

# EVANS

Point out the "Way"—however dimly,  
and lost among the host—as does the evening  
star to those who tread their path in darkness.  
—*The Voice of the Silence.*

## THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. V

DECEMBER 1934

No. 12

### CHRIST—THE SAVIOUR

The Christmas season is again with us, and in all lands this festival of the western world will be celebrated. Peace and good will once more will be talked about amid the many nations preparing themselves for war, making ready to strike when a favourable moment arrives.

The churches will be busy; the priests will have the satisfaction of seeing the pews fairly well filled—a rare sight nowadays, especially among Protestants. High Church sacerdotalism seems to be attracting better audiences from among the weary exhausted minds of this post-war period, by its soothing artistry, chanting and incense. Preachers and especially congregations are not insincere, but the inspiration which the preachers desire to give and the congregations to receive, will not flow. Why? Because the Christ-Spirit has abandoned the churches these many centuries—abandoned them when

they rejected Gnosis. Many are the devices and the contrivances employed to uphold the fast-falling structure, but none of them answer the purpose. There is one and only one way to attract to their work the quickening Christ-Spirit, but popes and priests will not part with their privileges, their claims, their dogmas. Real knowledge of the Mystery of Christ-Birth, of Crucifixion, of Resurrection, etc., is absent in the churches while the gross and palpable fraud of apostolic succession and the like is maintained, and claims are made for the unique nature of Jesus, which He Himself never made. How truly applicable to the priests are the words of the Gospel:—

Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.

How many adherents of Christian-

ity really know the true significance of Christmas? They are not even taught it, because such instruction would necessitate a mystical interpretation of the term Christ. Few Christians, among the laymen, are aware even of the true meaning of that word. It would not suit the churches to let it be known generally that Christ was no man (nor a Master either, as taught by pseudo-theosophists), but that Christ is the Principle, the awakened and glorified Spirit of Truth, *universal and eternal*. No man, no institution can monopolize it; and it cannot be confined to any creed or sect. Such a Christ is not to be sought either in the wilderness or in the sanctuary of any temple or church. Christ, the true esoteric Saviour, is the Divine Presence in *every* human being. H. P. Blavatsky taught in her *Esoteric Character of the Gospels*:—

“He who strives to resurrect the Spirit crucified in him by his own *terrestrial passions*, and buried deep in the ‘sepulchre’ of his sinful flesh; he who has the strength to roll back *the stone of matter* from the door of his own *inner* sanctuary, he *has the risen Christ in him*. The ‘Son of Man’ is no child of the bond-woman—*flesh*, but verily of the free-woman—*Spirit*, the child of man’s own deeds, and the fruit of his own spiritual labour.”

“The Christian Saviour, like Krishna, whether as man or logos, may be said to have saved those who believed in the secret teachings from ‘eternal death,’ to have

conquered the Kingdom of Darkness, or Hell, as every Initiate does. This in the human, terrestrial form of the Initiates, and also because the *Logos* is Christos, that principle of our inner nature which develops in us into the Spiritual Ego—the Higher-Self—being formed of the indissoluble union of *Buddhi* and the spiritual efflorescence of *Manas*. ‘The Logos is passive Wisdom in Heaven and Conscious, Self-Active Wisdom on Earth,’ we are taught. It is the Marriage of ‘Heavenly Man’ with the ‘Virgin of the World’—Nature, as described in *Pyramander*; the result of which is their progeny—immortal man. It is this which is called in St. John’s Revelation the marriage of the lamb with his bride (XIX. 7). That ‘wife’ is now identified with the Church of Rome owing to the arbitrary interpretations of her votaries.”—*The Secret Doctrine* II, 230–31.

Such teachings break down all barriers between man and man, broaden his outlook, deepen his insight, universalize his feelings and enlighten his mind concerning the mysterious throbbings of his soul. They bring inspiration, moral courage to face and overcome life, and they have the power to unfold the spirit of sacrifice and service for the race as a whole. In which church are they to be found? In none made with human hands; but there is the Temple of God within us, walled in by matter, but penetrable by any one who can find the way; the pure in heart see God.

## VIRGIN BIRTHS

[ Sir Alexander G. Cardew, K. C. S. I., entered the Indian Civil Service in 1881 and rose to be a member of the Executive Council of the Governor of Madras in 1914. He presided over the Indian Jails Committee ere retiring in 1919. He is the author of *The White Mutiny, A Short History of the Inquisition* and *Life of the Rev. Cornelius Cardew, D. D.* He is a Rationalist and a regular contributor to *The Literary Guide*. In this article he ably presents the long story of the dogma of the Christian Church which deprives it of any uniqueness so often claimed by its ignorant blind believers. We append a short Note which explains the great Myth.—EDS. ]

The disintegration of religious beliefs under the powerful solvents of science and education is one of the most prominent characteristics of the present epoch. Conservative religious opinion deplores this process but is powerless to arrest its progress. In his recent book entitled *Modern Tendencies in World Religions* Mr. C. A. Braden of the Northwestern University, Illinois, U. S. A., has shown this movement at work in Europe, Asia and America, in Christianity, Hinduism and Islam. An important illustration of the process is furnished by the Christian dogma of the Virgin Birth of Jesus. Until recent times this doctrine was regarded as an essential part of the Christian faith. It was accepted with unquestioning belief for centuries and it still occupies a prominent position in the Christian profession of belief. Children still readily accept the legend as they accept other fairy stories and in those regions which are still under the numbing influence of the Church of Rome every Christmas sees in every Church the sacred *crèche* with the infant Jesus watched over by his Virgin Mother, while shepherds and wise men look on in

adoration and the Star of Bethlehem shines overhead. Old childish recollections endear the story to every one brought up in Christian surroundings and few would care to dissect it too brutally. But as a living doctrine of the Church it has lost its reality. The Modernist school has openly abandoned it. The clergy generally prefer to pass it by in silence and even those Christians who have not yet definitely renounced it are aware that it is retained more as a piece of folk-lore, a charming legend, than as a doctrine to be intellectually grasped and defended.

For there is indeed no part of the Christian programme which is more difficult of acceptance and defence than the legend of the Virgin Birth. Considered biologically it is at once incredible and inept. The Bishop of Birmingham, who is eminent both for his high scientific attainments and for his enlightened views on theology, pointed out last year in his immensely learned Gifford Lectures that an individual produced by parthenogenesis would probably be haploid. Possessing only half the normal number of chromosomes, he would be likely to be of imper-

fect mental and physical development. As Bishop Barnes remarks, such a result would hardly be congruous with the Christian conception of Christ.

Apart from this biological objection to the Virgin Birth, it seems clear that to represent Jesus as of non-natural origin, the miraculous offspring of the deity and a woman, must destroy that claim to complete humanity on which the Christian Church lays so much insistence. It would indeed convert Jesus into a sort of freak or *lusus naturae* and would raise an impenetrable barrier between him and ordinary men and women. As the more intelligent churchmen are beginning to feel, such a story, however much it may have pleased the wonder-loving minds of an uncritical age, is now a stumbling-block to adult intelligence.

Considered in the light of critical study of the Christian documents, the story of the Virgin Birth is equally indefensible. Of the four Gospels, two make no mention of it. Of these two, that to which the name of Mark attaches is, by common consent, the most primitive and the absence from it of the episode of the Virgin Birth suggests that that episode is a later invention. Even in the case of the two gospels which contain the story, those of Matthew and Luke, there is clear evidence that it constitutes an interpolation. It was an article of Christian belief from very early days that Jesus, as the Christ or Messiah, was descended from the great Jewish Hero-King, David. Genealogies pur-

porting to establish this descent appear both in Matthew's and in Luke's Gospels. Yet, if Jesus was not the son of his father, Joseph, through whom the descent from David was traced, the genealogies completely lose their *raison d'être*. Their presence as an integral part of these gospels shows that the legend of the Virgin Birth was a later addition.

It is not, therefore, surprising to find that, except in those chapters which contain the interpolated legend, no one in any of the gospels shows the slightest knowledge of Jesus's mysterious and supernatural origin. On the contrary, when he preached in his native town and astonished every one by his power and wisdom, the people expressed their wonder by exclaiming: "Is not this Joseph's son?" Had any extraordinary circumstances surrounded his birth, there would have been plenty of people in a small country town to recall them and to point to them as an explanation of his great gifts. Even Mary, his Mother, seems completely oblivious of his wonderful origin. On Jesus's return to the city, after roaming the country-side, preaching, working miracles and consorting with disreputable people, his family were so concerned at his conduct that they intended to put him under restraint, as being out of his mind, and his mother went with his brothers to find him. It is incredible that such a course would have been taken had Mary had any recollection of her own supernatural visions and of "the day-spring from on high" that had visited her.

But the Gospels are not the earliest Christian documents. These are to be found in the writings of the Apostle Paul, some of which at least are generally accepted as genuine. It is important, therefore, to note that this earliest witness, like Mark the author of the earliest gospel, knows nothing of the Virgin Birth but evidently regards Jesus as the son of his father, begotten in the normal way. Indeed Paul expressly describes him as "born of the seed of David according to the flesh," words which imply human paternity, for the descent from David could not be traced through Mary who belonged to another tribe. In the Acts of the Apostles, also an early document, both Peter and Paul are represented as stressing Jesus's descent from David, a claim which, as already suggested, is irreconcilable with the story of the Virgin Birth. It may thus be asserted that, on a valid exegesis, that story is not capable of adequate defence.

When we examine the Gospels by the light of comparative folk-lore, the argument against the legend of the Virgin Birth is found to be immensely strengthened. In all parts of the world it can be shown that similar legends ascribing supernatural birth, often from a virgin, to heroes and other famous men are prevalent. Space is insufficient to make anything like a complete examination of this vast subject, but a few illustrations will show the world-wide occurrence of such stories. In Greek legend Perseus, the rescuer of Andromeda, was born of the virgin Danae whom

Zeus visited in the form of a shower of gold when her father had confined her in a brazen tower. Minos, the mythical king of Crete, was also the son of Zeus by the virgin Europa, whom the god in the form of a bull carried off to Crete. The same prolific deity was also the father of Herakles, one of the most famous of Greek heroes, and Dionysus was his offspring by "the hapless Semele," who was destroyed by the lightning of her lover. In Turkish legend, the ancestor of the race, Budantsar, was miraculously conceived by a Mongol widow, and a supernatural birth was even attributed to the famous conqueror Jenghiz Khan. Hebrew story narrates how Abraham's wife, Sarai, conceived her son Isaac in extreme old age, through the favour of Jehovah, and the great champion of the Israelites, Samson, had a similar history. India is not without somewhat similar legends. According to one story, Vyasa, the celebrated collector of the Vedas, was born of a fish. The Sage, Visvamitra, is said in the Vishnu Purana to have been conceived through his mother's eating a grain of rice of magical qualities. Raja Rasalu, the hero of the Punjab, owed his origin to a similar occurrence, and Gugu Pir, the Mahratta saint, was likewise fabled to have been conceived when his mother received resin and milk from the guru Gorakhnath. It is said of the Buddha that "he shot through the void as a six-rayed star and entered Maya's womb upon the right". Fo-Hi, the founder of the

Chinese Empire, was the offspring of a virgin who ate a miraculous flower, and the great Emperor Yu was born of a girl who swallowed a pearl. Kiang Yuan, mother of Hau ki, the ancestor of the kings of Kau, was a virgin who conceived through stepping on a footprint left by a god or a giant. In Siam, Codom was virgin-born, his mother being impregnated by sunbeams and a similar story is told in Japan of a maiden who slept by the shores of a lake and whose offspring thus conceived became the wife of a chief.

On the American continent, the Sia Indians relate that their hero, Poshaiyänne, was born of a virgin who conceived through eating some pinon nuts. The Aztecs attribute the birth of Quetzalcoatl to his mother's having swallowed a turquoise, and Montezuma, the hero of the Mexican Indians, was the son of a virgin who was impregnated by a summer shower. The Apaches, the Pimas and the Mojaves have the same story. Both in Brazil and in Samoa, we hear of a young virgin who was fertilized by a fish and the Samoan saga also tells of a woman fructified by the rays of the rising sun. The Admiralty Islanders trace the descent of mankind from a woman who was thus fecundated. The Minahasers of Celebes claim to be descended from a girl who was impregnated by the west wind, and Hiawatha owed his birth to the same cause. In Africa the Hottentots hold that their divine

ancestor Heitsi-eibib was virgin-born.

If we turn to northern Europe not dissimilar stories abound. The Celtic saint, Aidan, was born of a virgin into whose mouth a star fell while she lay asleep. In the Finnish epic Kalevala, the virgin Ilmatar is fructified by the east wind and gives birth to the wizard Vainamoinen. The mother of the Irish hero, Conall Cernach, consulted a Druid who sang songs over a spring, and on her bathing in it, she became pregnant. Maba'Se-you, the saint, gave a woman some holy bread which proved so efficacious that after two years she returned with two children! This exploit, which is related in an Ethiopic manuscript of the fifteenth century, may perhaps be regarded as the *ne plus ultra* of such occurrences, the recital of which from all parts of the world tends to become tedious.\*

Christian writers were naturally somewhat taken aback when they came on these likenesses to the Gospel incident, but they found comfort in the reflection that Satan, the enemy of mankind, had spread these false stories abroad as a snare. They anxiously discussed the possibility of parthenogenesis in general and they speculated rather hazardously on the particular manner of the Blessed Virgin's impregnation. On this subject the Christian gospels maintain a seemly reserve, which the Fathers of the Church were not able always to imitate. Painters repre-

\* Those desiring further information may consult E. S. Hartland's *Primitive Paternity*, which contains a vast collection of stories and an extensive bibliography.

sented the Holy Spirit as entering Mary's ear in the form of a dove and Saint Augustine gravely announced that she was impregnated through this channel. But a picture by Fra Filippo Lippi in the National Gallery in London shows a hand emitting rays, in which a dove flies towards her side, just as in certain Eastern tales Buddha entered his mother's side in the form of a white elephant.

