The second requisite is the still deeper conviction that such knowledge—such intuitive and certain knowledge—can be obtained by effort.

The third and most important is an indomitable determination to obtain and face that knowledge.

Self-knowledge of this kind is unattainable by what men usually call self-analysis. “It is not reached by reasoning or by any brain process; for it is the awakening to consciousness of the Divine nature of man.

To obtain this knowledge is a greater achievement than to command the elements or to know the future.

—*Lucifer*. Vol. I, p. 89

THE BRITISH IN INDIA

MATERIAL SUCCESS AND SPIRITUAL FAILURE

[Robert Sencourt, M. A., B. Litt., of Oxford University, has spent four years each in India, Italy and France. He is the author of *Outflying Philosophy* and the *Life of George Meredith* characterised by André Maurois as "one of the best lives of a writer that we possess".

This is a well considered article. Mr. Sencourt writes to us "As I go into this matter again—and I gave some years to it when I was writing *India in English Literature*—I find that England has offered India practically nothing of the treasury of ancient wisdom or spiritual philosophy: and because she has given so little, she has so far taken little. The relation has been a material one, though as I try to show even that should be founded on spiritual principles."—EDS.]

I

The high debate of policy which drew to London princes and leaders from India was occupied with a sweeping change in government in India. Aiming on the one side in keeping India within the loose alliance which the British Empire has now become, it acknowledged on the other that the peoples of India were beyond accepting dictates from another people. The idea of the British race in India as a dominant race, in the sense in which the Moguls once were dominant, or as the Romans or the Normans once were dominant in England, has gone for ever.

The peoples and states of India are henceforward in the same relation to England as what are called the self-governing dominions. They are each in a position which closely resembles that of the province of Quebec. It has a different origin, a different vernacular, and a different religion from England, though it is assimilated to a common culture. It has its

own marked place in a federation. It accepts an order, and a legal authority which have their centre in London. It has full cognisance of the power, and the commercial enterprise, of the great Empire in which it finds its place. But it retains its own traditions which give to Eastern Canada a flavour of their own. If the French Canadians are therefore—and they insist they are—British, there is every reason why, with equal elasticity, the peoples of India, while making themselves equally masters of their own house, should also find advantage in adhering to the law, to the commercial enterprise, and to the loose interplay of the British Empire. A population some nine times that of England, with such a rich legacy of traditions, will provide a unity indescribably more dynamic than French Canada. Its influence is not only so much vaster: it has the romance of a peculiar strangeness: it meets Europe with the oriental philosophy in which her own culture and religion

learnt first to find the reality of things unseen.

It is from the point of view of the philosophies which underlie great religions, and from this alone, that we shall see to the heart of India's political relation to England. For the art of government which is the application of the science of government is but one province of the science of life which is dominated by those queenly sciences which treat of truth and the spirit. Behind the question of right which occupies the debaters, the questions of tariffs, the question of privileges and pensions, the question of police and of military responsibility, the question of the freedom of Princes from their residents and their share in Indian excise, the questions of federation, of representation, of minorities, the great question of the tension between Islam and Hinduism—for the questions of right are soon absorbed in the great general demand for the maintenance of order—there remain august and final the principles of order.

II

Order, it must be remembered, is the unity of variety. As the successive moments of time are each a window upon the stable and unsuccessive immediacy of timeless being, so the endless movement by which the things of time change with other things holds up in every kind of thing which we contemplate a mirror of some aspect of final reality. The truth of things is in the bal-

ance kept between the witness of the senses, and the far intuitions of reason. But reason working so in unity with the spirit does more than balance, for otherwise there could be no order in created things: reason identifies itself with the spirit which masters the potentialities below it to a spiritual purpose as thoroughly as the writer who makes of ink and paper a trumpeted messenger of his unseen thought. And just as each of the works of man mirrors an aspect of its maker's life, so each of the things of sense gives through sense a message to the mind.

We cannot think of a good man who disdains the physical well-being of those around him. Just as the sun is not only a consuming fire but also the source of energy in the world, so love and charity are not only the secret of the Divine Nature; they are throughout creation the energy of life and the principle of order.

III

The problem of India is to apply to the peoples and languages between Peshawar and Pondicherry, between Chittagong and Quetta, between Trivandrum and Kanchinjanga, an order of government which will work towards unifying variety with something of the tranquil operation of God's perpetual providence. Such a government needs to temper the inexorableness of universal law with the sympathy of those who live by the heart, and yet live spiritually. Logical and intellectually consistent on the one side,

relentless in the grasp and application of its principles, it can have no authority but by its harmony with the spirit of the people, and by a constant adaptability to their spontaneous choice, and by an unwearying justification of itself to the leaders of their thought. Burke wrote in his *Reflections on the French Revolution* :—

To make a government requires no great prudence. Settle the seat of power; teach obedience, and the work is done. To give freedom is still more easy. It is not necessary to guide; it only requires to let go the rein. But to form a *free government*; that is to temper together those opposite elements of liberty and restraint in one consistent work requires much thought, deep reflection: a sagacious, powerful and combining mind.

But it needs much more: it needs above all a heart: a heart warmed by the glowing interchange of intuitive sympathy. It is the greatness which is born of this warmth of heart when it is inspired by a clear view of the intellectual principles of order which can alone give happiness to India: and it is that which has been missing.

When the English came to India, the great stretches of the country had no real unity. The Mogul conquerors had established over their wide empire the authority which they associated with their loyalty to their Prophet: beyond that stretched the social system and the complex traditions of the religions associated with Hinduism. Such was the country which opened to the Elizabethan voyagers, who came neither as governors nor philosophers, but

to exchange material advantage. Queen Elizabeth wrote to the Emperor Akbar:—

The great affection which our subjects have to visit the most distant places of the world, not without goodwill and intention to introduce the trade of merchandize of all nations whatsoever they can, and by which means the mutual and friendly trafique of merchandize on both sides may come is the cause that the bearer of this letter, John Newbury, jointly with those that be in his company with a courteous and honest boldnesse doe repaire to the borders of your Empire.

It has been the business of the historian to trace the development of the East India Company into a responsible government: to see how the idea of administration and justice developed under Clive: to watch how Hastings adapted himself both to the ways of the Company's servants, and to reverence for India's ancient wisdom while he worked out his administrative reforms: to trace how his trial, and especially Burke's attack upon him, marked England's sense of moral responsibility towards the people of a venerable civilisation; how the ordering government of Britain spread through India; how the genius of England in great pronouncements recognised the rights of Indians, and how at last England has offered to India the promise of a free Indian government.

Yet as one traces this majestic episode of history, one cannot but observe how stubbornly the English have ignored the complications brought in by personal self-interest. Not only have their histor-

ians passed over their own legitimate claims as traders: but they have ignored their own moral faults, and spoken of themselves with a shameless pharisaism. The Englishman has, for the most part, not gone to India for self-sacrifice: but to gratify ambition. He has claimed all the rights of supremacy; his manners have been often overbearing; and he has done very little to spread the ideas or standards of the highest European culture. The English in India have developed the faults and virtues of the material greatness they have for three centuries attained.

It is not unnatural that the peoples of Northern Europe should confuse civilisation with comfort, and exchange for ordered thought the order of material organisation. It was nature's defence for them against a winter of rain, of snow, of fog. It naturally arose out of their robust physical survival. It received an enormous addition from their power over mechanical invention, and the exploitation of their wealth in coal and iron and steel. It developed not only wealth, but new powers of character, not only in enterprise and thoroughness, but by a peculiar instinct of honesty and justice. Such was the background of the people who went to create modern America, and who attained supremacy in India. And we do not understand their rôle in India till we consider America where material organization is at once so complete and so monotonous, so regular and so unsatis-

fying, and where the highest forms of life, the life of the heart, of the mind and the soul, have been sacrificed to providing with such unusual thoroughness the appurtenances of physical smoothness: where there is little of hunger, of cold or of nakedness, but still less of the unbought graces of life: men have foregone their heritage of leisure, of wisdom, of beauty, and of joy. For even joy is an inward mystery far beyond exercise and amusement. Sport is obviously excellent: and no one should tolerate the world living in physical hardship. But comfort like games is insufficient: games are a health-giving discipline: they should be a pleasure; but as a religion they are, like material prosperity as a religion, a mark of decadence. The English have failed to make the exercise of their bodies a means to that of the Soul.