Various theories have been put forward to account for the worldwide prevalence of the myth of the Virgin Birth. That offered by theosophy is too well known to need mention here. Mr. Hartland believed that the stories of supernatural birth originated in the imperfect recognition of the physical relationship between father and child. That early or primitive people are sometimes ignorant of the connection between sexual commerce and impregnation has been clearly established. Thus Spencer and Gillen showed that the Australian aborigines were without knowledge of these physiological facts. But it is also

clear that myths of the type of the Virgin Birth arise among people who have long passed beyond this stage of ignorance. Thus the story that Plato was the son of Apollo, Alexander the offspring of Zeus, and Julius Cæsar the child of some god arose among people who were in an advanced stage of culture. The Christians who imagined the legend of the Virgin Birth of Jesus were under no illusions as to the normal course of paternity. Plutarch indeed discusses the subject in a serious tone. "I see nothing absurd," he wrote, "in the supposition that God, instead of approaching women in humanwise, touches them to finer issues with other modes of contact and so fills the mortal with divine offspring." Thus the myth, whose object it is to account for the marvellous qualities of great and noble men, is given a half-philosophic, half-poetical aspect, and is readily transmuted into those more ethereal fancies according to which human beings are inspired and filled by the Logos or Word of God.

ALEXANDER G. CARDEW

### A NOTE ON THE ABOVE

The thoughtful reader will not be satisfied with writing Q. E. D. to Sir Alexander Cardew's able demonstration that the legend of the Virgin Birth is not exclusively Christian but is found in various religions widely separated in space and time. It was, in fact, universal, but what does the recurring

tradition allegorize? Why do we find the theme so many times repeated? The answer must be sought in the cosmogonical and philosophical conceptions of the ancient world, remembering that the ancients turned naturally to symbol, myth and allegory to record their scientific no less than their

philosophical truths. They knew that nothing—least of all teachings that transcended the ordinary powers of ratiocinative thought—could be preserved in human memory without some outward form.

All ancient myths have a deep philosophical meaning, and the older they are the more important and significant they are found to be. The first formulation of the Virgin Birth myth is lost in the night of time, but the first echoes from that distant past point to its having been a purely metaphysical concept in its origin.

*Ex nihilo nihil fit* was a self-evident proposition to the great minds of antiquity. They long anticipated modern thinkers in recognizing that visible and tangible matter is illusory. They held that its source was the Primordial Substance of which matter, as we know it, is the faint and blurred copy. This root of matter, they were taught, exists from all eternity, beginningless, endless and essentially changeless. Only its "Son," the periodically manifested universe, is subject to change. This substance principle was named the "Mother-Goddess," whose terrestrial symbol is infinite and shoreless Space.

That Space is not only boundless but ever-existing, whether there are universes in manifestation or not. In a sense, Space *is* the pre-ex-

istent eternal root-substance itself. Holding these views, it is not surprising that the ancients recognized in Space before its periodical cosmic activity the mother of all manifestation. Fertility and productiveness inhered in the Immaculate Virgin Mother, the ever-youthful Nature, who generated and brought forth her son, the universe.

That drama was enacted on the plane of metaphysical abstraction. It was conceived as re-enacted on a lower plane. Numerous goddesses of antiquity were Virgin Mothers of an immaculately born Son—the Sun, the Day-Star. Our Earth was thought of, too, as Virgin Mother; her son—Humanity as a totality, past, present and future. Above, the Son was the whole Universe; below, he was Mankind. Likewise each successive personality, the ancients thought, is son of Virgin Mother; the latter, the immaculate root of its being, the immortal individual Soul.

Madame Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* shows that such lofty concepts of the ancient world lie at the root, and form the origin, of all the "Sons of God" born of Immaculate Virgins. How infinitely grander, more poetical and more philosophical was the Immaculate Virgin of the ancient Pagans than the modern Papal materialization of the once metaphysical and spiritual nature myth!

PH. D.



## CHRISTMAS

[The following are extracts from a stenographic report of a Theosophical lecture delivered in Bombay on Christmas Day, 1932.—EDS.]

Christmas is generally known as the festival of the nativity of Christ. It is regarded as the Birthday of Jesus, the teacher recognized by Christendom. Though generally known as a Christian festival, it is not exclusively so; it was already observed by the entire pagan world long before the era of Jesus.

### A PAGAN FESTIVAL

When the question of celebrating the Birthday of Jesus came up for some discussion in 245 A.D.—two and a half centuries after the starting of the Christian era—no less an authority than Origen repudiated the very idea of celebrating the Saviour's Birthday "as if he were a King Pharaoh". Another great authority, Clement of Alexandria, writing about 200 A.D.—note, again two centuries after the supposed day of birth—mentions several theories as to when Christ was born, and condemns them all as superstitions. He says that some give the 20th of May, others the 19th or 20th of April, while he himself, Clement of Alexandria, sets it on the 17th of November—a date of significance and interest to all students of Occultism and Theosophy. He says that Christ was born on the 17th of November, 3 B. C. He also says that the Basilidians, one of the most philosophical Gnostic sects, fixed the 6th and the 10th of

January as the day of Christ's Baptism, and that it was with the aid of the Egyptian Calendar they did so. As late as 350 A.D. the birth of Christ was fixed on the same day as the feast of Baptism, that is, on the 6th of January. Thus it is quite clear from historical and documentary evidence that before the fifth century there was no agreement as to the actual date of Christ's birth, and till then the calendars do not speak of it. When the Romans began to celebrate the day on the 25th of December their Armenian and Syrian co-religionists stuck to the 6th of January and accused the Romans of sun-worship and idolatry. St. Chrysostom (390 A.D.) is reported to have said that "on this day also the birth of Christ was *lately* fixed at Rome, in order that whilst the heathen were busy with their *profane* ceremonies, the Christians might perform their holy rites undisturbed."

In the religious history and the mythology of many peoples we become familiar with numerous Sun-Gods who are all born at the time of the winter solstice, round about the 21st of December. Thus the Romans were celebrating the Rite of Mithra which they had adopted from Persia, and the birth of Mithra, the Sun-God, was celebrated on the 25th of December. Gibbon in his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* says:—

The Roman Christians, ignorant of the real date of Christ's birth, fixed the solemn festival on the 25th of December, the *Brumalia*, or Winter Solstice, when the Pagans annually celebrated the Birth of Sol.

From Central America where civilization flourished in far distant times we have the examples of Mexican, Aztec and Yucatan Gods, all born of Virgin mothers and all born round about the 25th of December. I have a very interesting quotation from the historian, the Venerable Bede, who lived in the eighth century. This is what he says :—

The ancient peoples of the Angli began the year on the 25th December when we now celebrate the Birthday of the Lord ; and the very night which is now so holy to us, they called in their tongue "modranecht," that is, the mother's night, by reason we suspect of the ceremonies which in that night-long vigil they performed.

Thus the ancient Britons before they were converted to Christianity worshipped a Sun-God born of a virgin mother.

The Christmas festival is the drama, the representation of a divine and mysterious event—the Birth of Christos, the Avatara. It is a drama that the early Christians borrowed from the Pagans, and it is good that they so borrowed it ; but unfortunately its real significance is not understood by the masses of Christendom to-day, nor is it explained to them. Jesus was not born on this day ; the early Christians incorporated in their religion this festival, feeling the need for it in a moral and a spiritual way.

#### THE FESTIVAL OF BIRTH

We shall study Christmas as the festival of birth—the Birth of Divinity, of Christos, of Avalokiteshwara, of Krishna. In the process of human evolution, in accordance with the great Law of Cycles, cosmically, Divinity manifests through special Incarnations, and, psychologically, in special ways. The doctrine of Avataras or Divine Incarnations has two phases or aspects : one cosmical, the second psychological. There are appearances of great cosmic Avataras, they are macrocosmic phenomena ; secondly, in our own individual human unfoldment there are appearances, the afflatus of our own Divinity, our own spiritual Atma, and such are microcosmic phenomena. Nothing takes place in Nature that does not also occur in the human kingdom ; and the appearance of Great Avataras has its counterpart in the life of men and women. The Great Birth, the Supreme Birth, is that very rare phenomenon in Nature when in a human individual, evolving onwards and upwards, the Great Purusha, Uttama-Purusha, enters and manifests Himself. Evolution in the human kingdom is a long process ; yuga after yuga, man struggles ; he sins and suffers and grows as he attempts to gain virtue and abandon vice ; after many lives he frees himself from the enslavement of Nature, Prakriti, he becomes pure, suddha, and then he develops higher spiritual powers or siddhis, and becomes a Siddha—Proven-Soul, a Perfected Soul. Then he becomes

fit to hold in the casket of his heart the living Image of Uttama-Purusha, the Supreme Man, call Him Krishna or call Him Christ, call Him Mithra or call Him Osiris, call Him Odin or call Him Apollo. This is the Great Mystery, the advent of the Divine Man into the Living Temple of the Human Heart. It is to this secret and sacred Mystery that the *Gita* refers when it says that "among thousands of mortals a single one perhaps strives for perfection and among those so striving perhaps a single one knows me as I am". This rare Being is described in the same chapter as the "Mahatma difficult to find".

Now come to the psychological aspect: Each one of us has a dual nature; it is not merely the duality of lower and higher or evil and good; it is the duality of two distinct lines or pedigrees which mix and mingle in man. In part of our nature each one of us is a lunar being—a Chandra Vamshi; in another part of our being we are solar—Surya Vamshi. . . .

Now note—the Moon has one very striking characteristic: it changes in its phases every hour, every day. From crescent to half, from half to gibbous, from gibbous to full, then waning from full it becomes new and is invisible for a day or so. This is a good representation of our personal nature—ever changing.

Look at the Sun: it is ever full, rises and sets every day in the glory of fullness. This is our higher nature—the spiritual Individuality. . . .

When the lunar or personal nature comes under the control and guidance of the solar or spiritual it becomes full of radiance and light. We must make an effort to be born as the full moon, to live as the full moon and to die as the full moon. That is the message of the Buddha Festival. It is said that He was born at full moon, He attained Nirvana at full moon, He passed away when the moon was full.

Our practical question now is how shall we increase, how shall we enhance the power of the Solar Pedigree in us so that here on earth we may shine like the moon when it is full. *The Voice of the Silence* says: "Destroy thy lunar body," that is, the kama-rupa, and "cleanse thy mind-body," that is, the manasa-rupa. These two forms of life have to be dealt with—the destruction of kama, passion; the cleansing of manas, mind. These two processes are simultaneous, must go together; mind cleansing produces the death of kama. The final death of the lower passions brings to birth the Higher Man. Living as desire entities we are familiar with the phenomenon of death. We say we are born to die. Every child who is born is sure only of one thing—that it is going to die.

The festival of Christmas brings to human attention the Miracle of Birth. Why not so live that life is a perpetual creation, a series of births? It is rightly said that death disappoints the Soul; then why not take precautions against the snare of death? We die perpetually,

continuously, because of delusion, moha, born of ignorance, avidya. The Birth of the Soul if perpetually brought about by kriya-shakti, creative activity, would take human beings not from death to death, but from one birth or awakening to another birth and awakening. Let us attempt always to awaken

to new realities. The process of ever being born takes place because Atma, the Superior Luminous Self, has begun to create within the purified heart. That Superior Self is Krishna or Christos, the Uttama-Purusha, the Divine Man, and His Birth is the real celebration of Christmas.

### THE MESSIAH CRAZE

Our age has seen the rise and fall of numerous "messiahs"—claimants themselves some of them, while on behalf of others claims have been made. Curiously enough, even in the name of Theosophy the coming of a world-teacher, an avatara, a messiah was proclaimed, but even that "prophecy" will not now be fulfilled, and the "prophets" have been proven false. It is not, however, recognized that H. P. Blavatsky not only never gave the teaching of the coming of Christ but warned against it; and the sensationalism caused by pseudo-theosophists would not have arisen if they had been fully familiar with the doctrines of the true Theosophical philosophy. Below we print one short extract from H. P. Blavatsky's *Esoteric Character of the Gospels* written in 1887:—

"Millenarians and Adventists of robust faith, may go on saying that the coming of (the carnalised) Christ' is near at hand, and prepare themselves for 'the end of the world.' Theosophists—at any rate, some of them—who understand the hidden meaning of the universally-expected Avatars, Messiahs,

Sosioshes and Christs—know that it is no 'end of the world,' but 'the consummation of the age,' i.e., the close of a cycle, which is now fast approaching.... Many and many a time the warning about the 'false Christs' and prophets who shall lead people astray has been interpreted by charitable Christians, the worshippers of the dead-letter of their scripture, as applying to mystics generally, and Theosophists most especially. . . . Nevertheless, it seems very evident that the words in Matthew's Gospel and others can hardly apply to Theosophists. For these were never found saying that Christ is 'Here' or 'There,' in wilderness or city, and least of all in the 'inner chamber' behind the altar of any modern church. Whether Heathen or Christian by birth, they refuse to materialise and thus degrade that which is the purest and grandest ideal—the symbol of symbols—namely, the immortal Divine Spirit in man, whether it be called Horus, Krishna, Buddha, or Christ. None of them has ever yet said: 'I am the Christ.'"

S.

## THE VICARIOUS SACRIFICE

[Dr. Irene Bastow Hudson, M. R. C. S. (Eng.); L. R. C. P., M. B., B. S. (London); L. M. C. (Canada), is of English birth but for some years has resided in British Columbia. Although she has been in active medical practice, public and private, in England and in Canada, for twenty years, she is probably more widely known as a journalist and author. She was the original compiler and publisher of "The Writers' Year Book," and was at one time Editor of several journals in London. Her *Heredity in the Light of Esoteric Philosophy*, was reviewed in THE ARYAN PATH for December, 1932.—EDS.]

Since the dawn of history we have had accounts of the sacrifice of the one, or the few, for the many, and so long as physical life has been we know that cells have divided to form daughter cells, thus sacrificing individuality for the propagation of the species. "The seed must die before the plant can be born."

Religions of modern and ancient peoples have alike made use of the universality of the vicarious sacrifice, and from this habit may be traced all sorts of customs and ceremonies, some of which exist even to the present day. The vicarious atonement seems to be a modern fungoid growth, which would take from Man his responsibility, and has no place in the evolutionary scheme of Nature.

Sin-eating at a funeral, though dying out, if not dead, was well-known in Wales, and on the Border as recently as last century, and is reported by J. Aubrey, as well as being used by Mary Webb in one of her novels. At the funeral ceremony, the corpse or coffin was brought out and a loaf of bread was delivered to the Sin-eater over the corpse, as also a Mazer bowl of maple full of beer, which he was to drink up, and sixpence

in money, in consideration of which he took upon himself all the sins of the defunct, and freed him from walking after death. In another account, the clergyman officiating at the funeral, asked if there was a sin-eater present, and one of the relatives finally stepped forward and acted as such, since no sin-eater had been provided. Turning to India, a similar custom is reported from Tanjore, prevailing, at any rate, last century. It was said that when the Rajah died, some of his bones and those of the two wives who were burnt with his corpse, were ground to powder, mixed with boiled rice, and eaten by twelve Brahmans. It was believed that the sins of the deceased passed into the bodies of the Brahmans, who received payment for the service. Such accounts have come from different parts of India and many other parts of the world, suggesting that some form of sin-eating at funerals was general.

Few kings or commoners seem able or willing to forego their privileges or their authority, but when it comes to the responsibilities and sacrifices, men often look eagerly for a substitute. Coupled with this is the imagining of a god in our own likeness, and therefore, a god

who may be propitiated with offerings, the more valuable the better. Whether the sacrifice is to be made to the Corn Spirit; to Sedna, the goddess of seals; to Baal, the god of Fire; or to Jehovah, the Lord God of the Jews, the purpose seems to be the same, *viz.*, to present such a substitute as may be accepted for the good of the whole tribe or race, either to pay for evil done, to avert evil, or to produce positive good. The sacrifice was evidently usually human at one stage of development; later the human being was replaced by an animal, and, in these later and less physically brutal days, an image is often substituted, or corn, or fruits. In some communities, *e. g.*, the Jews, the first-born of man and beast and the first-fruits of the harvest, all alike belonged to God, and must be sacrificed. Then the priests instituted a system of payments, by which the money might be paid, or the flocks surrendered in place of the slaughter. In some communities there is still an inclination to give the first-born son to the Church or Ministry.

The whole scapegoat system is difficult to trace, for the person chosen to bear the sins and ills of a district varied from the first-born son of the royal family to the elderly and useless captive; while in sacrificing to the Spirit of the Harvest, it might be a small child, a growing child, or an adult, according to the period of the growth of the crops at the time of the festival.

Many of the legends and ancient stories found in the reports may

not be entirely true; for those who have, for instance, translated some of the Hindu and Sanskrit literature, have been led into errors by taking allegories and legends as literally true. None the less, there were human sacrifices made in parts of India, just as there were in Mexico, Africa, North America, and even in Palestine, to say nothing of Europe during the Inquisition, and even later, of the very general custom of burning as witches or magicians those who showed more knowledge than the majority—even when the sin of Magic had not been proved against them. Human sacrifice is certainly much less prevalent now than in former days, and we no longer have festivals such as those of the Romans, where men sold themselves to be slaughtered for the amusement of the populace, or the appeasement of ghosts at funerals. Still, the craving for some god or superior being to take charge of our sins and troubles seems to stay with mankind, and is not easily eradicated.

It is interesting to take a few samples of these brutal customs some of which still obtain, either secretly or in modified form, in many places. Thus, in *The Golden Bough* we find a quotation from Crowther and Taylor's, *The Gospel on the Banks of the Niger*, which relates—

At Onitsha, on the Niger, two human beings used to be annually sacrificed to take away the sins of the land. The victims were purchased by public subscription. All persons who, during the past year, had fallen into gross sins, such as incendiarism, theft, adultery, witchcraft, and so forth, were expected

to contribute 28 ngugas, or a little over two pounds sterling. The money thus collected was taken into the interior of the country, and expended in the purchase of two sickly persons "to be offered as a sacrifice for all these abominable crimes—one for the land and one for the river." A man from a neighbouring town was hired to put them to death. On the 27th February, 1858, the Rev. J. C. Taylor witnessed the sacrifice of one of these victims. The sufferer was a woman, about nineteen or twenty years of age. They dragged her alive along the ground, face downwards, from the king's house to the river, a distance of two miles, the crowds who accompanied her crying, "Wickedness! Wickedness!" The intention was to take away the iniquities of the land. The body was dragged along in a merciless manner, as if the weight of all their wickedness was thus carried away.

In Uganda, when disease or misfortune hit the people, or at the crowning of a new king, certain human scapegoats (often captives) were taken to the border of the enemy's country, and there maimed and left to die. With them were taken a cow, a goat, a fowl and a dog, who were also so maimed that they could not return or procure food.

The Red Indians of Arizona used to offer human victims at the Feast of Fire, until the custom was put down by the Mexicans, and a mock sacrifice has been gradually substituted. For long periods (as among the Jews) the human victim was replaced by an animal, just as the king in some countries managed to escape death (when his time was due) by getting a more common man to take his place. Still earlier, the king, chief or priest became the

substitute for the god. It would seem that the god, or the king, was put to death at a certain time, in order to avoid his growing old or feeble, so that he might pass on his kingship or godhead while his body was still virile and youthful.

There are many references in the Old Testament to the sacrifice by the Jewish people of their children, either as sin offerings, or as first-fruits, and it is unnecessary to remind readers of Abraham's preparing to offer up Isaac to the Lord, and the substitution, at the last moment, of a ram caught in a thicket.

The human scapegoat was well known in ancient Rome, as in ancient Greece, and the Romans had a popular festival in the Spring at which "Old Mars" was driven out and beaten, as if by that means their sins and misfortunes could be transferred to the unfortunate man, who had to take the part of the god. A Slavonic custom, known as Carrying Out Death, had much the same intention, and in one form or another this idea was found in all European countries. In Greece, human scapegoats were used to carry away evil at any special time of disaster or plague, and, in some districts, an annual sacrifice was customary. The victims were maintained at the public expense and, when needed, were dressed in sacred garments and paraded through the whole city, and then turned out and stoned to death.

The killing of the god in Mexico was another form of vicarious sacrifice, although not a voluntary

one on the part of the victim. It frequently fell to the lot of a young woman to personate, for a time, the goddess, and then to die in some specially prescribed manner. It is reported that, at the festival of the Goddess of Salt among the Aztecs, the woman had first to watch the killing of the captives, and then her heart was torn out by the priest. The Goddess of the Young Maize also required the sacrifice of a young woman before the people might eat the maize, and again a girl personated the goddess. She also was slain by the priest on the summit of the steps of the temple, and, in this case, her head was cut off before her heart was torn out. On Christmas Day a similar sacrifice and ceremony was performed by the Aztecs—this time to the Goddess *Ilamatecutli*.

Throughout these customs it would seem that the blood of the scapegoat was supposed to have value in remitting sins, and that brings us to another form of sacrifice, in which cannibalism, or at least the eating of the flesh of the offering, is involved. By eating the flesh of a man, you are supposed to gain some of his courage, strength, agility, intelligence, etc., and so amongst many American Indian tribes, it was believed that if you ate Bear you would be strong and brave; if venison, you would be quick and agile, etc. This eating of the sacrifice was ceremonial and religious, performed with much ritual, purification and rites.

When animals were offered for sacrifice in place of human beings,

the species used depended on the gods honoured in the district, and, to some extent, on the distribution of the fauna. In parts of Assam, it was reported that a scapegoat might be a monkey or a bamboo rat, while in the Western Himalayas and in North America, a dog was sometimes slaughtered to carry away the sins of the community. The Iroquois had a New Year festival at which white dogs, decorated with red paint, were strangled and hung on a ladder. Then the sins of the people were transferred to them, and the carcasses were burnt on a pyre of wood. The ashes from this fire were carried through the village, and sprinkled at the door of each house.

In *Leviticus*, chap XVI., we are told that on the Day of Atonement, after the sacrifice of a bullock and of a goat as a sin offering, and the sprinkling of their blood in the prescribed places—

And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited.

Having gradually accepted animal sacrifices in place of human, we soon find in the history of such customs, that images made of straw, clay, wood, etc., were made and paraded, and then finally burnt, or thrown into the river or sea, and at important festivals these might be set adrift in handsome boats or rafts, with provisions and fur-



nings. Gradually the meaning of such festivals may be forgotten. Sometimes a mock sacrifice is held, in which a supposed victim is treated with all the usual ceremony, and even ill-treated, but in which the final killing does not occur and the worst that happens to the human or animal is that he is turned out of the village or district. In such cases as those of a Sin-eater, it is usually reported that the person was shunned, and lived rather as an outcast, though maintained at the public expense.

It is often recorded that flesh is eaten sacramentally, and this is especially so when it is the flesh of a god or king eaten by his successor, or by the chiefs of his tribe. Particularly were the heart and brain supposed to give to the eater the qualities and attributes of him to whom they had belonged in earthly life. From this sacrificial eating of flesh has, no doubt, come the idea that the saying: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you" (*St. John*, vi. 53.)—may be taken in the dead-letter sense, instead of the symbolical one evidently intended.

Even in materialistic Europe, some of the old festivals are kept up at May Day, Midsummer and Harvest, and though they have lost much of their significance, their origin may yet be traced back to the sacrificial appeasing of the Nature gods, etc., in the days when men lived closer to Nature, and shared the consciousness of the animals and plants around them.

Since then, man's consciousness of the Unity of all Life has dimmed, if not vanished, though he has gained enormously in his intellectual appreciation of the material advantage of subjecting all others, be they plants, animals, or weaker humans, to his own purposes. The fact that the old ceremonies were usually deeply religious, and that the first-fruits of the harvest were really sacred and must be offered to the spirits of Nature and sometimes to the ghosts of the departed, does not entirely meet the approval of modern religious sects. Some of the Old Testament laws on such subjects, as also the ethical teachings of the New Testament, are accepted by Christianity, but are usually more honoured by omission than by observance. From the offering of the first-born of man and beast to the gods has gradually come the idea that one can be made the scapegoat for the many. Exoteric religions, notably Christianity, having adopted and monopolized the godhead, and tried to turn it into an anthropomorphic deity, do not allow their followers to realize their individual share in the divine ray, or the need for the universal AT-ONE-MENT of that divine ray with man's Higher Self, by the sacrifice or crucifixion of the lower selves in this purgatory of the material world, which is Hell.

The vicarious suffering should mean suffering for or on behalf of others; the vicarious atonement should mean union (or reconciliation) with God for or on behalf of others—an obviously illogical and impossible performance. Man has

within him, if he choose to develop it, a ray of the Universal Spirit; hence he must for himself unite and blend his mind and soul, and bridge the gulf between the two, before he can attempt to realize his at-one-ment with the Divine Self.

With regard to the Crucifixion, it must be recognised that it had been written of allegorically very many years before the founding of the Christian Faith, and nailing upon the Cross had only been adopted later by the Romans as a means of torturing before killing criminals. From *The Secret Doctrine*, we learn:—

The figure of [the Hindu] Wittoba [a form of Vishnu], even to the nail-marks on the feet, is that of Jesus crucified, in all its details save the Cross: and that MAN was meant is proved to us further by the fact of the *Initiate being reborn after his crucifixion on the TREE OF LIFE*. . . . Thus, one of the *seven esoteric meanings* implied in this mystery of Crucifixion by the mystic inventors of the system—the original elaboration and adoption of which dates back to the very establishment of the MYSTERIES—is discovered in the geometrical symbols containing the history of the evolution of man. (II, 560).