In India they have brought their railways, their telegraphs, their machinery, their organization, their background of international prestige, and as between Islam and Hinduism the neutrality of their government. The benefit has been immense. The principle of their commerce is so close to that of universal life that it is intrinsically august, as peace and justice are. But as long as they confuse material order with spiritual order, as long as the brute weight of force is held to be the authority of government, so long will the English be incapable of providing India with either freedom or a government. The Indian instinct

which is exhilarated by the very mention of ideal and spiritual things: the great tradition of caste which, though it has often been applied tyrannously, does insist on the hierarchy of function: the relations of authority and service as essential to freedom; in all these India is at present far in advance of England. But though the adjustment of government with freedom will lead to some beneficial and some doubtful expedients, the real balance is to be found only in the acceptance of certain metaphysical principles of order and function which English administrators have forgotten though they are still to be found in the treasury of the thought which she inherited from Mediterranean civilization. The English have

shown, and to a large extent have completed, their function in India. But it will not be finally completed until material organisation has been replaced by that intellectual and spiritual order by which the attraction of two strangers come together in a communion of the heart, a communion finding its motive and its law in the magnetism which centres the force of mutual attraction in the planetary system of the spiritual universe. It is in accepting a delegation of this authority, spiritual in its principles, yet applied in details of law and administration which ensure free commerce and spontaneous growth to a vast aggregation of peoples, that India will be re-born as a federated nation.

ROBERT SENCOURT

I have always regarded the encouragement of every species of useful diligence, in the servants of the Company, as a duty appertaining to my office; and have severely regretted that I have possessed such scanty means of exercising it, especially to such as required an exemption from official attendance; there being few emoluments in this service but such as are annexed to official employment, and few offices without employment. Yet I believe I may take it upon me to pronounce, that the service has at no period more abounded with men of cultivated talents, of capacity for business, and liberal knowledge; qualities which reflect the greater lustre on their possessors by having been the fruit of long and laboured application, at a season of life, and with a licence of conduct, more apt to produce dissipation than excite the desire of improvement.

Such studies, independently of their utility, tend, especially when the pursuit of them is general, to diffuse a generosity of sentiment, and a disdain of the meaner occupations of such minds as are left nearer to the state of uncultivated nature; and you, Sir, will believe me, when I assure you, that it is on the virtue, not the ability of their servants, that the Company must rely for the permanency of their dominion.

—*From a letter of Warren Hastings to Nathaniel Smith, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the East India Company, dated 4th October, 1784.*

ON THE MYSTIC SYMBOLISM OF SHAKESPEARE

[The name of **G. Wilson Knight** has been seen often during the past three years in such leading English magazines as the *New Adelphi*, the *Fortnightly Review*, the *London Quarterly Review*, and the *Dublin Review*. His deep insight into the mysticism of the great playwright was evident in his recently-published work *Myth and Miracle: An Essay on the Mystic Symbolism of Shakespeare*. Mr. Knight is now Senior English Master at the Dean Close Memorial School, Cheltenham.—EDS.]

The criticism of Shakespeare has in the past been too strictly limited. Confining itself almost wholly to "Commonsense" analysis of the plays, it has noticed the clash of character with character, the human interest of poignant dramatic situation, and the firm ethical sanity that is everywhere apparent in Shakespeare. Such criticism has done valuable service; yet that which is of even greater significance has been left almost unnoticed. The more imaginative qualities have been too often forgotten. Throughout Shakespeare there is a subtle use of atmospheric effect, as for instance, the murk and evil that muffle the Scotland of *Macbeth* or the bright imagery and sensuous magnificence that scintillate in *Antony and Cleopatra*: and this can be analysed, can be, and should be, related to the metaphysical and ethical significance of the plays concerned. Nor have the varied uses of poetic symbolism been adequately noticed: such as the use of animal-symbolism in *Julius Cæsar* and *Macbeth*, where an essentially *unnatural* act is accompanied by unnatural behaviour in the animal world; or the recurrent

stress throughout Shakespeare on "storms" or "tempests" as symbols of tragedy. Now a careful attention to such poetic and imaginative effects produces striking results: for it illuminates the significance of those Final Plays whose curious plots have never been properly explained.

Elsewhere* I have shown that Shakespeare's later plays fall naturally into three groups: first, plays of pain and intellectual despair, such as *Hamlet*; second, plays of tragic grandeur, superficially sad, it is true, yet inwardly strong with the mystic optimism of poetic tragedy—of these I would quote *Lear* as a typical example; and third, a curious group of plays where the tragic theme is reversed, and a happy ending is brought about contrary to the natural logic of human life, and to the canons of realistic art. *Pericles* and *The Winter's Tale* are not plays of any usual type. The poet who designs a happy ending naturally attempts to clothe his plot with some outward probability. Shakespeare does not do this here. There is no attempt at realism. Therefore, having regard to the succession which these

**Myth and Miracle: An Essay on the Mystic Symbolism of Shakespeare.*

plays continue, and, moreover, to the fact that they are strongly impregnated with an atmosphere of religious mysticism—dreams, oracles, and divine appearances—I regard them essentially as mystical resolutions of those difficulties and despairs which are the theme of earlier plays—which are definitely painful in the first group, and recognised intuitively as things of necessity and beauty in the great tragedies. They do, in fact, definitely and decisively contradict the earlier humanistic logic. They explicate the irrational optimism of tragedy in the form of myths or parables. Shakespeare's greater tragedies turn nearly all on the same theme: the failure of Love to body itself into any earthly symbol. Sometimes the loved ones prove actually false, as Queen Gertrude or Cressida, or Goneril and Regan, or the friends of Timon; sometimes the lover suspects falsely, as Hamlet seems to distrust Ophelia, as Othello distrusts Desdemona. But the difference is superficial: all these plays equally suggest that the human soul finds love too delicate a thing to weather the stormy voyage of temporal existence.

The Final Plays of Shakespeare, however, reverse this theme. In them the story is pursued to the brink of tragedy: and then tragedy is curiously averted. Thaisa, the wife of Pericles, is cast, apparently dead, into the stormy waters: yet she, and his lost daughter, Marina, is restored to him after a long passage of years. And Cerimon,

the hermit, raises Thaisa to life in a scene which recalls the raising of Lazarus in the Gospels. Now, in so far as we admit a universal tragic significance in earlier plays, we are, I think, forced to recognise a universal mystic significance in these Final Plays. They represent, symbolically, the resurrection of that which *seems to die*, but is yet alive; the conquest of love over those stormy waters of temporal existence which appear to engulf it. It is significant that *Tempests*—Shakespeare's percurrent symbol of tragedy—recur in these two plays. But there is not only loss in *Tempest*: there is revival, resurrection, to the sounds of music. Pericles, finding his long lost Marina, hears a mysterious "music of the spheres" just before his vision of Diana. Hermione, too, is awaked to the sounds of music.

As though some insistent truth was yet striving for fuller expression, we have these same themes amazingly multiplied within the compact plot-texture of *Cymbeline*. Bellarius, Arviragus and Guiderius, long-lost to *Cymbeline* through his mistrust, are yet restored to him at the end; and both Posthumus and Imogen think each other dead, only to be joyed at their loved one's miraculous survival. Most interesting of all, in this play we have the *Vision of Jupiter* which has baffled past commentators: yet it is indeed, a natural attempt on the poet's part to explain in some degree, through an anthropomorphic theism, this

mystic realisation of the ineffable which is beating in his mind.

And Shakespeare found the perfect form at last. Let me again emphasise the importance of the Tempest-symbol which is ubiquitous throughout the plays of Shakespeare. *The Tempest* is well-named. Here the whole sequence of past plays is, as it were, caught up into one supreme moment of vision. More exquisitely compact than *Cymbeline*, *The Tempest* is a record of Shakespeare's spiritual progress and, simultaneously, a vision of mankind tossed on the turbulent waters of this life. Therefore Prospero is both the Supreme Being—from one point of view—and, from the other, Shakespeare, the poet. The story is simply this: a magician draws to him, by means of a tempest, a ship-load of men—good, evil, wise and ignorant: them he both wrecks, and saves. The mystic melodies of Ariel's pipe sing the travellers to the yellow sands where all is forgiven and all restored. *The Tempest* is the most perfect work of mystic vision in English literature.

A detailed interpretation of *The Tempest* involves many references and many subtleties. I cannot note them here. But my view is most interestingly corroborated by a remarkable and profound book by Mr. Colin Still, *Shakespeare's Mystery Play: A Study of The Tempest* (Cecil

Palmer, 1921). This book the publication of my essay, *Myth and Miracle*, brought to my notice. Mr. Still analyses *The Tempest* as a work of mystic vision, and shows that it abounds in parallels with the ancient mystery cults, and works of symbolic religious significance throughout the ages. Especially illuminating are his references to Vergil (*Æneid* VI) and Dante. Now his reading of *The Tempest* depends on references outside Shakespeare, whereas my interpretation depends entirely on references to the succession of plays which *The Tempest* concludes. We thus reach our results by quite different routes: those results are, however, strangely—and yet, after all, I believe, not strangely—similar. To the sceptic, this may suggest that mystical interpretation of great poetry may be something other than "wild and whirling words". It is, indeed, not without its dangers, yet it is the only adequate and relevant interpretation of Shakespeare that exists. Since, if the vision of the poet and that of the mystic are utterly and finally and in essence incommensurable, where are we to search for unity? And yet if the art of poetry have something of divine sanction and transcendent truth, then what limit can we place to the authentic inspiration of so transcendent and measureless a poet as Shakespeare?