The original idea of "Man Crucified" in Space belongs certainly to the ancient Hindus, and Muir shows it in his "Hindu Pantheon" in the engraving that represents Wittoba. Plato adopted it in his decussated Cross in Space, the X, "the Second God who impressed himself on the Universe in the form of the Cross;" Krishna is likewise shown "crucified". . . Again it is repeated in

the Old Testament in the queer injunction *to crucify men* before the Lord, *the Sun*—which is no prophecy at all, but has a direct phallic significance. (II. 561)

It is man who has tried to make the sacrifices vicarious; it is man who has tried to shift his responsibilities to other shoulders, by paying another to act or die in his stead, or by paying a priest or a "wise man" to free him, or absolve him from his sins and his troubles. The Great and Holy Ones who have gone on ahead on the PATH will look back and hold out the helping hand, albeit invisibly to most of us, and such are the Adepts, the Bodhisattvas, referred to in *The Voice of the Silence*, but even They cannot alter the LAW, and Karma must be worked out. "The ripple of effect, as the great tidal wave, thou shalt let run its course."

So far as the writer has been able to discover both sacrifice and at-one-ment must be personal, individual and racial, and the sooner people learn that vicarious suffering for the sins and sorrows of all men is a fallacy, the healthier and happier will be the population of this earth on which we have to dwell. Indeed, such realization might well be the beginning of true spiritual growth, and thus the speedier working out of the deadly Karma that still hangs around the Kali Yuga.

IRENE BASTOW HUDSON

## CHURCH REFORMATION TO-DAY

Here are two articles—the first suggests reforming and liberalizing Church-Christianity. The second looks upon the Churches as anti-Christ and says that their bluff is called, not by men but by Nature.

### I—LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY

[ **Leslie G. Berrington**, who founded the Leamington Literary and Philosophical Society in 1912, was Rector of Churchover in 1915. In 1931 he settled in Brighton as Vicar of Moulsecomb and in the following year founded the Progressive Thought Society of Brighton and Hove.—EDS. ]

The word "liberal," despite party associations in the political world, remains expressive of generosity and tolerance. It may, therefore, be used to describe the new movement in the Church of England which, nebulous because unorganised, is yet the most significant thing in contemporary religious development.

The Church of England is peculiarly fitted to be the seed-ground of such a movement because it has avoided the fanatical extremes of most Protestant Churches. It had, and has, its fanatics, and these tend to occupy the limelight, as fanatics always do, but the majority of Anglican laity can be classed as Liberal Christians.

Since Liberal Christianity is a movement, not a party, it is only possible to give a personal interpretation of what it stands for, differing, probably, in many points from interpretations which might be given by other like-minded people—because the essence of Liberal Christianity is tolerance and all-inclusiveness.

History has disproved—to any one who has studied it in order to learn and not to extract support for a theory—every claim to divine

authority and infallibility, whether residing in Popes, General Councils, or Bishops. In so far as any one Church asserts exclusive doctrinal knowledge or exclusive authority it can only be regarded as a sham. Christianity is a development—a development often side-tracked by royal and political ambitions. The Church as a magical entity does not exist.

Nevertheless it exists for those who believe in it. God is not a man, therefore He answers prayer and blesses His worshippers through whatever channel they sincerely believe to be true. That is where the Protestant cuts himself adrift from Liberal Christianity. God comes to the Catholic through the Host, pardons him through the priest; and He expects from the Catholic an observance of the religious rules in which he believes. Similarly He comes to the Protestant through the prayer-meeting; and demands from him an observance of the particular devotion in which he believes.

Ceremonial and forms of worship are purely psychological. The dramatic type of worship—such as the Mass—appeals to a totally different side of human nature

from the prayer and sermon type. That both have their place is proved by experience. Thus all intolerance belongs to the past and one can only smile at the hostility of Christians towards one another.

But although each Church suffices for its sincere members, much in the belief and practice of each is a burden. The papacy, or the autocratic episcopacy and priesthood on the one hand, and the Bible and dogma on the other are chains in which Christians bind themselves quite unnecessarily. Jesus taught by parable, proverb, and epigram, carefully avoiding definite teaching about forms of worship, and sanctioning no dogmas. His words are seldom to be taken literally. There is no evidence even that He condemned the Temple worship. Deliberately He left belief and worship to evolve as age succeeded age from the seeds which His life and utterances sowed.

Survival of the fittest applies in the long run to religion, and it does not follow that because belief in eternal torment and a Church wielding powers over the world to come was a suitable belief for predatory barons and savage clans in days gone by, that it is either true or suitable for to-day.

The creeds are a brief summary of Christian belief, and such a summary is desirable if not necessary, nor would it be wise for each generation to revise creeds according to its transient beliefs and interpretations. But a revision will be due as soon as Liberal Christianity has found its voice, which at present

is drowned by the strident voices of religious partisans.

The Athanasian Creed is only suitable for the British Museum, not merely as a curiosity, but as a warning that once reason and logic have given place to fanaticism, no absurdity is beyond credence.

The Nicene Creed could be revised advantageously in those clauses which deal with the person of Jesus Christ.

Directly the idea of salvation by belief is dropped, a new tolerance is engendered. And salvation by belief in dogma is untenable, because it involves an unworthy concept of God. If God gave us reason to exercise, yet condemned us for an honest use of that reason, He would not be just. Obviously sincerity in belief—or disbelief—is all that He can require.

When we realise this we do not condemn beliefs different from our own, and we must admit that Christians are free to interpret the creed of Christendom differently. Ideally, therefore, a creed should be suggestive rather than dogmatic—as was Christ's teaching.

It does not concern us that Jesus is "of one substance with the Father". We are not made better or worse by such a belief; and it is surely typical of the absurd impertinence of man that he should pretend to decide truth about God by the majority vote of a Council!

Still less does it matter to us whether Jesus was Virgin-born.

The resurrection of the human body seems unlikely, and educated opinion increasingly discredits it, but it does not matter. It is a

scientific rather than a religious question. As a dogma it is absurd.

The resurrection of Christ's physical body is a more complicated question, and various opinions may be held. The Great Christian Father, Origen, believed His physical body to have been transmuted into His spirit-body. The one view that cannot be accepted is that set forth in the Black Rubric at the end of the Church of England Communion Service, where it is said that "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven". The suggestion that Jesus still lives in the spiritual worlds in the body which He had on earth can only be described as foolish. A "natural" body would, we may reasonably conclude, be no more visible in Heaven than a spiritual body on earth.

At present English Christianity is suffering from preachers and writers who attempt to foist the current theories of scientists and psychologists on to a poor salvage of Christianity. A scientist's guesses, which he never supposes to be more than an approximation, have become the preacher's facts. Yet in spite of party strife and pseudo-scientific jargon Christianity survives. Can there be a surer proof of its fundamental soundness than its power to live and flourish in spite of its adherents? Christians are the worst enemies of Christianity.

Despite the apparent strength of Roman Catholicism, and of dogmatic Christianity in its English and Eastern forms, I think that the day of Liberal Christianity is

not far distant. In religion, as in literature or at the cinema, people have to make the best of what is available until something better offers. People choose a Church because it is the best of those existing and they are not prepared to found a new one. The Church they choose does not wholly satisfy them, but they can find no better religious organisation.

Physically old people sometimes seem to defy age, and look as they have looked for years, then all at once crack up and become wrecks. The old Christianity presents, I think, a like false appearance of vitality. The new has been born, and the new will, if it keeps true to itself in wisdom and tolerance, become the world-religion of the future.

Liberal Christianity accepts Jesus as the manifestation of God once in Galilee, and reveres Him now as Living Lord of the world.

The Scriptures of Christianity cannot be regarded as a divine book written by God. The Old Testament is directly contrary to the New. Christianity is built on the life and teaching of Jesus, of which I think it may fairly be said that we have a reliable picture in the four Gospels. All four are human documents, indeed it is their obvious human colouring that is the guarantee of their general reliability. Their discrepancies serve to confirm the narrative.

As a commentary on the life and teaching of Jesus by early Church leaders the Epistles are valuable, but St. Paul's theology and opinions in general have no authority

beyond that given by their intrinsic soundness. The Epistles, again, are human documents, sometimes sublime, sometime crudely Jewish and unacceptable to the modern mind.

The Old Testament has its value as literature, poetry and history, but it has been a curse to Christianity. Christ abolished it as a book of authority for His followers, but the Church revived it. Hardly any parts of it are suitable for reading in public worship, and the Psalms are, for the most part, grotesque on modern lips. How far the history of the Old Testament is accurate concerns only the historian. Jehovah, as portrayed in the Old Testament, has been a corrupting influence on Christianity.

Liberal Christianity suffers from one great disadvantage. It is not calculated to rouse fervent enthusiasm. Movements of peace and tolerance never do, nor can majority opinions excite the zeal which comes easily to a battling minority. Moreover, human nature is so egoistic that tolerance comes hardly. Not only Protestants and Catholics, but many Modernists are foreigners to the Liberal movement in Christianity, because they would force others to think and worship as they think and worship. A Modernist who seeks to drive Anglo-Catholics out of the Church of England, or curtail their worship, is of the fanatic-dogmatic breed and has no part in Liberalism.

It is easy to work up a frenzy of antagonism over vestments, incense, adoration of the Host, candles, and such things, but the

Liberal has no objection to these accessories of worship. So long as they are desired they should be retained. Prayers for the dead are as reasonable as prayers for the living; indeed the Protestant dislike of these is really directed against a totally different thing—the pardons and indulgences of the Romish doctrine of Purgatory. Most of the points about which fanatics grow apoplectic are either of no importance or are innocuous pious customs.

Liberal Christianity believes in love. No existing Church either believes in or practises love. Kneeling or not kneeling, ringing bells or not ringing them, bowing or not bowing—these will start hatred in the pew and denunciation in the pulpit.

Liberal Christianity believes in peace, freedom in belief, variety in worship. It recognises no authority beyond that conceded by the Christian people. Dogma, persecution, bigotry, belong to the immature past. Nor does it suppose that the Christianity of the future will be as the Christianity of to-day. If Christianity does not evolve and develop it can only be because it is moribund—or perfect. Perfect it is never likely to be in this world.

Eternal damnation, an eternal Devil, Christ's blood-Atonement, Justification by Faith, Original Sin, Predestination, all the sinister background of post-Nicene Christianity needs to be shed as a butterfly sheds its chrysalis. Imitation of Christ is man's fulfilment, not beliefs about His person. Progress through death to ever more glori-

ous life is man's destiny if he cultivates the character which befits a son of the family of God.

I entertain the hope that the Church of England will cease its petty strife and become Christianity as such, including on an equal footing Anglo-Catholic and Anglo-Protestant, leaving freedom

for that which is fittest in each to survive. In that case there is hope that Anglicanism may extend further than the English-speaking peoples, that it may become the cradle of the New Christianity—which is the old—and so draw together the other faiths of humanity in a world-religion.

LESLIE G. BERRINGTON

## II—JESUS VERSUS THE CHURCHES

[John Middleton Murry preached a sermon last Easter on "The Agony of Christianity". It was published in the April number of his *Wanderer*; he "wonders how many priests of the Christian Church, this Good Friday, will have preached the kind of Easter sermon that I am preaching now". In it Mr. Murry refers to Karl Marx as John the Baptist, and says that "men may laugh at the strange Marxian notion of the Proletariat as Messiah" and proceeds to examine that view. Space forbids our extracting at greater length, and as our chief aim is to give Mr. Murry's views on the present state of the churches, we have to confine ourselves to reprinting the following; we do this by the kind permission of Mr. Murry.—EDS.]

Suppose that, in order to make some approach to the reality of Jesus, we were to begin by comparing the duties of a Christian to-day with the duties which Jesus enjoined upon those who had the marvellous experience of being taught directly by him. We are generally given to understand that the first obligation on a Christian to-day is to go to Church. But, curiously enough, Jesus himself did not go to Church, nor did he tell his disciples to do so. If we may believe the gospel of St. Luke, at the very beginning of his mission he attempted to deliver his message in the synagogues, but they threw him out and tried to kill him. . . . He disregarded his religious duties, consorted with publicans and sinners, declared openly that the outcasts and the underdogs would

go to heaven before the respectable and conscientious clergymen, and proclaimed that "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath."

"Ah," you may say, "but that was not the Christian Church which Jesus thus flouted, but the Jewish Church." That is true; but I ask you to ask yourselves seriously how much difference that makes. What is the distinction, in religious reality, between the Christian Church to-day and the Jewish Church nineteen hundred years ago? . . . .

The difference is, I shall be told, that the Christian Church believes in Jesus. Believing in Jesus is a vague phrase. I also believe in Jesus. The question is: *How* does the Christian Church believe in Jesus? Does it believe in what he

taught? Let us remind ourselves of a few of the things he did teach. He taught that a man must forsake home and possessions—houses and lands, wife and children—to follow him. He taught that a rich man should sell all that he had and give to the poor. He taught that men should not resist their enemies: that they who took the sword should perish by the sword. He taught—and this was simply the quintessence of *all* his teaching—that “he that loseth his life for my sake and the gospel’s, the same shall save it.” . . .

Does the Christian Church believe in that? Or in any of it? We know it doesn’t. What then does it mean by its belief in Jesus? I should say that, in fact, it reduced to one very simple thing: namely to the belief in the Atonement, to the belief that by his death upon the Cross Jesus redeemed the sins of the world. I am not here to criticise that belief and all that it implies; what concerns me now is to suggest that that belief alone substantially differentiates the Christian Church to-day from the Jewish Church which Jesus repudiated and which repudiated Jesus.

And that belief, however profound it may be, whatever depths of meaning it may contain, was not taught by Jesus. Not that, if it had been possible, he would not have been ready to deliver himself up to agony and death that the sins of the world might be forgiven; but that he knew it could not be done that way. He did not invite men to be saved by a vicarious sacrifice,

but to change themselves: to think differently, to live differently, to be different. The essence of the gospel of Jesus was that men should repent, not in the hackneyed sense of that word to-day, but in the sense of the strong Greek word of the gospels—“*metanoein*”—that men should have their minds turned upside down, that there should be a revolutionary upheaval in men’s souls. . . .

For what was this revolutionary upheaval of heart and mind which Jesus preached—this change of the old man into the new? Well, he himself described it in many ways. His favourite and most natural way of expressing it was to say that men should become “sons of God,” just as he himself had become a “son of God”: which meant that they should realise that God was indeed their Father, and the Father of all other men besides: and it followed that all men were indeed brothers, fellow-sons of God the Father. That was the good tidings, the blessed news. To know and believe that was to undergo a revolutionary inward change. And the simple statement of what that belief meant is this:—

“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.”

. . . If only men would become “sons of God”—sons of the God whom Jesus had discovered, whose perfection was so strangely different from that of the God of the Churches.

“Love your enemies, and pray



for them that do you harm. That thus ye may be sons of your Father: for he makes his sun to rise upon good men and bad, and his rain to fall upon the just and the unjust."

Not the God of the Churches; but far more near to the God of whom Spinoza said: "He who loves God cannot endeavour that God shall love him in return." A God, of whom it was *obvious* that for a man's love He could give no particular love in return: indeed the only God who could be *loved*, nay more, the only possible object of Love: for the love which expects to be reciprocated is a precious human affection, but no more. But, as Spinoza said, the Love wherewith we love God is the Love wherewith God loves Himself in us. Spinoza knew what Jesus meant, as not many men have done. He knew the secret of that impossible command: "Be ye therefore *perfect*, as your Father is perfect." . . .

Since Jesus and his teaching never can be other than revolu-

tionary, it is expedient that they should be left decorously alone. And left alone they have been—century after century. "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." What sort of teaching was that for pliable youth? And whither might it not have led? This would never do. The proper function of a Christian Church was to assure men that the service of Mammon was indistinguishable from the service of God.

And it did its work, on the whole, very well. The Christian Church itself served Mammon with exemplary zeal, till it became a prosperous and efficient department of Capitalist Society Ltd., where in return for a very small fee the shareholders could

Compound for sins they were inclined to  
By damning those they had no mind  
to.

Why, in the name of justice, should the moment have now arrived when this ancient and successful bluff will be called, not by men, but by the nature of things? . . . .

JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY

[Between the above two articles and the pair which follow we may appropriately draw our readers' attention to *The Indian Social Reformer* of 20th October (pp. 116-17). Its esteemed Editor, Mr. K. Natarajan, puts forward a suggestion which, in our opinion, would be conducive to the right reform in connection with Christianity. What is needed is a Society—on the lines of the Buddha Society of Bombay—whose members would study the teachings attributed to Jesus, each appropriating in his own way whatever he deemed fit to better his own character and improve his own spiritual perceptions. An International Society would be advantageous, inasmuch as non-Christians would be able to inform their Christian co-members of the point of view of other faiths. But such a society must beware of the interference of the *padres*.—EDS.]

## CHRISTIANITY, CHRIST AND INDIA

[ Below we print two articles both written by patriotic Indians—the first of whom is a Christian, **Dr. J. M. Kumarappa**, the second is a Hindu, who has dedicated his life to the service of his religion and his country as a Swami of the well-known order of Ramakrishna-Vivekananda. **Swami Jagadiswarananda** as an admirer of pure Christianity, which the *padris* have corrupted, makes an appeal for a radical change in the creed, while Dr. Kumarappa would reform the church from within. We appreciate the noble motive of each of our esteemed contributors, but the remedies they suggest will not avail. To-day the world, and India most of all, needs Religion not religions. “The nearer to church, the farther from God” is a true saying; therefore, organized religion, Hindu, Christian or any other, has to be delivered from the dead-weight of dogmas, interpretations, personal names, anthropomorphic conceptions and salaried priests. That seems to us to be the only remedy, not only for Christianity but for every creed.—EDS. ]

### I—A PLEA FOR AN INDIAN EXPRESSION OF CHRISTIANITY

As Christianity went out into the Western world, it took to itself national, racial and cultural modes of expression, and without such adaptation it has existed nowhere in the West. In the ancient world there were the Judaistic type and the Hellenic type of Christianity existing side by side. Then as it moved into the Roman world, it took on a slightly different complexion; other differences began to appear as it moved still further west. In England the Christian religion, influenced by the racial traits and culture of the English people, has developed many features not fundamental to Christianity itself. Even the universal elements in the teaching of Christ are capable of different expressions. It is but natural, therefore, that each nation to which Christianity is presented, should develop the core of Christ's teachings according to its own national genius. Has then, one may ask, Christianity in India expressed its substance in an Indian form? Has

Christianity anything to learn from India's religious experience and her search after God?

#### I

Though Protestant Christianity, such as we have to-day, came to India about one hundred and fifty years ago, it has not up to the present been *allowed* to take on an Indian character, for the simple reason that the Western missionary, being strongly of the opinion that everything not Western is heathen, fights shy of things Indian. Hinduism is so strong in South India that to Indianize Christianity is taken as equivalent to Hinduizing it, while Islam is so influential in North India that Indianizing in thought is practically proscribed. Hence Christianity in India is denied the privilege of appropriating to itself anything from India's religious heritage. No wonder then if it still remains a *foreign* religion; foreign in its dictation and control, foreign in its church architecture and forms of worship, foreign in its organization

and methods, foreign in its songs and music, foreign in its patterns of thought and traditions; in short, foreign in everything.

Thus Christianity in India has been under the powerful domination of the ecclesiastical traditions of the West. While such domination has helped Christian missions to reproduce in India the sectarian divisions and theological standards, it has not helped to foster a movement that is faithful to the lessons of Christian history and at the same time freely adapted to the racial genius and cultural heritage of the Indian people. No religion that is merely borrowed or mechanically imitated can ever become powerful enough to change the thought and life of a civilized nation. India has, in the course of her long history, evolved valuable religious ideas and practices, associations and traditions, customs and habits, peculiarly sacred and binding through long usage, and it is idle to expect that she will forego beliefs and practices which are so deeply interwoven with her very life and civilization.

Therefore it is necessary, if Christianity is to express itself in an Indian form, to produce a gigantic theological work, connecting the fullness of the Christian revelation with the religious and philosophical property of India, as the Alexandrines and Cappodocians, Augustine and Thomas of Animo, have connected it with Greek and Latin philosophy. Such theological synthesis is even more important for India, but at the same time also more difficult, than

for the West, because the religious and philosophical treasures of India are much older and richer than those of Greece. Nevertheless, without this theological synthesis, it will not be possible for Christianity to be the same for India as it once became for the Greco-Roman world. All the more, therefore, is it to be regretted that Indian Christianity, in spite of its long history, has not been able to produce an outstanding theologian who could effect that synthesis.

This intellectual paucity is due, among other reasons, to the absence of first-rate Christian theological colleges based on Indian religious thought and culture. At present theological education in India differs little, except in quality, from that of the West. There is an utterly inadequate provision made in theological seminaries to help Indian Christian leaders of religious thought in the task of relating Christianity to the religious experience and heritage of India. The theological college must make far more use of men who are recognized authorities on Hindu and Islamic cultures—not Christian scholars who have acquired a knowledge of these cultures, but men who are the acknowledged leaders of these great religions, and who can give us the spirit of them as well as the letter.

In this connection it may be worth while also to make it possible for every graduate of a theological college to have a post-graduate year in a Hindu ashram or centre of religious learning, to help him to study and appreciate

Hindu religious thought and life. Only thus can he acquire a real knowledge of India's great religions and her spiritual culture. Further, he must be taught to make the scriptures of the living religions of his own land the Old Testament of his Christian faith. To this end, the theological students in India must be required to study Sanskrit and Arabic instead of Greek and Hebrew. It will also be possible then for Indian Christianity to develop a religious terminology of its own, which will at once appeal to the Indian heart, and at the same time to retain its own peculiar characteristics. India has many religious terms and phrases of vital significance and deep meaning which could contribute much to a fuller understanding of Christianity. Indian Christianity must appropriate such terms and drop out the pagan Greek terms and practices which have come to be introduced into Christianity in the course of its European development.

## II

And that is not all. There is even more for Indian Christianity to take in from the more important features of the Indian religious atmosphere. The contemplative life, the sense of the presence of the Unseen, aspiration towards ultimate Being and reverence for sanctions of the past may be mentioned as the significant elements in Indian religious consciousness. Just an enumeration of them is in itself enough to bring out the difference in the religious attitude of East and West. While India places

thought above action, Europe reverses the valuation. India maintains that matter is *maya* and therefore an evil to be got rid of, if man is to realize the divinity in him. This religious consciousness has greatly influenced India's outlook on life, and also the development of the great ideas of renunciation and asceticism. So also Christianity in India must learn to emphasise the reality behind all phenomena, and not its appearances. If Indian Christianity would only lay stress on the supreme value of the Eternal, it would be able to counteract the destructive influences of the materialistic utilitarian standards of the West.

The idea of the immanence of God, as understood and developed in Indian religious thought, is already beginning to influence Western philosophy. And no attempt to re-interpret in Indian categories of thought the verities of the Christian experience can afford to ignore this truth and its historical development in India. If Christianity takes on a really Indian expression, then it will be in a position to provide a good corrective against the tendency to Deism in the West. The Indian sees God everywhere, and has a longing for universal harmony. This accounts for his sensitive regard for all life. While upholding the superiority of man, Indian Christianity must seek to bridge the enormous gulf which the West has created between man and the lower creation, and develop the consciousness of the unity of all life and the oneness of the human family. It must

seek to stimulate the sense not only of the immanence of God but also of His transcendence.

Then again there are the doctrines of the "Incarnation" and the "Atonement," needing restatement. Indian Christianity may approach these doctrines starting from the widespread Indian belief in Karma. That evil must of necessity be expiated, that demerit cannot be expiated by merit alone apart from divine grace, and that a man cannot escape the consequences of sin—these are points in Karma which might profitably be used as a starting point in an effort at an interpretation of the doctrine of Atonement. Moreover, the widely prevalent belief in *Ahimsa*, not as mere non-violence but as a positive concept of active love, capable of infinite suffering for the good of others, is another element which may be utilized for understanding and interpreting the vicarious suffering of Jesus Christ. Even the doctrine of reward and punishment needs to be restated if it is to appeal to Indian thinkers. The old-fashioned theology back of this doctrine is neither closely allied to the Gospel story nor easily reconciled with a God of love. Indian Christianity must seek to correct this in the light of Indian thought.

### III

Then, in working out techniques of spiritual communion, Christianity in India must not fail to take into consideration the peculiarities of the religious nature of the people. The Indian is contemplative by nature, and therefore

delights in meditation. As a result, the *Yoga* practice has come into being. It aims to bring into perfect harmony and repose the body and mind, so that the devotee may receive without any interruption the inflow of that Divine life which pervades the universe. The essence of *Yoga*, therefore, is spiritual communion with the Unseen, and its method is that of self-surrender in quietude of spirit, relaxing the human effort, while allowing the divine grace to flow in. The Indian Christian, who desires to come into the spiritual heritage of India and who is eager to attain a vivid and intimate sense of God, must endeavour to study the technique of *Yoga* and practise it in a selfless spirit of earnest striving. *Yoga* is a mental discipline, and Indian Christianity may well adopt this technique of prayer and inner communion, and also make greater provision for meditation in its church worship.

Attempts must also be made to interpret the doctrine of the Trinity from the Indian point of view. While we speak of the Trinity as the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, others speak of it as the True, the Good and the Beautiful; some others speak of it as Force, Wisdom and Holiness; still others as *Sat*, *Chit* and *Ananda*. Indian Christianity would present the supreme Brahma of the Vedas as God, Jehovah; Divinity coming down to humanity as the Son, and Divinity carrying humanity upwards as the Holy Spirit. This is really the philosophy of salvation. God ever coming down

and ever going up—this is salvation, this is creation. Then, again, while Western Christianity represents Christ as man-God, Indian Christianity must present Him as God-man. This is not only more intelligible but a possibility in the nature of things. In this presentation man remains man; only God is superadded to his nature. Humanity, in other words, continues to be humanity, but divinity is engrafted upon it. In Christ divinity dwells. In Him we see human nature perfected by the application of divine nature. And in this application we realize the purpose of Christ's life and ministry. To be Christ-like therefore is always a process of transformation, bringing us nearer and nearer to God.

By recognizing the natural necessity for variation in religion in order to meet the psychological differences in human beings, India has developed an attitude of religious tolerance such as is not to be found anywhere else. This accounts for the fact that there has been little or no religious persecution as compared with Western countries. (The present Hindu-Muslim conflicts are not religious persecution; they are communal quarrels.) All religions are recognized as differing forces in the economy of God, which emphasize different aspects of truth. In a country where so much religious tolerance is practised, it is unfortunate that Western Christianity should have taught its followers in India religious exclusiveness and sectarian antipathy.

Indian Christianity may well learn to accept and honour truth wherever found, maintaining that no one religion or sect can claim to have apprehended the whole truth, encouraging intercourse with its neighbours, be they Hindu or Muslim, and inviting *Gurus* of different faiths to address its congregation.