G. WILSON KNIGHT

IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS

MILITANT NON-VIOLENCE*

[Dr. L. P. JACKS, Editor of *The Hibbert Journal*, wrote on "Democracy and Culture" in our July issue. We are very glad to be able to present his thoughts on the vexed problem of religion in politics.—EDS.]

It has been said that autobiographers are at once the most interesting and the least trustworthy class of historians; the most interesting because the human element in the person of the autobiographer pervades the narrative; the least trustworthy because whatever he narrates is apt to be seen by him through the distorting medium of his own personality. This last is quite distinct from conscious falsification, which may be wholly absent, and is compatible with accuracy in detail, but it leads the writer in spite of himself to see the facts in a false perspective. To see himself and his own doings as they really are the autobiographer must view the facts of his life with the Eye of the Universe, and this is normally beyond the powers of mortal men. The same disability applies, of course, to history in general, but is most apparent in that kind of history which turns upon *oneself*.

Mahatma Gandhi: his own story is no exception to this rule. It has a profound interest, especially for those who will make the effort, which we of the West ought assiduously to make, to understand the inner workings of the Indian mind, so different, in some

respects, from ours. But when Mr. Gandhi turns to the story of his wrongs or sufferings, as alas, he has frequently to do, we find that though the story is told without trace of exaggeration or bitterness, or the least desire to exhibit himself as a martyr, he nevertheless underestimates the acute provocation which his methods cause to those whose notions of responsibility differ from his own, and hardly gives them the credit they deserve for refraining from measures more severe than those actually taken. It is in such matters that the perspective goes wrong.

Mr. Gandhi's narrative leaves the present writer entirely convinced of the author's sincerity, but unconvinced of his freedom from self-deception. His purity of motive is beyond question or, to speak more strictly, it is as little mixed with self-regarding impurities as human motives can be expected to become. Whether the appellation of "saint," so commonly bestowed upon him, is correct or not it would be futile to discuss. But he is certainly not a professional saint, and it is to be regretted that so many of his followers are doing their best to

* *Mahatma Gandhi: His Own Story*. Edited by C. F. ANDREWS. (George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 12s. 6d.)

turn him into one—a regret which he himself, much to his honour, seems to share. In several passages of this book he has recorded his dislike of “darshan” or saintworship, which is apt to grow, if unchecked in time, into deification later on. Mr. Gandhi is well advised, in the interest of the cause he has at heart, as well as for the sake of sanity in general, to do all he can to prevent his followers from making him an object of “darshan,” and to place it on record, as I think he has done in this book, that he desires no apotheosis. The world would be a saner place than it is if all the great men of the past, whether heroes or saints, had taken similar precautions. Mr. Gandhi on his human level is a sufficiently imposing figure, an object lesson in self-mastery and self-devotion. But exaggeration may easily spoil it.

The main question which most readers of this book will ask, when they come to the end of it, will be as to the effects which the entry of such a character, essentially ascetic and otherworldly, upon the confused battlefield of politics is likely to have. Few persons will deny the general proposition, defended by Mr. Gandhi in this book (p. 338), that religion and politics are connected. But it does not follow from this that Indian politics and Mr. Gandhi's religion make a happy combination. One can only judge by the course of events and so far the omens can hardly be called favourable. Nobody can quarrel with

Mr. Gandhi for believing that universal love is the ultimate solvent of all human problems, political or otherwise. But there are many ways of propagating love. Some of them have the unfortunate effect of stirring up hate, and I doubt if it can be claimed for Mr. Gandhi that he has wholly escaped them.

In common with Indian thought in general his mind attaches too much weight to negative phrases and negative propositions. The supreme example is the phrase “non-violent non-co-operation” invented by him at the Amritsar Conference which, as stated in this negative way, seems to embody the uttermost of innocence or harmlessness. But this principle, innocent as it seems, becomes when translated into action a deadly weapon of offence, and none the less deadly because it stops short, at least theoretically, of the shedding of blood. It seems to have escaped Mr. Gandhi's observation that non-resistance as practised by himself and enjoined on his followers is something more than doing nothing, or standing still while others illtreat, buffet or oppress you. As adroitly practised it becomes a highly positive way of resisting those whose purposes are opposed to your own and so getting your own ends in spite of them. Practised by a master, non-resistance is, in fact, resistance endowed with a special technique, and as such more exasperating to the opponent than open violence, inflaming the blood it refuses to shed, and often ex-

tremely painful in its effects, though the pain it inflicts is of a different kind.

Admitting for the sake of argument that violence is wrong, it by no means follows that the absence of violence stamps an action or a course of action as right. Many poisons are non-violent in their action but they are none the less destructive on that account. Passive resistance, non-resistance, non-violence and the rest are, indeed, among the most misleading and dangerous terms which have ever been introduced into political warfare. As used by Mr. Gandhi their worst dangers are no doubt reduced by the nobility and transparent sincerity of his personal example. But as used by men on a lower level than his—and who can prevent such men from appropriating them?—they are apt to become cloaks for aggressiveness, or wolves in sheep's clothing. Mr. Gandhi betrays some inkling of this in the efforts he records to limit the scope of civil disobedience. He would not apply the method wholesale or indiscriminately to all the regulations of the state, but only in those cases where the political law is in opposition to the moral. But since each man must be his own judge of when such opposition occurs, the attempt to isolate the operation of this principle by restricting it to special cases is obviously futile and affords no protection whatever against the misuse of it by the unworthy. Mr. Gandhi has here unwittingly invoked a principle of

disorder which neither he nor any man could control and which would be just as fatal in the world which he seeks to create as to the system he seeks to overthrow.

"The only true resistance to the Government" he says (p. 318) "is to cease to co-operate with it." Here the verbal disguises of non-resistance are abandoned and the method of non-co-operation frankly announced as a principle of positive resistance. And such most assuredly it is. For "ceasing to co-operate," every time it is applied in practice, will be found to mean, not doing *nothing* when the Government bids you do something, but doing *something else* which, there and then, is forbidden. "Ceasing to co-operate" is, in fact, active defiance called by a name which conceals its true character. I am far from suggesting that defiance of a government is never justifiable. But to be so it must come out in its true colours and not pretend to be something other than it is. At this point Mr. Gandhi's devotion to Truth seems to have failed him, or at least so it seems to those of us who are accustomed to look for Truth in realities rather than in phrases. And it is precisely because of his readiness to be dominated by negative phraseology, without regard to the positive facts concealed beneath the phrase, that, while admitting his sincerity, we are bound to suspect him at times of unconscious self-deception.

And this is the more unfortunate because Mr. Gandhi, though a man of the most charming simpli-

city and winsome manners, is not an easy person to reason with or persuade. "I felt," he says on one occasion (p. 312), "that my position was so above question that no intelligent person would question it." There are many incidents recorded in the book which lead us to think that this is Mr. Gandhi's normal state of mind when the error of his ways is pointed out to him by anybody but himself.

Perhaps the most revealing of these is a domestic incident (recorded on p. 180) which he describes "as one of the sweetest recollections of my life". For reasons which appear, as he states them, to be quite absurd, Mr. Gandhi had conceived that his wife's health would be benefited by abstaining from "pulse and salt," articles of a diet, already much simplified, which the lady was not inclined to abandon. Needless to say, Mr. Gandhi carried his point, using methods for the purpose in which the wisdom of the serpent was effectively combined with the innocence of the dove, but which, though violence of course was not employed, have a strong savour of domestic tyranny—at least to the Western mind. Had Mrs. Gandhi been sufficiently practised at the time in civil, or rather domestic, disobedience, no doubt she would have resisted successfully and continued to eat her pulse and salt as before. But apparently she had not learnt that lesson and a rapid combination of manœuvres on the part of her husband forced her to yield. "You are too obstinate," she cried at the con-

clusion of the debate, "you will listen to none"—and burst into tears. Hers are not the only tears to be shed over Mr. Gandhi's obstinacy.