#### IV

It is consonant with the spirit of the Gospel that Western missionaries should divest themselves of that bitterness and antipathy towards the spiritual heritage of a land which is truly the mother of religions. If Christianity is to express itself in an Indian form, it is necessary for Christian forces to alter their point of view, reconstruct their message and revise their methods of work. There must be less insistence on the acceptance of Western creeds, dogmas and traditions and more generous readiness to learn from those of different creeds and views, and to count spiritual experience and conduct of life the decisive test of Christian discipleship. Indian Christianity must not be a foreign religion. It must strike its roots deep in the national heart of India and, drawing its sap from India's spiritual resources, develop with all the freshness and vigour of indigenous growth. Only when Indian Christianity is allowed thus to enrich itself freely with the spiritual heritage of India, will it be able to give the world of to-morrow its own interpretation of the Galilean's ideal.

J. M. KUMARAPPA

## II.—HOW INDIA WILL ACCEPT CHRIST

“Had I lived in the days of the Nazarene, I would have washed his feet not with tears but with my heart’s blood,” exclaimed Vivekananda, one of the modern apostles of Hindu Reformation.

The genius of Hinduism is assimilation and expansion. India can accept what does not already exist in her religion. From time immemorial the Hindu genius has been ever active in assimilating new doctrines. What characterises Hinduism most is not only its tolerance but its universal appreciation and acceptance. Even the oldest of the Vedas proclaims: “Truth is one though Sages describe it variously.” So Hinduism bars no truth, though it refuses to stereotype any doctrine. It makes room for all. It is ever vigilant to welcome a new Prophet, and therefore is not averse to assimilating Christ-teachings. And yet—for the last two milleniums countless missionaries with fervid energy and enthusiasm have tramped India in vain. In spite of their enormous power of men and money, they have been able to evangelise only two per cent of the large Indian population. Christ has not touched the heart of Hindustan. Why is this?

The fact is that as yet no missionary has truly understood the Hindu mind. The Westerners who come over to India to preach the gospel generally dump on the reluctant minds something which threatens to weigh down and eventually to crush the soul of the nation. They are motivated by

selfish interests. Christ was an Oriental but they preach to India the Occidental Christ wearing the garb of Western Materialism and Western Imperialism. Christianity of the Churches savours of commercialism. Hindu thinkers scorn and berate the padres as “wolves of imperialism”. Dr. Sudhindra Bose of Iowa University says, “The missionary has always been a tool of Imperialism and economic exploitation—an integral part of the Imperialistic advance of the West.” Sir S. Radhakrishnan confirms this:—“The Anglican Church is linked up with British Imperialism even as the Greek Church in Russia was bound up with Czardom.” (*East and West in Religion*, p. 67) Religion in the West has ever been a handmaid of the State. The inordinate ambition for the wholesale Christianisation of India and the East is itself a phase of the Western imperialistic craze. History evidences that the flag follows the missionary.

Nathaniel Peffer writing last year in *Harper's* (U. S. A.) commented on foreign missions as follows: “Everywhere in the East denationalisation which is now reflected in the political and social breakdown is in part chargeable to what missionaries call education.” The social and educational services of the Christian missions are a “kind of bait to entice people into being preached to”. Even devastating wars have always got the sanction and the blessing of the churches. But the days of such aggressive

and high-handed methods of the missionary movements seem to be over, at least in India. India needs Christ but not Christianity. India will accept Christ, but will reject Christianity. That the religion of Christ and Christianity are poles apart is admitted even by some missionaries. The Rev. Dr. R. Simpson, Principal of the Lawrence Memorial Royal Military School, said last year at a meeting in Ootacamund:—

Christianity and Christ are not synonymous terms. The formal religion of Europe and America is but a pale shadow of the religion of Christ. The West is not Christian yet, although it has officially embraced Christianity.

The Indian mind prefers cultural conversion to a ceremonial one. Modern religious liberalism has tolled the death knell of formal proselytism. The Christian propagandist should set aside permanently this hobby and whim of proselytisation. A reinterpretation of Christianity in the light of Indian thought is perhaps the most important task that confronts the Indian Christian to-day. To ask India to renounce her innate culture is to ask the sun to cease to shine. Not only Vivekananda whom we have quoted, but also Ram Mohan, Keshab Chandra, Ramakrishna and Gandhiji yield to no orthodox Christian in their love and regard for the Anointed One. It is a happy sign that some Christian leaders are in favour of the Indianisation of Christianity, but they must consider gravely certain facts:—

India will accept the Bible as *one* of the scriptures, and will reverently peruse it along with the Vedas,

but she will never substitute the Bible for the Vedas as the padres want her to do. Further, India will interpret the Bible in the light of her Vedic wisdom. Thus reinterpreting, India will shed new lustre and light on Bible-teachings free from limitations of the churches, and make Christianity wide and universal as Hinduism itself.

A Hindu need not be converted, because virtually all the doctrines taught by Christianity are already there in Hinduism. But conversely, all the grand detailed teachings of Hinduism are not to be found in Christian scriptures.

According to the mystical Gospel of St. John, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." And "the Word was made flesh". The Hindu *Sabda-Brahma*, or *Nada Brahma* or *Sphota* are identical with this conception of the Logos. Corresponding to the Advaita, Visistadvaita and Dvaita schools of Hindu theology the Bible also advocates three concepts of God. Christ's sayings, "I and my Father are one"; "Ye are gods"; "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which in Heaven is perfect"—declare in no uncertain terms the Divinity of man as taught us by Advaitavada. Then the doctrine of Divine Immanence or Pantheism as held by Visistadvaitavada are echoed in Christ's teachings as follows: "I am the vine, ye are the branches"; and "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." As regards the Dvaitic or Dualistic teachings it is well known that the Gospels are full of



them. "Our Father which art in Heaven, Hallowed be thy name"; "Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son"; "Thy will be done"; "I am the way, the truth and the life"; "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you," etc.

Then the Christian doctrine of the Trinity corresponds to the Hindu Trimurti of Brahma-Vishnu-Shiva, or perhaps more appropriately to Brahman-Ishvara-Avatar. God the Father and Brahman, God the Holy Ghost and Ishvara, and God the Son and Avatara are synonymous. Hence the Christ may be regarded as an Avatara.

That brings us to the doctrine of Incarnation. While Christianity upholds only one Divine Incarnation, Hinduism asks, "If God can incarnate once can He not do so again?" But Christ has nowhere said that He is *the only* Son of God.

Concomitant with this is the doctrine of Atonement. The Hindu belief is that Divine Incarnations or Avataras come to earth to establish Law and remove the accumulated burden of unrighteousness. Though They are born sinless They do suffer for humanity. Whenever virtue subsides and vice prevails Ishvara assumes human form out of infinite grace and mercy to man. Says Christ, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Krishna also says in the *Gita*, "Take refuge in me and I will liberate you from all sins."

If according to Christianity man is created after the image of God how can he be innately sinful?

What then does the Christian doctrine of Original Sin mean? Take its Hindu counterpart—the doctrine of Avidya, that is, Anadi. This doctrine of Eternal Nescience is parallel to that of Original Sin.

Turn to the laws of Karma and Reincarnation. This doctrine of cause and effect has been taught by all the Saviours and the Teachers of the world and can be traced in every religion. No man of common sense can deny that good brings good; and evil, evil. Christ says also, "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." St. Paul wrote:—"Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." But without its twin, Reincarnation, the doctrine of Karma is meaningless. Christ however believed in reincarnation, and such a doctrine was believed in among the Jews in his time. In early Christianity this doctrine was recognised till the sixth century A. D., when a Church Council anathematised it. Moreover, there is no denial of it anywhere in the Bible. And if we read the Gospels between the lines we shall read confirmative statements of this law in some places. That the Jewish people believed in reincarnation is clear from the question they put to John the Baptist: "Art thou Elias?" And still more significant is Christ's affirmation: "If ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come." So reincarnation was a popular doctrine in those days. Reincarnation is the lost chord of modern Christianity and without it numerous statements of the Bible are meaningless.

Christ reserved the highest truths for the few disciples of the inner circle only. To the masses he preached the path of devotion. As the people around him were prepared only for the Dualistic Truth he taught them that. The Teachers never unsettle the faith of the ignorant. They teach according to their hearer's competency. Even that is clearly hinted in the *Gita*. So, generally speaking, the religion of Christ was Dualism like the Bhaktivada of India—but to his own he taught otherwise.

Thus we see that all the dogmas which the Christian missionaries preach in India are already present as doctrines in Hinduism. There are many more points of contact between these two religions, but this short and rough sketch is enough for our present purpose. Thus interpreted and preached Christ will have a permanent place in Indian religious thought.

The faith of the future must point out to the seeker the many steps on the long Path of the Spirit so that each struggling soul may find its place according to its bent and competency.

India, then, will accept Christ as one of the many Saviours. He is one of the great Reformers and the Indian Christians should have the moral courage to admit this truth. Indianisation of Christianity

will be complete if its Indian custodians go on liberalising and universalising their creed, and give up the madness of proselytism, which creates a muddle in society and antagonism in Hindu minds. Let them not depend upon foreign padres. If the missionaries both foreign and native are true devotees of Christ, they will preach only his original teachings and not narrow church dogmas. India will never accept dogmas from the missionaries, and if they persist in their efforts to force them on the country the time will come when they will face complete failure. Perhaps when they leave our holy land bag and baggage then Christ will shine here as a great spiritual Teacher.

Christianity is in urgent need of reinterpretation and expansion. The sooner it is done the better for its future. It has become static and rigid. India perhaps of all nations has the greatest contribution to make to Christianity. Only with the Indian contribution can it get over its crisis all over the world. This will give it a new lease of life. Our Indian Christian brothers have an opportunity of serving their religion not only in our Motherland but throughout entire Christendom. Will they rise to the privilege which that opportunity offers?

SWAMI JAGADISWARANANDA

## NEW BOOKS AND OLD

### THEOSOPHISING CHRISTIANITY

AN ATTEMPT OF 1855.

[**Edith Ward** whose familiarity with Theosophical literature is extensive here writes about an old and little known volume.—EDS.]

I contributed to **THE ARYAN PATH** of April 1931 some notes describing a curious volume—*Theosophical Transactions of the Philadelphian Society*, 1697—which is in my possession. This book was cursorily referred to in a paper read by Dr. J. D. Buck at Chicago in 1889, and a long extract from his paper, including this reference, was quoted by H. P. Blavatsky in the second chapter of *The Key to Theosophy*. Dr. Buck mentioned another work which he linked with the volume previously described as evidences of pre-existing Theosophical Societies or, more accurately, evidences of past attempts to found such organisations. Both these old books are very little known, and the first is a biblical rarity; the second has recently passed through my hands for the first time and it is possible that some readers of **THE ARYAN PATH** may be interested to learn a little more about it than appears in *The Key to Theosophy*, where the full title and dedication are given. These, in the fashion of an earlier day, were of inordinate length. Here is the title:—

An Introduction to Theosophy, or the Science of the "mystery of Christ," that is of Deity, Nature, and Creature. Embracing the philosophy of all the working powers of Life, Magical and Spiritual. And forming a practical

guide to sublimest Purity, Sanctity, and Evangelical Perfection. Also to the attainment of Divine Vision, and all Holy Angelical Arts, Potencies and other Prerogatives of the Regeneration.

This surely was a programme calculated to fire the ambition of any would-be student! The publisher was John Kendrick, London; the date 1855. Now for the Dedication:—

To the students of the Universities, Colleges and Schools of Christendom,

To Professors of Metaphysical, Mechanical, and Natural Science in all its Forms,

To Men and Women of Education generally, of fundamentally Orthodox Faith,

To Deists, Arians, Unitarians, Swedenborgians, and other Defective and Ungrounded Creeds, Rationalists and Sceptics of Every Kind,

To Just-minded and Enlightened Mahomedans, Jews, and Oriental Patriarch-Religionists,

But especially,—To the Gospel Minister, and Missionary, (whether to the Barbaric, or the Intellectual Peoples),

THIS INTRODUCTION TO THEOSOPHY, or the Science of the Ground and Mystery of All Things,

(To consist, it is supposed, of about Thirty Volumes,)

IS MOST HUMBLY, AND AFFECTIONATELY

DEDICATED.

After these imposing claims the writer or editor remained modestly

anonymous. The copy before me is inscribed "To the Rev. N. Rouse 1862, with the Editor's kind regards." It is a small 8vo volume of about 531 pages and was intended as the first of a series of thirty, as indicated in the dedication, and reiterated in the Preface. It is not surprising that this vague and vast proposal never developed into maturity. Dr. Buck tells us that a second volume was issued under the title of *Theosophical Miscellanies*—a name which is more familiar to many of us in connection with a much later—and also uncompleted—enterprise emanating from Calcutta in 1883 "under the Authority of the Theosophical Society".

When one comes to examine the nature of the proposed issue of volumes thus pompously heralded, it is found to be concerned not with any original work, or revelation, but with reprints of the writings of Christian Mystics of an earlier age. Thus this first volume consists of selections from the writings of William Law; others from the same source were to follow and to be succeeded by studies of Freher and Boehme himself and these by judicious treatises of *Animal Magnetism*, setting forth in proper classification, its various recorded and known phenomena, both of body and mind; . . . . . and then indicating the ground of the same, with suggestions as to further research and experiment, all according to the constituted principles, properties, and laws of spiritual nature; . . . . . And also showing, how this wonderful, but as yet undeveloped, nay unapprehended, discovery of these last ages ( of ' vital magnetism ' ) has ever been the great

*experimental* desideratum of Theosophy, though alluded to and prophesied of, by its grand masters in their writings, as an event that should assuredly arrive, and to be continually expected.

This surely might have proved a tempting bait!—but the middle of the nineteenth century was not a favourably aspected season for such occult enterprise and early Victorian age is stamped all over this book whose sentences are italicised as freely as those of that great little monarch herself in her private correspondence. The Appendix supplies us with more detailed information as to sources whence it was proposed to draw for this vast undertaking, and here also the Editor reveals that

One very important result to be expected from the proposed work, if duly executed, will be the refinement and exaltation of the *genius* of Methodism, which is undeniably the most advanced system of *practical evangelism* that this country and the continent of America have ever witnessed.

In short the scheme centres round a plan for expounding and developing a more mystical and philosophical Christianity, also, as the Editor naively says, "of the true means for the Induction of the intellectual 'Heathen,' Jewish and Mohamedan Nations into the Christian Faith"! The aim thus revealed does not appear to bring this book ( in spite of the auspices under which it has been introduced to the interest of theosophical readers ) into line with the objects of the modern Theosophical Movement. As Dr. Buck remarked, "these works were soon forgotten, and are now generally unknown".

Not without amusement do we find at the end of the volume an Advertisement to the "Enlightened, Wise and Loving Reader of this Treatise, who is Rich in this World," and then a modest appeal for one hundred thousand pounds to found a theosophical college, or spiritual hospital, the details of which are set forth at great length and conclude by mentioning "the glorious benefits to the world at large, and to the English nation in particular, to be expected from the establishment of a Theosophic College when once rightly in operation. Also, "to show to the noble minded Lady or

Gentleman the *everlasting blessedness* they would confer upon *themselves*, by such an act of *philanthropy*." The "Enlightened, Wise and Loving Reader" is informed that he, or she, may "confer with the Editor upon the project, or otherwise place the money to his Account at Messrs. Glyn & Co.!" Here we may leave this abortive attempt at world regeneration, merely recalling how often, even in our own day and generation, similar grandiose conceptions seem to have foundered on bricks and mortar!

EDITH WARD

### A CHRISTIAN SADHU\*

[Sri Krishna Prem Vairagi was the name assumed, in the old traditional manner prevailing in India, by a young English gentleman when he resolved to enter the Path of Vairagya, renouncing his all, including the name given to him at birth. He took his Tripos at Cambridge in Mental and Moral Sciences and is a deep student of Indian philosophy. Away from the world, he lives in a small Asram in the Himalayas.—EDS.]

Sadhu Sundar Singh is known to most people at least by name. Born a Sikh, he became a Christian while still a boy as a result of a remarkable experience. Thereafter he lived the life of a wandering sadhu and preacher and became very well-known in both hemispheres for his saintly life and mystical experiences. He went on several missionary journeys into Tibet and suffered many hardships, finally meeting his end (for this book makes it clear that the legend of his

being still alive has no real foundation) in unknown circumstances during a similar lonely journey undertaken when his health was already tottering.

His visions and experiences have aroused much attention and have found both ardent defenders and severe critics. The great experience of his life was the one already mentioned. Always of a highly religious nature, he suffered intense emotional shock at the death of his mother. Unable to find satisfaction for his religious doubts, he

\* *Sadhu Sundar Singh. A Personal Memoir* By C. F. Andrews (Hodder & Stoughton, London. 3s. 6d.)

Our readers will be interested in the following note by the publishers—

"There was a touching incident in connection with the proof reading of this book. C. F. Andrews gave a proof copy to a great friend of his, a girl who is very ill with cancer, saying jokingly that he would give her a penny for every mistake she found. When he came to see her again she claimed no pennies, but made a suggestion for a rather drastic alteration to the last thirty or forty pages of the book. He saw at once that she was right and came straight round to us to get our opinion. It was one of those things which become obvious as soon as they are pointed out. The drastic alterations were made at once, and his last words to me before he left were 'I am glad we made those changes. It is at least a ten or twenty per cent better book now.'"

was about to commit suicide when he had a vision of Christ which changed his whole life and converted him from a hysterical opponent to a devoted follower whose faith in his Master was shown by the deeds of a heroic and saintly life.

Too much stress, however, has been laid in some circles on this and other visions. Such visions, uncommon in the west on account of the spiritual deadness of modern protestant Christianity, are quite frequent among religious men in India, the only difference being that, in this country, a wise tradition deprecates public mention of such experiences. It seems that later in life Sundar Singh himself came to realise this and regretted the publicity he had given to his visions.

His devoted life of sacrifice and love is sufficient testimony to the spiritual nature of his experience, but it must also be borne in mind that such experiences are in no way a testimony to the doctrinal truth of the particular creed which happens to be attached to them. If a vision of Christ is to constitute a proof of the truth of the Christian creed or Bible, then the similar (and more numerous) visions of Krishna or Buddha will constitute proof of the truth of the Hindu and Buddhist beliefs and Scriptures.

One may advert here to the curious delusion among orthodox Christians and that is, that when someone has a vision of Christ it is a proof of His existence as a historic person and "living God" while exactly similar visions of, say, Sri Krishna, are mere subjective experiences having no relation to history or truth! Undoubtedly the Christ is no dead myth but a living Truth but so, and on the same evidence, are Sri Krishna and others.

The above-named delusion is bound up with the sectarianism that seems so inseparable from any form of traditional Christianity. Even Sundar Singh, free from all bigotry as he undoubtedly was, and scornfully as he repudiated any talk of the "heathen darkness of Hinduism," could yet allow himself to

say: "Christianity is the fulfilment of Hinduism. Hinduism has been digging channels, Christ is the water to flow through those channels." This statement, true for his personal life, is ludicrously untrue if applied to Hinduism in general.

Again, while his missionary journeys into Tibet were undoubtedly performed at great sacrifice and with profound conviction, yet one cannot but lament the ignorance which allowed him to speak of Tibetan hermits (he is not speaking of the ordinary lamas), as solely occupied in the turning of prayer wheels, and to describe their Nirvana as the extinction of all life and spirit, a view that even the western scholars have now abandoned. A little study of the doctrines of these despised Tibetan hermits would have saved him from the mistake of attributing objective and historic reality to the formal content of all psychic experiences. To do him justice, some realisation of this seems to have been dawning on him but there are many others on whom it has by no means dawned.

Mr. Andrews has added an appendix about some modern attempts to graft certain yogic practices upon the structure of traditional Christianity. These attempts, though springing from a praiseworthy realisation that an ounce of experience is worth a ton of doctrine, are nevertheless mistaken. *An essential requirement of any real yoga is complete detachment from any personal prejudices or sectarian notions. Without such impersonality the practice of yoga will lead to no enlightenment but, by inducing subjective visions, will plunge the so-called yogi deeper and deeper into the net of his own personal notions which will seem to be confirmed by the experiences which, in point of fact, owe their form to those very notions.*

It may seem to some that these remarks cannot apply to the initial vision of Sadhu Sundar Singh because of its unexpected nature. This, however, is a very superficial view. He himself has written: "Up to that moment I hated Jesus." All who know

anything of these matters are aware that hatred, (especially a somewhat hysterical hatred), is as powerful a formative force as love, and even more powerful in some cases. Hindu readers will remember the story of Shishupal which symbolises this truth.

Be that as it may, it is certain that this book is a record of a noble, lovable and saintly character, profoundly devoted to the service of that Deity which is One though called by many names.

SRI KRISHNA PREM

*Short Stories, Scraps and Shavings.*  
By BERNARD SHAW (Constable & Co., London, 7s. 6d.)

As the title indicates, this book is a miscellany. But every piece, however slight or trivial in content, has the true Shavian touch. From the point of view of artistry, to which Shaw generally pays little attention, the short story of *The Miraculous Revenge* is the least unsatisfactory in this collection. For brilliance of dialogue *The Domesticity of Franklyn Barnabas*, in which Chesterton is caricatured, is equal to anything that G. B. S. has written. And for vividness of description *A Sunday on the Surrey Hills* may be recommended to any prose anthologist. The collection is made weighty by the addition of *The Adventures of the Black Girl*, which was first published in 1932.

It is worth while comparing the evolution of the idea of God described in *The Black Girl* with a similar evolution in the religious literature of this country. Shaw points out that there are at least four conceptions of God in the Bible. The God of Noah is a murderous tribal deity, who in a fit of anger at the wickedness of mankind drowns every living thing on earth, except a family of each species. And quite in accordance with his nature he delights in the sweet savour of burning flesh on the altar built for him by his protégé and says, "I will not curse the ground any more for man's sake." The God of Job is an improvement on the God of Noah. Though he accepts seven bullocks and seven rams from Job's friends and easily excuses their complicity in his scepticism, he is philosophical, academic and argumentative. Though he is unable to solve the problem of evil he can speak most eloquently and poeti-

cally of the wonders of creation. The God of Micah is again a great improvement on the argumentative deity of Job. For the prophet says:—

Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

We thus see that the blood-thirsty God of the earlier books of the Old Testament disappears and in his place we have a God who makes purely ethical demands on man. But still he is only an external God. And a man walking humbly before an external God has an immature soul; he has not come into the full possession of his heritage. One of our Upanishads says:—

*Whoever worships a deity thinking "He is one and I another," he knows not, he is like a sacrificial animal for the gods.*

The conception of an all-pervasive, immanent Spirit working through all creatures and especially through the heart of man separates the Upanishads from the Brahmanas which revel in elaborate descriptions of animal sacrifices. In the Upanishads the priest and the ritualist give place to the mystic and the thinker, and severe mental and moral discipline takes the place of elaborate sacrifices. We see a similar break between the Old Testament and the New, for to Jesus God is the spirit who incorporates himself in man: "The kingdom of God is within you." "I and my Father are one." But unfortunately this great discovery of Jesus was not properly followed up. The idea of the divine spark in man was not courageously developed in the New Testament as in the Upanishads. Jesus him-

self was caught up in the whirlpool of the apocalyptic thought of his times; and he may really be said to have gone under when he declared that he would soon come back to judge the world in thunder and lightning. And his disciples completed the destruction when they made Jesus a son of God in a very unique and exclusive sense and developed the strange and fantastic doctrine of Atonement. In effect they revived the old and discarded sacrificial religion of the Old Testament under a new guise and made Jesus himself the victim slain on the altar of the cross to appease an angry God. Shaw is never tired of ridiculing what he calls Christianity—the Christian doctrine of the salvation of mankind through the vicarious suffering of Christ on the cross. In his prefaces to *Major Barbara* and *Androcles and the Lion* he had

attacked the doctrine, and now he returns to the charge in the *Black Girl*. With his usual "irreverence" he makes the conjurer who represents Christ say:—

I am so utterly rejected of men that my only means of livelihood is to sit as a model to this compassionate artist who pays me sixpence an hour for stretching myself on this cross all day. He himself lives by selling images of me in this ridiculous position.

A devout non-Christian may be as much repelled as a Christian by irreverent raillery of this sort. But the follower of every religion should have the courage to face the most hostile criticism of his faith, and in the sacred name of Truth try to see if there is anything wrong, fictitious or outworn in the creed that has come down to him.

D. S. SARMA

*Whither Asia? A Study of Three Leaders.* By KENNETH SAUNDERS (Macmillan and Co., London. 8s. 6d.).

*The Ideals of East and West.* By KENNETH SAUNDERS. (Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.)

A man's attitude to religion may be one of four main types—first, indifference; next, bigotry; then a friendly toleration that recognizes good in other beliefs but which is still overpartial to its own "superior" creed; and finally the understanding that sees Religion as universal, the source of all religions and creeds, which are in their exoteric form its partial and even distorted reflections.

These two books come under the third group, since despite a definite bias towards Christianity they are actuated by the ideal of the brotherhood of East and West. The first presents pen portraits of the mystic reformer of India, Gandhi; the rationalist reformer of China, Hu Shih; and the Christian social worker of Japan, Kagawa. The author concludes that while the rationalistic basis is insufficient, the Christian ideal of service is more

potent than the Indian ideal of sainthood, of one above the pleasure and pain of life, free from the wheel of action. This is a false comparison, though a common one among Christian writers. Renunciation, or freedom from self-interest, and true service are ultimately identical. "Children only and not the wise speak of renunciation of action and right performance of action as being different," says the *Bhagavad Gita*.

The second book summarizes and compares the ethics of India, China, and Japan, of ancient Greece, the Hebrews and the Christian Church. Selected passages illustrate the thesis, while in prologue and epilogue the characters discuss the similarities and dissimilarities of their respective religions. Yet somehow one cannot feel that the fact of the living basic unity is grasped.

All endeavours to promote understanding are good, but at the same time efforts that are coloured, even a little, by a predilection for one creed as "superior" and for one spiritual teacher as "unique," cannot give the white light of *absolute* truth.



It may seem ungracious to play the critic thus with books which contain so much of good in them. But the higher the ideal set the higher must be the standard of judgment, and goodness alone is not the highest "good". There must be Knowledge, or let us call it Wisdom. It is good to recognize that the ethical ideals, however much their expression may vary, "are like the ideas of Plato, rooted in the very nature of the cosmos". But it denotes lack of knowledge to consider the Vedas as merely the primitive undeveloped expression of religion, and various early

allegories as superstition. It denotes a limitation of vision to conclude that "Christianity" is more excellent in love than the other religions, and that the person of Jesus is the "unique and original synthesis of those high qualities which he taught"—a statement that cannot be corroborated.