We gather from concluding remarks in the book that his service of his nation and of humanity are all of a piece with his renunciation of "pulse and salt". They are motivated by an intense desire for self-purification which, he believes, is not to be attained without active participation in political life. "Though a Mussulman or a Christian or a Hindu may despise or hate me," he writes, "I want to love him and serve him even as I would love my wife or son, though they hate me. So my patriotism is for me a stage in my journey to the land of eternal freedom and peace." With general principles of this kind it is difficult to find fault; but their real meaning, as it exists in Mr. Gandhi's mind, is not apparent until we have observed the application he makes of them. And when we observe that they take the form of promoting habits of civil disobedience in a population of three hundred millions it may well be questioned whether he is doing as much for the eternal peace and rest of those millions as he believes he is doing for himself. As for those now responsible for the government of India (and they too number many millions) it can hardly be contended that *their* way to eternal peace and rest is being made any smoother by Mr. Gandhi's particular combination of religion and poli-

tics. Whether or no the practice of civil disobedience is justified by the present circumstances of India, a more unfortunate starting point could hardly have been found for a movement whose ultimate aim is universal love, peace and concord. Civil disobedience is a principle of discord. Once it has become a habit, it may be trusted to turn any community which adopts it into a chaos of warring elements, which develop internal discord as soon as the external object of their common opposition is removed.

If we now ask on what does Mr. Gandhi rely to counteract the demoralising tendencies of civil disobedience, the answer (so far as it can be gathered from this book) is that he relies on the influence his personal example will have, when his self-purification is complete. "My national service," he writes (p. 337) "is part of the training I undergo for freeing my soul from the bondage of the flesh"; and again (p. 344) "when that fineness and rarity of spirit which I long for have become perfectly natural to me; when I have become incapable of any evil; when nothing harsh or haughty occupies, be it momentarily, my thought-world, then, and not till then, will my non-violence move the hearts of the world." That these words strike the authentic note of a lofty nature few will deny. At the same time one can hardly avoid reflecting that in the interval, be it short or long, while the process of Mr. Gandhi's self-purification is com-

pleting itself, the principle of discord he has let loose may give rise to evils which the completed form of his example will not be able to overtake. "These things don't stand still."

If non-violence were really the pure negative indicated by the form of the word, there might be no ground for these apprehensions. But, as we have seen, and as events in India abundantly prove, non-violence, when equipped with an adequate technique is a positive weapon of offence, whose effects, though less spectacular than those produced by guns and swords, are highly destructive in the material world and hate-provoking in the moral. Had a choice to be made between encountering opposition in the manifest form of open violence and encountering it in the insidious forms covered by the non-violence formula, most persons, I believe, most Western persons certainly, would find their evil passions less aroused by the former than by the latter, and would choose open violence as the lesser of the two evils. Once more Mr. Gandhi seems to have fallen into a self-deception, one not uncommon among pacifists, who are unquestionably right in their opposition to violence but doubtfully right in the non-violent but highly positive methods of warfare adopted by them in place of the bloodshedding variety. If these dangers are to be avoided by Mr. Gandhi's personal example he should lose no time in completing it.

We are far from questioning

the great and (up to a point) the beneficent influence of Mr. Gandhi's personality not only among his own countrymen but in other nations. *Not the least of the world's needs at the moment is the need of noble ascetics*; and of these Mr. Gandhi is one. But we fear that his example may come too late to control the forces liberated by the propaganda of civil disobedience.

Notwithstanding the dignity of his asceticism and the beauty of his otherworldliness (or is it in consequence of these qualities?) Mr. Gandhi's self-revelation has left on the present writer the impression of one who is, essentially, a fighting man, accomplished in the arts of his warfare and nobly indifferent, as every "happy warrior" should be, to wounds, suffering and death. Only among a people like the British, sufficiently stupid to be deceived by such formulæ as "passive resistance," "non-violence," "civil disobedience," would this essential characteristic of Mr. Gandhi have been overlooked; and probably nowhere else than within the bounds of the British Empire would he have found it possible to carry on his many campaigns. One trembles to think what would happen if a counterpart to Mr. Gandhi were to appear with the gospel of civil disobedience among the coloured population of the United States, in Fascist Italy, or Soviet Russia. I imagine that his propaganda would be met, in those countries, by methods of repression more drastic than those Mr. Gan-

dhi has been accustomed to under the British Raj. The Americans may admire such things from a distance and the Bolsheviks may welcome them as contributing to the downfall of the capitalist system, but were either of them asked to tolerate them within their own borders, their attitude would be different. I do not know whether gratitude has any place in the non-violent scheme of political morals, though it is obviously not wanting in Mr. Gandhi's private relationships. But if he allows that gratitude has any political value at all, I think the British Government, though far from being a charitable institution, is justly entitled to a little of it from Mr. Gandhi, for *not* having treated him as other Governments most assuredly would have done.

No thoughtful man will deny the immense gravity, both human and political, of India's problems. They are so grave and, at certain points, so heart-rending that errors of judgment and excesses of zeal may well be pardoned in those who are honestly concerned in their solution, as Mr. Gandhi unquestionably is. In no region of this sorrow-laden earth, not even in Russia, has human suffering through the ages been more prolonged or attained to greater proportions. In none is the task of government, no matter who or what the governing power may be, more complicated, perplexing and perilous.

There are errors to be admitted and evil courses to be amended on both sides. A common recognition

of this would help greatly to the solution of present antagonisms. No doubt it is asking too much of Mr. Gandhi, apostle of love though he be, to influence his countrymen in the direction of loving the British Raj. But might he not urge them, without inconsistency, *not to hate it*—a form of appeal well suited to his predilection for

the negative.

I am reminded of a story told by the late William James about a wicked farmer who, finding himself confronted by a grizzly bear in a lonely spot, fell to prayer for the first time in his life. "O Lord" he cried "I can't expect you to help *me*, wicked man that I am. *But don't help the bear!*"

L. P. JACKS

A FORGOTTEN THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY (1697-1705)

[**Edith Ward** has been a student of Theosophy and a silent but efficient and effective server of the Cause for many years. She is a lover of "our younger brethren," the animals; for them as for her fellows she has spent her time and labour mostly in private. We are very glad THE ARYAN PATH has gained her co-operation in its task of unveiling the universal nature of the Theosophical Movement.

The following article naturally brings to mind the statement of H. P. Blavatsky that the term Theosophy "is many thousands of years old" (*Key to Theosophy*, p. 1). Its Sanskrit equivalent is Brahma-Vidya. A historical and philosophical examination of this *word* would in itself reveal the continuity of the Movement representing the Wisdom-Religion, Bodhi-Dharma, of old.—EDS.]

In the second chapter of *The Key to Theosophy*, first published in 1889, there is a long quotation from a paper by Dr. J. D. Buck in which he mentions a volume entitled *Theosophical Transactions of the Philadelphian Society* as a book in his possession which affords proof of his statement that the Theosophical Society, founded in 1875, is not the first sodality of its kind and purpose. This volume is a rare work published in 1697. There is a copy in the British Museum, and there is a copy lying before me. I have heard of, but have not seen, a

third in this country, and if Dr. Buck's copy remains in America that completes the roll so far as I know. The reason for its rarity is not far to discern, for it consists of only five transactions—the *Acta Philadelphica* or monthly memoirs of the Philadelphian Society—which commenced in March 1697 and ended with August of the same year, and it is unlikely that there were many purchasers of these small papers who had them preserved by binding.

Presuming that Dr. Buck's contention is correct, endorsed as it is by citation in *The Key to Theo-*

sophy, it appears to have a special interest for readers of THE ARYAN PATH in view of the statement in the concluding chapter of *The Key*, where Madame Blavatsky speaks of the attempts of the Masters of Wisdom to help the spiritual progress of humanity in a marked and definite way towards the close of each century, and challenges investigation for traces of such movements century by century so far as detailed historic records extend.

Vaughan in his *Hours with the Mystics* describes the Society as "a coterie of some twenty ghost-seers" who "professed to have seen apparitions of angels and devils in broad daylight, every day for nearly a month. But he admits that the veracity of Dr. John Pordage, one of its founders, was never impugned even by his enemies, and that Jane Lead, or Leade, a widow of good Norfolk family, "carried to its practical extreme the Paracelsian doctrine concerning the magical power of faith". Vaughan adds that "some stir was made for a while by the theory that the power of miracle was native in man," but the doctrine is dismissed as "one of the many retrogressions of the mediæval school"!

Dr. Inge, so far as I can discover, makes no reference to this mystical school, but in Mr. A. E. Waite, we find, as we might expect, more respectful treatment. In his *Way of Divine Union* his view as to the position of the Philadelphians in theosophy is indicated, and they are assigned

to the non-Catholic school of English mysticism, obviously in the Boehme tradition. Of Dr. Pordage he writes that "while Boehme is incomparably greater, Dr. Pordage is much clearer, could we take him at his own valuation; but were it possible—as it scarcely is—to tolerate the cosmic revelations, his external psychic history, auditions, locutions and unvolitional dealings with devils are beyond human patience." From this it would appear that the short-lived career of the Philadelphians may have had some connection with their leaning to the dubious path of psychism. Dr. Pordage was originally in holy orders and was ejected on the alleged ground of ghostly visitants and supernatural communications. He died in 1698 and the Society disappeared in 1705 or thereabouts.

For a fuller treatment of the movement students should see Mr. Waite's Introduction to a translation by D. H. S. Nicholson of Lopukhin's *Characteristics of the Interior Church* wherein the linkage is made between Lopukhin and Eckartshausen on the one hand and Jane Lead's *Revelation of Revelations* and the teachings of the Philadelphians on the other.

But to the book itself. A small volume of irregular size, the title page reads:—*Theosophical Transactions* by the Philadelphian Society, consisting of Memoirs, Conferences, Letters, Dissertations, Inquiries, etc. for the Advancement of Piety and Divine

Philosophy. Underneath is the text (Daniel xii, 4.), "Many shall run to and fro, and Theosophy shall be increased," which is of course not the translation of the Authorised Version! Five pages of very large type are occupied by an Editorial:—"The Undertakers to the Readers giving an account of this Design." In part this reads as follows:

We having an Established Correspondency in most parts of Europe relating to the Affairs of Religion and likewise to the Extraordinary Appearances of God in Nature, and to the Ancient Mystick Knowledge of the Eastern Nations, which we do esteem no contemptible Key, towards a Right and Fundamental Understanding of great Part of the *Sacred Writings*, both of the *Old* and *New Testament*: Hereupon, from the root of Divine Love springing up in us, we have been moved in this Present Juncture of Affairs, to bring forth our Light. . . . Wherefore our design is to Publish many *Secret Memoirs* of the greatest Consequence, which are, or shall be communicated to us; and which we are, or shall be, under no obligation of Concealing. . . . Part of it is to make Peace betwixt Contending Brethren, and to put an End (as far as possible) to the Controversies among the Religionaries. . . . For this is one of the Golden Rules that is written over the Gates of Our School, *Blessed are the Peace-makers*.

The opening paper takes the form of a dialogue on "The City of Pure Gold like unto Clear Glass" (Revelation xxi, 18.), between Philochrysus and Philadelphus, and this is followed by a "Disquisition Concerning the Twelve Foundations of this City"—a favourite theme with early Christian writers. This purports to be a letter written by one

Aletheus and is a highly mystical communication of which the editors themselves say it is "mighty strange" and "by some likely to be deemed wholly unintelligible". But points of contact with a more modern presentation of Theosophy seem indicated by:—

(a) The opening statement that the communication was received from the "Hierophants of a certain Secret Temple with whom I have taken great pleasure to converse, for so many uncommon intimations as are given me from them:

(b) Indications of Initiation rites with opening of higher vision as the result:

(c) A very elaborate cosmogony for which the pectoral of the Jewish high priest with its twelve jewels, or stones, offers some kind of symbology.

We read about the Archetypal, Intellectual, and Angelical Sun; of sacred trines falling into quaternaries; of the famous tetractys and of a science of numbers; of Vital Light (Fohat?); of how all created beings were governed by the Deity according to such and such proportions of three qualities (gunas?), and so forth, all of which evoke memories of another and later book of Cosmogogenesis.

Coming later to a second letter from Aletheus wherein he replies to questions and objections, we find arguments and answers which have a familiar ring, e.g., when unintelligibility is urged the objectors are asked "to whom is it unintelligible?" Surely, writes

Aletheus, in effect, intelligibility must depend on some previous acquaintance with the subjects treated.

Yea, let them tell whether if Euclid's Elements, or a lecture of Algebra, were to be read at a Country Market, or elsewhere, they would not be sorely in danger of being voted down by the Majority, for unintelligible Jargon.

Again, when "Authority" for the statements is asked for:—"Who are these Hierophants and where are they to be found? If there be any such they ought not to be ashamed to appear, and produce their evidence"—the answer of Aletheus (to whose identity there appears no real clue) recalls memories of *Hints on Esoteric Theosophy*, No. 1, published in Calcutta in 1882. But he patiently describes the Secret Temple "hitherto hidden from the world, for that it is impossible to discover it by the vulgar eye: which yet Several Mortals, the inhabitants of these regions, (some of whom are intimately known to him) have had by permission a sight of; and some also have been even admitted into."

The whole is too long to quote but it may be concluded that Aletheus was genuinely in communication with Adept sources though his Secret Temple was no material structure but recalls that Hall of Learning of which *Light on the Path* has borne more recent testimony. From the testimony of Aletheus the High Priests ministering there were some whose names had been known of old time. Jacob Boehme and S. John

of the Cross are mentioned with others who, "having passed through the veil, by natural dissolution, are now entered into the Sanctuary". But then the writer continues—and this passage may, I think, be taken as evidence that the Philadelphians were not overstating their claim to be in touch with the members of a great fraternity of wise men whose main purpose was the "Bettering of mankind, and the raising up of our nature to the highest pitch of Purity and Felicity":—

There are also some Subordinate Priests known to me, waiting without the veil, who have a liberty of access by the High Priest granted to them at certain seasons, as their occasions require the same, and as they are found Faithful in the Ministrations to them committed. But ask not Who these are or Where they are to be found? They are *in* the World, but they are not *of* the World: and so are unknown (and unseen) *to* the World, yet they are neither *ashamed*, or *afraid* to appear, when God shall command them. Wherefore wait a little while, and you may possibly see them appear, as coming out of a cloud: and fear not, but they will *produce their evidence* along with them. The Proclamation is for this already made: and some Forerunners are sent out to make ready the way for those that are to follow. But it is better not to look at all Outwardly for their Appearance, or to inquire where you may find them: but rather endeavour to possess your own Soul by an holy Introversion, and you will find therein a greater Satisfaction, than by all the Outward Demonstrations which your Bodily Eyes can ever give you.

Space does not permit of fuller account of the philosophy of the Philadelphian Society, or one might write of their recognition

of a "Twofold Genealogy," "the one Terrestrial, being the Soul's descent into this Out-World," the other Celestial "being her ascent into the Inward World, and Hidden Sanctuary of God." Also one might discourse on their devotion to Music and the Laws of Harmony "a Musick that is (1) Natural, (2) Magical, (3) Prophectical or Ecstatical. The Musick I mean which was used in the Colleges of the Prophets, etc." So writes Aletheus, and illustrates his discourse with a sheet of diagrams which include the cube unfolded into a cross, the interlaced triangles forming a six-pointed star and a most elaborate and complicated design of seven six-pointed stars within one large one, all

linked up with numbered lines—and suggests that the universe is built up on laws of Harmony. Did these old Theosophists know the true answer to the Riddle of Pythagoras? It would seem they saw adumbrations of it in the pursuit of their inquiries.

Perhaps sufficient indication has now been given that this seventeenth century sodality was in truth in some way linked up with the great stream of traditional Wisdom at whose waters the writer of *The Secret Doctrine* more deeply drank in the nineteenth century for the refreshment of another age wherefor she claimed to be the humble messenger from the Hierophants of the Great White Lodge.

EDITH WARD

An Indian Diary. By EDWIN S. MONTAGU, edited by Venetia Montagu (W. M. Heinemann, Ltd., London. 21s.)

"The Wandering Jew" was the title of a poem of "welcome" to Mr. Montagu which appeared in a British owned, British managed, and British edited daily, in one of the British capitals of India during 1917-18 when he was going the round of this country. This volume is a reprint of the Diary of these wanderings, for which India owes gratitude to Mrs. Montagu. Why this great Secretary of State was so disliked by his own countrymen in India becomes very apparent in this record. Mr. Montagu had a clear oriental perception born of sympathy which permeated his psychic blood; his magnetic fluid attracted the Indians as naturally as it repelled the Britons. In this double expression of feeling—friendliness on the one side, antagonism on the other—we have a symbol, that of the whole problem of India. Racial arrogance is the besetting

sin of the Britishers in India. It turned into hatred when it came face to face with Mr. Montagu, himself a white man but of a superior calibre, with deeper perception and greater understanding. He saw through them and they felt like pigmies in the presence of a giant; they could not answer him when he showed them that they were tying up what minds they had with the red tape of political cant. They avenged themselves behind his back, but that story is not narrated in this volume. It is indeed a most interesting study to compare this book with the second volume of *Recollections* by John Morley, the former Secretary of State who tried to reform the political conditions of India. Both Morley and Montagu complain of diehardism in the beurocrat: the former complains of the jingo-tendency of the British Indian administrators, remarking that they don't like lawyers because they don't like laws. Mr. Montagu writes of errors seen and admitted but

not mended because of the influence of tradition and precedent. The soul of the Indian problem is a moral one : social antagonisms, economic rivalries and even political propaganda would take a very different turn if the British administrator acknowledged his moral weakness, his moral irresponsibility, his moral guilt. Many years ago writing to Mr. A. P. Sinnett, then editor of *The Pioneer*, a great Indian whom Theosophists revere as a Rishi said :—

The white race must be the first to stretch out the hand of fellowship to the dark nations—to call the poor despised “nigger” brother. The prospect may not smile to all, but he is no Theosophist who objects to this principle.

Our reading of this volume brings the same moral. Justice which is Karma has brought Britons and Indians together

so that each may learn from the other as well as teach. Learning requires humility, and no one without sympathy attains success as a teacher. The British have not learned the priceless Wisdom of India because of their proud aloofness—and what is more, they know neither the country nor its people, say they what they please. They have failed as teachers of mechanics, of hygiene, of sanitation, because they are hated and despised by their pupils, made sulky and suspicious through a lack of sympathy. Fortunately there have been exceptions among both classes in both departments; these like the few drops of rain are not a monsoon but presage it—the rain which comes from Sacrifice, as the *Gita* teaches. The propagation of Brotherhood should become the common mission of Indians and Britons to the benefit of their respective countries and more—the world.

A. F. A.

Literature and Occult Tradition. By DENIS SAURAT, translated by DOROTHY BOLTON. (G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., London. 12s. 6d.)

The chief interest in this book for the Theosophist is the acknowledgment by the author of the importance of H. P. Blavatsky in the realm of the literature of occultism. The Society for Psychical Research gratuitously branded her in her lifetime as “the most accomplished impostor of the age, whose name deserves to pass to posterity”. Some forty-five years later we take up this book written by the Professor of French Literature at King’s College, London University (surely a sufficiently respectable and academic recommendation) and we find that he considers Mme. Blavatsky “a precious witness,” and calls her *Secret Doctrine* “a colossal work”. Moreover, M. Saurat makes *The Secret Doctrine* the basis of a table, selecting from it various subjects and ideas connected with occultism and treated therein, and listing where these are to be found in some of the ancient philosophies of the world and some of the modern poets and thinkers of the

west. The word “modern” is used here in a comparative sense, since among the poets are included Milton and Spenser. The table is interesting because it shows how many of the topics treated by Mme. Blavatsky are to be found in the philosophical poetry of the west. But we are in complete disagreement with M. Saurat when he comments on *The Secret Doctrine* thus :—

Her chief book, *The Secret Doctrine* published in English in 1888, is a kind of modern summary of occultism which made use of the data found in all works of this sort since the Renaissance. *A kind of Indian veneer has been laid over the structure* but in its materials and build it is European. It is to Fludd, d’Espagnet, Court de Gebelin, Bailly, Fabre d’Olivet, Eliphas Levi that the ideas expressed by Madame Blavatsky belong, and their origin further back lies in the occultism of the Renaissance. *Her infatuation for India is only a fashion*, which had doubtless persisted in Russia from the end of the eighteenth century. (Italics ours.)

M. Saurat has missed the point. He has treated *The Secret Doctrine* as a book of reference and therefore he has failed to grasp its stupendous significance. To say that “her infatuation for India is

only a fashion" is a grave misrepresentation. If we are to believe Mme. Blavatsky herself, all her teaching was got from Indian Sages, and throughout her writings it is obvious to anyone who studies that her information is to be found by the sincere searcher in the ancient Indian texts. This we do not think M. Saurat would deny (see ft. note p. 69). That H. P. B. wished to establish the *universality* of Theosophy is true, and in order to bring evidence and corroboration for what she states to the modern western mind, she quotes from every available source. But her inspiration indubitably came from the east, where Wisdom has ever been preserved. In the very first sentence of the preface of her very first book *Isis Unveiled*, published in 1877, she states:—

The work now submitted to public judgment is the fruit of a somewhat intimate acquaintance with Eastern adepts and study of their science. It is offered to such as are willing to accept truth wherever it may be found, and to defend it, even looking popular prejudice straight in the face.

In M. Saurat's book a curious passage occurs on p. 72 with a very unfortunate footnote:—

Man being made of a divine substance, his desires are sacred and sensuality in particular is legitimate. *Footnote.*—Madame Blavatsky is, however, rather reserved on this point and blames the Jewish Cabala, which is one of her intellectual guides, for its tendency to emphasise the sexual side. . . . It is true that she had personal reasons for wishing to appear

puritanical, accusations of looseness being rife about her.

What is true is that Madame Blavatsky suffered from baseless calumny all her life, but she never left anyone for a moment in doubt as to her ethical principles. If M. Saurat would only read *The Voice of the Silence*, he would see at once that there is no compromise on the part of Mme. Blavatsky as to purity of life:—

The WISE ONES tarry not in pleasure-grounds of senses.

Strive with thy thoughts unclean before they overpower thee. Use them as they will thee, for if thou sparest them and they take root and grow, know well, these thoughts will overpower and kill thee.

Kill thy desires. Lano, make thy vices impotent, ere the first step is taken on the solemn journey.

Strangle thy sins, and make them dumb for ever, before thou dost lift one foot to mount the ladder.

Do not believe that lust can ever be killed out if gratified or satiated, for this is an abomination inspired by Mara. It is by feeding vice that it expands and waxes strong, like to the worm that fattens on the blossom's heart.

M. Saurat's object in writing this book has been to show that "in the philosophical poetry of a race its very soul can be seen." Such poets seem to transcend limiting creeds and to touch universal truths, and though this may show itself in different ways, yet it may be traced. M. Saurat has given a very valuable survey of several such poets and develops his theme in an interesting and sympathetic manner.

B. A. (OXON.)

The Outlines of Vedanta based on Sri Sankara's Dakshinamoorthy Stotra. By M. SRINIVASA RAU, M.A., (Madras), D. P. H. (Cambridge) (Bangalore City. Rs. 1/8.)

The present book is a translation and interpretation of a Sanskrit hymn by S'ankara, preceded by an introduction. A stotra is a hymn in praise of some deity. It is a spontaneous outburst of devotional feeling. In a Stotra the devotee enshrines his deep spiritual longings, his bubbling eagerness and affection, his utter self-dedication. Of the innumerable Sanskrit hymns the Dakshinamoorthy

hymn has a significance all its own. It is an evidence of the devotional side of the greatest of metaphysicians and Brahmanas. It is a beautiful epitome of the Advaita doctrine, while it emphasises the supreme necessity of a Guru for the attainment of the Higher Life. It never even hints at elaborate rituals as a means to liberation and in this it re-echoes the same revolutionary note which it was the mission of Sankara to strike. Sankara was a strenuous fighter against mere rituals; he laid greatest stress on Knowledge. ज्ञानान्मोक्षः—this was the message of his supreme metaphysical construc-

tions. The Dakshinamoorthy Stotra repeats the same theme, showing in addition that S'ankara did recognise the place of Bhakti or devotion in the soul life.

There are two important points as regards the Stotra which the author has left undiscussed. First, about the meaning of the name Dakshinamoorthy he has only this much to say: "The Lord who sits facing the South." Surely, however, it has a greater significance. The Dakshinamoorthy is an image of S'iva with an esoteric significance. The exact meaning of such images is for us to-day a matter of conjecture. According to the Puranas Dakshina is one of the twin daughters of Ruchi and Akuti, the first human pair. Yajni is the name of the other daughter. Dakshina means offerings to the teachers; Yajni means sacrifice. Just as Utsavamoorthy is the

image meant for special purposes of a festival even so Dakshinamoorthy might mean a special image of the Guru, to which the S'ishya or the pupil gives the offerings of his own soul in the spirit of self-dedication.

The second important point—and on this M. Srinivasa Rau has not even touched—is as regards the number of the stanzas in the text. Neither tradition nor manuscripts seem to be agreed on the point. Our author gives ten verses. In *Brihatstotraratnakara* (Bombay Nirnaya Sagara Edition) the text of the Dakshinamoorthy Stotra consists of fifteen verses. The twelfth verse from that text is highly mystical and is well-known to the Indian esotericists; it is said to contain a key to the Being to whom the Stotra is addressed.

D. G. V.

The Universal Mind: A Study in Psychology and Religion. By ALFRED HOOK. (Jonathan Cape, London. 12s. 6d.)

What may be achieved in the way of a thoughtful and lucid study when man seeks to know himself is apparent in *The Universal Mind* which is of interest for several reasons. Mr. Hook, for instance, as a civil servant interested in economics, passed apparently to consideration of humanity and its problems, became a social philosopher to judge from the titles of other books of his, and so arrived at this work. Apart from its general interest to every reader, the student of Theosophy will find a deeper source, for the author is obviously searching for conclusions to be found in ancient lore *even where he does not approach them*. There is his idea of Universal Mind homogeneous and in equilibrium, in which mental states arise as specific and localized forms, where he reaches out after the First Fundamental Proposition of the *Secret Doctrine*; there are his carefully illustrated ideas of psychological states proceeding from the two main forces of attraction and repulsion, aspects of the One Law which is the Second Fundamental; and

in his Self in every one of the myriad constituent units of the whole, it is not difficult to see the Third. With his statement that consciousness of duration is the succession of experiences associated in one composite experience, when time becomes "duration" between two events, may be compared Mme. Blavatsky's statement: "Our ideas, in short, on duration and time are all derived from our sensations according to the laws of Association." (*Secret Doctrine*, I. 43-4.)

Who will not agree with the author that "desire for possession" is the dominant passion of modern civilization? "Volumes might be written about the appalling consequences of this human characteristic." On will and desire as with hypnotism, telepathy, apparitions, he seems to us but to be speculating. The rest of his book leads us to think that continued study will probably mean nearer approach to the Eastern teachings where the rationale of psychic phenomena was explained long ago. Certainly, to *The Universal Mind* justice cannot be done in short space. Its many points of comparison and contrast need perusal and correlation which will repay the student.

S. T.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE

In explanation of the word "iddhi" which occurs in the first sentence of the *Voice of the Silence*, H. P. Blavatsky has added a footnote (footnote 1) which contains the following sentence:

"Says Krishna in *Shrimad Bhagavat* :—'He who is engaged in the performance of yoga, who has subdued his senses and who has concentrated his mind in me (Krishna), such yogis all the Siddhis stand ready to serve.'"

This is what H. P. B. wrote and this is what is printed in the original edition of that book. In the subsequent editions printed at Bombay, Point Loma and Los Angeles, however, there is added after the words "*S'rîmad Bhâgavat*" the word "*Bhagavad-Gîtâ*" in square brackets. The square brackets indicate that what is enclosed within was not written by H.P.B. but was added later by the editor or editors.

These editors do not seem to have been so well acquainted with Sanskrit literature as H. P. B.; and in any case, the correction of *S'rîmad Bhâgavat* into *Bhagavad-Gîtâ* is without doubt wrong. For—

(1) Every one who is at all familiar with the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ* knows that the word *siddhi* in the sense of psychical faculties or powers is nowhere used in it.

(2) There is a book in Sanskrit literature known as *S'rîmad Bhâgavata* (or simply *Bhâgavata*; but since the name *Bhâgavata* is used of another book also the *Devi Bhâgavata*, the name *S'rîmad Bhâgavata* is used in preference by those who want to be unambiguous); this is one of the eighteen Puranas whose author

is alleged to be Vyasa, and treats of the doings of Viṣṇu's avatâras. The tenth and eleventh sections (skandha) of this book are concerned with the doings and teachings of Srî Krishna and the verse referred to by H. P. B. in the above footnote is in fact the first verse of the 15th canto of the 11th Section. This verse reads as follows, and is addressed by Krishna to his disciple Uddhava:

jitendriyasya yuktasya jita-s'vâsasya
yoginah |
mayi dhârayatas' ceta upatishṭhanti
siddhayaḥ ||

"The siddhis are at the service of (i.e. of themselves offer to serve) the yogî who has subdued his senses, who is engaged in the performance of yoga, has controlled his breath and has concentrated his mind in me."

I would therefore suggest that, in place of "*Bhagavad-Gîtâ*" the figures "XI. 15. 1." be substituted within square brackets in the above sentence, to complete the reference of H. P. B.

Mysore

A. VENKATASUBBIAH

[We are grateful to our correspondent. Owing to the great scarcity of the original edition, the copy of a later one was sent to the press. Although every endeavour was made to eliminate differences, this important error has obstinately persisted—perhaps for the paradoxical reason that it occurs in the very first page. It was an oversight during the process of comparison. The original edition was printed in 1889, but we have a London edition as early as 1892, where the mistake occurs. The correction will be made in our future editions.—EDS.]

ECHOES OF THEOSOPHY

"The sun of Theosophy must shine for all, not for a part. There is more of this Movement than you have yet had an inkling of."—MAHATMA M.

Ideas are generally other people's thoughts which we accept or challenge, or play with, but which really trouble us no more than other people's children. When a man begins to think for himself the trouble begins.—PHYLLIS SINGLETON (*New's Chronicle*)

There is a public (not an external) world and there are many private worlds . . . There is of course a private world for each of us, and we mustn't try to make it a public affair. Myself, I'd seek to shatter the world and then remould it nearer to the heart's desire; but the records of history have too much of *that* in them. The Jerusalem that we would rebuild should be the city of all men. My private world has prejudices, obsessions, acquisitiveness, lust, etc.; so has yours, in a rather different way.—JAS. JOHNSTON (*Journal of Philosophical Studies*)

It is not by any Parliamentary authority that taste and discretion can be fostered, that insight into essential needs can be given, that imagination and high accomplishment can be assured.—SIR EDWIN LUTYENS (*Letter to Architects, etc.*)

I do not agree with the notion that our whole purpose is to serve the next generation. This is to find the meaning of life in a goal which perpetually recedes. But, also, I do not think we ought to be content with a purely personal development. Each individual's life is partly a means to an end and partly an end in itself.—SIR JOSIAH STAMP (*The Observer*)

He who does not desire to stop and become a prisoner to his own virtues must know how to break at any moment the old habits in the kingdom of good, and how to form new ones in the kingdom of better.—PROF. VITTORINO VEZZANI (*The Hibbert Journal*)

The teachers of religion evidently need to consider themselves and to decide what is their religion.—A. M. THOMPSON (*The Clarion*)

To hunt any animal, for the love of hunting, for the love of seeing it gradually falter, stumble, and die an agonising death, is cruel. . . . It is no use to say, in excuse, that life is cruel. To dare to propose such truisms is sheer effrontery. But that is no argument for extending its cruelty. If we allow ourselves to quote the cruelty of life as an extenuation for all the abuses and sorrows of human society, we immediately adopt an attitude of despair. The doctor who is fighting disease would throw his tubes out of the window, the sociologist who is fighting slums would draw the blinds and stay at home, the educationalist who is fighting ignorance would take down a novel from his book shelves and lose himself in an unreal world.

—BEVERLEY NICHOLS (*Nash's Pall Mall Magazine*)

A recent writer observes that there are very few deaths that are really natural deaths. But then there are equally few lives that are really natural lives.

—D. G. (*Light*)

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"———ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."

HUDIBRAS.

Of late there has been a slight injection of religious atmosphere and terminology into books on physics and astronomy. Not attributing this to the personal hope and leaning of the authors, the general public is already talking of the reconciliation between religion and science. In this journal more than one note of warning and caution has been struck. Theosophy recognises the possibility of such reconciliation, but it will have to be effected along a very, very different line. Moreover, it asserts that complete accord between Science and Religion actually exists; for Science and Religion are but two of the main branches on the Tree of Knowledge—Philosophy being the third; and of course there are numerous minor branches. But such Science and such Religion are very different from the science whose god is Matter and the religion whose God is a gigantic genius with a strong cruel and egotistic trait wherewith He keeps His awed creation going. We therefore welcome an outspoken article in *The Spectator* of 31st January by John Langdon-Davies entitled "Science and God," which analyses the conceptions of God prevailing in Christendom. The author's remarks may be concisely summarised thus:—

No scientist hopes to know what his god, Matter, is; he is content to observe what Matter *does*. So also the Christian theologian has given up proving whether God is or is not and has come to believe that there is evidence that God *does* things. Science distrusts all theology, orthodox or otherwise, and the two cannot be reconciled. The difficulty lies in that there exist a thousand Christian Gods, but this polymorphism boils down to four chief ingredients.

(1) The God of mystic intimations, that is, private knowledge, not discussable in public as science discusses problems of knowledge; moreover it is the knowledge of an intimate lover which proves nothing about God, whatever it may prove about the lover.

(2) The God who is a bundle of all which has not yet been found out, a God who is felt as an outside creator and manipulator, and against whom science wages war although He is allowed to creep into scientific calculations under an alias like "absolute space" or "ether" only to be put out; science continuously shows that if He exists He does nothing and is useless and unimportant.

(3) The God who gives values to everything in the universe. He is invented by men aspiring for Goodness, Beauty, etc. Science

does not believe that a God is necessary to explain such values when His creation shows He does not live up to those values Himself. The creation of a cat which plays with mice, or an ichneumon paralysing a caterpillar so that its young may feed, is sub-human and not super-human.

(4) The God of the Bible in whom most intelligent Christians to-day do not believe in any real sense of the term. The belief of such intelligent Christians "might seem all very well to Confucius or Buddha [and Mr. Davies could well have added Jesus], it would be atrocious to Aquinas, Calvin or Luther".

In conclusion Mr. Davies pleads for a correct use of words and terms by the scientist; he says the scientists know and ought to know the danger of using words with emotional and traditional associations, and that God is one such word.

To most people the word God has too much that is primitive, savage, obscurantist, muddleheaded to make its use seem legitimate for the otherwise harmless overbeliefs indulged in even by eminent scientists in their private capacity. Surely it is dangerous for great physicists to use the terms of orthodox religion! It leads in ordinary minds to wave mechanics proving personal immortality, quanta demonstrating free will and the space time continuum being mistaken for the heaven of the apocalypse. Hence the God that is only a word is as bad as any.

To treat the last appeal first—Theosophy welcomes it. We find it more and more necessary to drop the use of the word God.

Even the word Deity is becoming difficult of use. Once again we plead—"Definite words for definite things."

Now to some of the lessons of the article which comes close to Theosophy in its reasoned denunciation of the God of the Churches—the personal anthropomorphic creator. It, however, once again destroys without constructing a substitute—it kills falsehood, but where is Truth? We agree, blind religious belief must be abandoned; but is there no possibility of providing knowledge which gives a faith and vision of pure reason? The four types of Gods analysed by Mr. Davies are like four forged rupee-notes, and of high excellence at that; but they also prove that genuine originals exist. Let us look at these forgeries with a view to trace not the culprits who forged them but the originals from which the forgers copied.

The mystic's intimations are not always only intimations; and further, a very large accumulation of intimations may be profitably studied as intellectual propositions to evolve at least a working hypothesis. In eastern mysticism, unlike the western, there is something more than intimations; description of realization-experiences are detailed. Further, programmes for experiencing not intimations but such full realizations are given. These warn against false tracks and dangerous pitfalls. These experiences that the Deity which dwells in the core of

man's being *knows* Deity in the heart of the universe are not proofs to isolated individuals; they are independent experiences of thousands of generations of Seers, experiences which are verifiable to-day and can be tested in the laboratory of the human head, in the observatory of the human heart, in the temple of the human body. These experiences, not only difficult but impossible of expression in words, have been described by many symbolic illustrations, each of which enables us to sense but one aspect of Deity. For those who are unable, at the moment, to make the experiments for themselves, these symbolic records afford matter for intellectual study and research. Just as it is possible for human mind to grasp the fact of earth's revolution round the sun without actually undertaking costly and intricate experiments, so also, says Eastern Esoteric Science, it is within the reach of ordinary intellects, provided they are truly honest, open-minded, rightly active to understand the import of these experiences. (This is the truth at the back of the first god so unacceptable to Mr. Davies.) Now this Record of Experiences reduced to symbolic writing is the reality whose dark shadow is holy books of revealed religions. Such Record is for study, unlike revelations which call for blind acceptance. (This is the truth at the back of the false god No. 4 of Mr. Davies.)

There is much more of what modern science does not know

compared with what it now does know. And these old Seers have also found out such facts about cosmos and man and emblematised them. This vast knowledge they acquired in the process of realizing their own divinity, so that their Record admits of no miracle and has logical and convincing explanations of all phenomena dubbed miracles. What is loosely called Magic was to them as it is to their modern heirs an exact science. (This truth is at the back of the false god No. 2 of Mr. Davies.)

The Code of Ethics which is part of that Record is founded on that knowledge of the laws of Nature, Nature not only visible to the ordinary senses but visible also to the super-normal, *i.e.*, super-mental, ones. The ethical values of concepts and aspirations are mathematically accurate in this ancient science. (This is the truth behind the third god Mr. Davies dethrones).

Mr. Davies has done a very necessary piece of iconoclastic work. Theosophy is all for dethroning the false gods of religious creeds; but also it is all against the negation which modern science would enthrone. Theosophy, ancient and modern, from that of the *Rig-Veda* to that of the *Secret Doctrine* proves the necessity of an absolute Divine Principle in Nature. It denies Deity no more than it does the sun. Esoteric philosophy has never rejected God in Nature, nor Deity as the absolute and abstract *Ens*. It only refuses to accept any of the gods of the so-called monotheistic reli-

gions, gods created by man in his own image and likeness, a blasphemous and sorry caricature of the Great Presence.

Apart from its influence on the social order, the kind of God in which parents and teachers believe seriously affects all educational problems. A gathering of Indian ladies was given the following advice by a lecturer whose theme was "Mother—Teacher and Pupil".

And what is the very first thing that every Mother has to teach the new babe? Why, the nature of God or Deity, and that is the third thing every mother should learn so that she may teach. Here too the old teaching is forgotten and much confusion exists. Rich as is our Indian philosophy its study is so neglected that crude conceptions of God have come to prevail, debasing ideas of prayer are held. What is God? What is prayer? These primary questions every mother must be able to answer, for at her knees every son and daughter of future India has to learn. The highest conception of God is in the Upanishads—God is Self, is Atma. And the Self is everywhere. Teach your child to recognise all children as his brothers and sisters. Don't make him selfish and narrow-minded by chaining him to the fetters of caste distinction and religious intolerance. And the Self is in us. There is no outside God or power to bless or to curse. Mother Nature is God. To the child Mother in the Home is Deity. The task of motherhood is to let the Atman in her shine forth so that the child may learn to shine as Atman. There is not a power in Nature which we do not possess: Nature creates, so can we; Nature blesses, so can we; Nature punishes, alas! so can we; Nature sacrifices, so can we; Nature withholds only in order to teach us, and we also withhold but in selfishness. The

only difference between Mother Nature and the Human Mother is that she is wise, and we are both wise and foolish; she is compassionate and we love as well as hate; she gives and gives while we give and take. Be like Nature, so that the child may see the God not by precept only but also by example. And be prepared, in loving humility to learn, for it is said: "From the mouths of babes and sucklings wisdom comes." In the open mouth of the child Krishna, the Divine Thief of Kitchen-curd, Devaki saw the Purna-Avatar. Every mother can see, if she is true in the performance of her own dharma, the divinity of the incarnated God.

Nowadays education of the young is being experimented with on a large scale, especially in the West, and while many attempts are bound to prove abortive and thus to the detriment of not a few growing individuals, signs of truly healthy development show themselves here and there. Much cant and a great deal of thoughtless talk prevails on the subject of disciplining the children, and so we read with some relief of another truly Theosophical expression of adult influence in a recent volume by Dr. Blatz of Toronto University and Helen Bott:—

I can usually find what I think is the reason of my child's misbehaviour. Sometimes she is hungry or tired, but more often her tantrums have been a reflection of my own nervous, uncontrolled state. I now spend less energy on managing the child and more on preventing upsets in myself.

Dr. Hughes Mearns (who is doing excellent pioneering work in this field, as will be apparent from an article from his pen which will appear in an early

number of THE ARYAN PATH) has written on "I believe in Discipline" in the January *Thinker*, in which he similarly advocates self-discipline for parents and teachers with a view to benefit children and pupils. On expounding his thesis to a mother he was told:—

"I am not asking you what I should do," she replied briskly. "I am asking you to give me help in disciplining a bad child. However, I see you do not believe in discipline."

"But I do," I assured her. "I believe in discipline for all of us. I believe in discipline for myself. I believe, for instance, in discipline for you. After several weeks in your home, suppose I should come to the conclusion that your child is suffering an almost irreparable hurt because it is you, perhaps, or some other person in your household, who needs the disciplining? Often, you know, it is the mother, the father, the favoured elder brother or sister, the teacher, the principal of the school—it is often they and not the so-called bad child who should be subjected to the experience of disciplining."

"All of which," she retorted, "sounds perilously like nonsense to me. I, for one, do believe in discipline!" And she liked saying it so well that she said it again, "I do believe in discipline!"

But teachers and parents who recognise the truth of the above are seeking for some method of exemplifying their own precepts; they find in their wandering minds and uncurbable feelings, their own and their children's great foe. Such will find help from an article in the *Hindu Education and Literary Supplement* (Madras) by Mr.

M. A. Venkata Rao. He recommends the ancient method which would help youth in disciplining its own boisterousness, sense-life and roving mind:—

The Yoga system of thought in India has made a very close and systematic study of the growth and discipline of the mind. It has discriminated natural stages in the ascent of mind in its career of self-liberation from the insistent urge of the senses and from the bondage to irrelevant details and chance desires. We begin with Dharana or concentration, proceed to Dhyana or meditation, till at last we reach the stage of Samadhi or illumination, the crown of thought consisting in the vision of ultimate reality. This scheme of mental discipline must be incorporated in educational organisation if we are to reap the full benefits of education as self-liberation.

Here once again the importance of the *subject* of meditation must not be overlooked. The ancient injunction should be steadfastly kept in view: the mind should be made to dwell on noble ideas, those that are universal and impersonal. Concentration acquired by fixing attention on small, ordinary objects and subjects build sharp but narrow minds, keen but selfish. There is plenty of such concentration in the modern world and it strengthens the struggle for existence producing the survival not of the spiritually fittest but of the mentally most selfish.

We might as well take this opportunity to say that the Theosophical views on the vital subject of educating the young are to be found in *The Key to Theosophy*, by H. P. Blavatsky.