Some day men will need, not a study of comparative religions, but a history of Religion itself. Such a book, however, would have to be written by one who "belongs to no cult or sect, yet belongs to each and all".

WINIFRED WHITEMAN

*The Mediator: A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith.* By EMIL BRUNNER, Professor of Theology in Zurich; trans. by Olive Wyon. (The Lutterworth Press, London. 20s.)

When a man of the erudition of Professor Brunner writes a volume of 619 pages, with appreciative forewords by Dr. J. K. Mozley, Canon of St. Paul's, and Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D. D., of New College, Edinburgh, the reviewer feels that there he may find at last a presentment of the Christian faith which may justify it in the sight of many who have deserted the Churches because they have been "sent empty away". To the convinced orthodox Protestant Christian, perhaps, the book will be satisfactory and enlightening, but those who have not found in creedal Christianity the inner enlightenment will scarcely be touched by it.

No one can doubt the sincerity of purpose of the author, but he is anything but convincing.

Dr. Brunner lifts Christianity out of the region of history. That Jesus Christ was born, lived, died and rose again, are of course facts to him, and therefore in a sense historical. But Revealers like Buddha and Zoroaster are ruled out of court for they did not claim to be unique (p. 27, footnote). Also—

the fact that special revelations—as, for example, theophanies and incarnations—are said to have happened several times really

means that nothing happened at all. The element which was repeated in each of these events was not final. A final event *can* only happen once. (p. 26)

If the reader is interested in the subject of revelation, he is referred to the excellent presentment of a sane and credible view in the Editorial of *The Aryan Path* for September last.

As regards the events in the life of Jesus, Dr. Brunner seems to us a little shaky as to the actual physical happening of the Virgin Birth, nor can we quite make out whether he regards the Resurrection as a physical fact. However, there can be no doubt that Dr. Brunner believes whole-heartedly in a Personal God, who can both love and be angry:—

The God who is really angry, really loves. To reject the idea of the wrath of God also means to reject His Love. Then all that is left, both negatively and positively, is the abstract idea of law. The idea that God is angry is no more anthropopathic than the thought that God loves. The reason why the idea of the divine anger is always exposed to misunderstanding is because among men anger is ethically wrong. And yet, even among men do we not speak of a "righteous anger"?

... To banish all emotions from the sphere of the Divine Good is not the work of Christian thought but of "Greek-modern," that is, rational thought. God is angry because He is personal, because He really loves. (p. 478)

That such an argument will in this age make any appeal is difficult to imagine. Can Dr. Brunner not rise in thought above personality, get beyond that which the *Gita* terms the pairs

of opposites, and realize that *there is no such thing as righteous anger?*

Then we encounter the old bogey of "original sin" presumably when we are told that "The central point in every human being is his attitude towards God. So far as his attitude towards God is concerned his nature is perverted, spoiled, and lost" (p. 443). To Dr. Brunner the reasonable doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation would make no appeal. To hold up divine perfection as a possible goal for humanity; to explain that from life to life we reap what we have sown, hence the apparent inequalities between different persons in the world, and that we are now preparing our harvest for next life would leave our author cold. Dr. Brunner's personal God cannot be approximated by mere man.

Sin is distinguished as a "religious idea" as apart from the "philosophical idea" of evil (p. 462). "But evil is never as bad as sin."

Sin against God is an attack on God's honour. Sin is rebellion against the Lord. But God cannot permit His honour to be attacked; for His honour is His Godhead, His sovereign majesty . . . . The holiness of God requires the annihilation of the will which resists God. God is not mocked. (p. 444)

Man is the personal property of God. God desires from him not merely a legally correct life, but personal surrender, even as He Himself, the Creator, grants to His creature not merely a happy life, salvation, but personal communion with Him, the Creator. (p. 477)

Sin has created a great gulf between God and man, a gulf only to be spanned by God's forgiveness, a real divine act. In the revelation of Christianity this bridge has been created. The real Atonement has been achieved.

Hence the real revelation and the real Atonement are closely connected with each other; indeed, rightly understood, they are one. The God of Love, the One who loves us in spite of everything, can only be known as He really is in this aspect of His Love. For apart from this fact of Atonement He is not the loving God at all. Apart from this perception of His Nature He is the God of Wrath. Only in Christ is He the God of Mercy. For "he who believeth not in the Son is judged already and the wrath of God remaineth on him," not as an imaginary idea but as a terrible reality. Whoever is not affected by the Atonement remains severed from the God of love, thus in the reality of death, whose end is the second death. (pp. 488-9)

We personally are at least borne up by the hope that the wrath of God may be a little mitigated by the statement on p. 413 that "the whole of the history of philosophy and of religion is a field which contains scattered elements of truth," and that "even outside the Christian revelation of the Bible man is not without God nor without truth" (p. 414).

It is surprising that a man of the erudition of Dr. Brunner should be so glamoured by a fixed idea. His great head-learning has almost obscured his soul-wisdom. This review has run to the length it has because it seemed well that the readers of THE ARYAN PATH should learn that there are still people of learning who indulge in blind belief. Dr. Brunner has produced no evidence, as far as we can see, to prove his case. He finds in his belief, however, his consolation and guide, and then presumes that his belief is the only true belief, the revelation of his religion the only true revelation, and that his Personal God is the only God.

B. A. (OXON)

---

The way to the Bible lies through Hermes, Bel, and Homer, as the way to these is through the Hindu and Chaldean religious symbols.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II, p. 383.

## THE LAND OF PSYCHE AND OF NOUS

[A. E. Waite's quarterly instalment deals with the relation of Christianity to Spiritism. We had not requested our friend to do this, nor intimated to him our plan of this special Christian Number. A "coincidence" again!—EDS.]

It was a serious loss to America and to Psychological Research everywhere when the fearless personality of Prof. James Hyslop was removed in 1920 to another sphere of activity. It was under his auspices that the American S. P. R. became and was maintained for years a living force in the borderland of Spiritism; that its *Journal* counted high in the periodical literature of the subject; and that its voluminous *Proceedings* stood almost alone therein. A time came when he secured the assistance of Dr. Walter Franklin Prince, a Priest of the American Episcopal Church, though no longer engaged in ministry. He succeeded Hyslop as Research Officer and Leader of the New York Society, a position which he held for four years and relinquished only on his removal to Boston, where he founded the Boston S. P. R. in 1925. It became in turn another living centre, issuing periodical "Bulletins" and occasional Transactions or Reports. Dr. Prince was elected President of the British S. P. R. in 1930, an appointment which did honour to itself in conferring honour upon him. His death in Boston on August 7th of this year,\* after an illness of twelve months, registers

at least as great a loss as that of Prof. Hyslop. He has been described accurately in an English memorial notice as "one of the outstanding figures of modern Psychological Research" and as one who leaves a "brilliant record" behind him. A first-hand acquaintance with the record itself is needed, however, to appreciate at its full value the significance of this panegyric, especially amidst the welter of the recent psychological output, which grows from more to more as the years go on. "The Case of Patience Worth," a Quakeress of the seventeenth century, communicating—according to claim—through Mrs. Curran as medium, is regarded by many as the most famous example of his critical research; but—on the contrary—it is "the Doris case," that amazing "study in multiple personalities," which must be called the crown of his achievement. It will not only be remembered but will hold its high place so long as Psychological Research is pursued among us. The vast dimensions of the records may have made them sealed books to all except earnest students†; but that which was said of them some seventeen years ago is not less true at this day than when it was first

\* *Light*, August 24, 1934.

† There are four mammoth volumes of the American Society's *Proceedings*, extending to over 3,000 pages, on the Doris case. The first two are the exclusive contribution of Dr. W. F. Prince. Hyslop and others intervened later. *The Two Worlds*, August 31, 1934, has a good memorial notice of Prince.

written, namely, that there is no psychical case which can compare with that of Doris "for the protean interest of its elements or for the rich minutiae of its details." It can be added only that there were five personalities manifesting through the vehicle of a German-American girl, whose name was Doris Fischer.

The relation of Spiritism to Religion continues—in journalese terminology—to "crop up" incessantly, and from quarter to quarter one is recalled thereto. The debates are intermittent and casual, prompted by that or this and never reaching a decisive stage, much less an agreed settlement. Their spontaneous recurrence at all points of the compass shews plainly that the theme is in the mind of all sorts and conditions of Spiritists. But there is no clear understanding as to the root-matter of debate. Spiritism itself means one thing only, the survival of human personality made evident by communion with the so-called dead; but who shall define Religion in such terms as will secure general consent? For the great majority in the West it connotes Christianity alone: but even within such limits the varieties of religious belief are sufficiently manifold. When, therefore, a well-remembered friend, F.W.H. Myers, suggests—as he did long ago—that Spiritism is a preamble to Religion, the inevitable question arises: What is meant by Religion? Is it that

of Ernest Rénan in his *Life of Jesus*, once described as the portrait of a "pastoral enthusiast"? Is it represented by the recent "Life" by Papini, or by Thomist Theology, laying out on hard and fast lines the irreplaceable scheme of redemption, to be left or taken at the price of hell or heaven? As regards the two former cases the proposed preamble may answer tolerably well, and in respect of Liberal Christianity at large, with a certain further dilution. But in the last case what message can Spiritism bring to those who hold that rigid form of faith, unless it is a blank denial? It knows nothing of the Paradise of Dante, his Beatific Vision or the abysses of his "Hell opened to Christians". The news, moreover, from the invisible world is not news of Christ. A recent convinced Spiritist has just suggested that the Immaculate Conception, the Trinity and the Atonement "do not seriously trouble the Christian of to-day"; but it is well to face the facts.

Unless and until the Latin and Greek Orthodoxies heave over their age-old Creeds among the rubbish, the findings of Spiritism cannot be added thereto, either as preface or postscript. When it is suggested also in yet more irresponsible terms that "the Churches will quickly annex the new knowledge,"\* the answer is that it will never be annexed by the two Obediences which count before all others, for in so doing they would tear up their titles and the system

\* *Light*, August 17. For other suggestions and affirmations on the subject, see *Ibid.*, May 18 and *The Two Worlds*, for June 29, July 6, July 20 and August 10.

which they exist to represent. The writer of these lines is neither spokesman nor apologist of the Official Churches; but he rests assured that the amiable and accepted institution which has its nominal centre at Canterbury will be adopting no preambles, for it is a State-made assemblage of conflicting elements in a condition of flux and would imperil its own existence. Finally, Spiritism itself is a complete chaos and has proved nothing unless or except the bare fact of survival. The messages which come from the "other side" about that side which is "other" are a story of "going on and still to be" in the likeness of things as they are, amidst our landscapes and seascapes, our hills and dales, our houses and temples spiritualised. So did the Hierophants of Eleusis present the Elysian Fields as the reward to come of their Initiates and Epopts. There is no evidential value anywhere, and we know not where we are. If the dead do indeed come back, the sum of our authenticated knowledge is that XYZ has made evident to ABC the fact of his posthumous identity. All else is in the clouds and much of the cloud-masses are suggestive of moonshine.

Looking from the Land of Psyche and towards the Land of Nous, the intellectual concern of the moment is not—shall we say?—the "Problem of Christian Origins,"\* presented by

Alfred Loisy in a discourse at the College of France, though it is good to note that, for him as for us, that which counts in Religion is not its external forms "but the spirit which gives life to the forms". It is not "Bergson as Liberator,"† a study in which Dr. Jacks presents the French philosopher expounding himself and his system, though we agree that the Bergsonian "Gnosis of Creative Life," sounds like another name for "the Living God". It is not with Mr. F. McEachran,‡ who laments the gradual disintegration of the idea of unity and the development in its place of a compartment view of existence in almost every sphere of life. He appears to condemn (1) "the modern obsession with immediate ends," (2) the Baconian concentration on "experimental rather than speculative research," (3) the industrial revolution, (4) democracy and nationalism, and (5) the theory of progress, as "so many forms of disintegration". He agrees with M. Benda that "the modern world is obsessed with practical aims" and is "perishing from the atrophy of empiricism." The point is that even a fantasia of this kind is an illustration of the "thirst for unity," for a belief in eternal values, for a living sense of "the existence behind the world of a source" adequate thereto. The intellectual concern is not, at the immediate moment, to be found even in the latest pronounce-

\* *The Hibbert Journal*, October, 1934.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *The Contemporary Review*, September, 1934.

ments of Sir Oliver Lodge,\* according to whom: (1) Mind employs matter as a vehicle of manifestation; (2) Thought and personality are not to be identified with any assemblage of atoms; (3) it is Mind and not the brain which hears and sees, which thinks and plans; (4) the self, the character, the memory are not in any mechanism but of and belonging to the indwelling psychic entity, which is life or soul; and (5) this persists, with heights unspeakable before it, for those who choose and will. Here is the kind of doctrine which can be written after or before that news of the invisible world which is Spiritism at its best and highest. It might also introduce the SUMMA transmitted to mankind and the ages by the Angel of the Schools.

The pre-eminent concern centres on an alleged contrast between the new and the old physics which was offered us in luminous terms when Sir James Jeans delivered his Presidential Address before the British Association at Aberdeen. It has been said that no such pronouncement has aroused so great an interest for a considerable number of years. It is almost as if we had been enabled to see for a moment where we stand with "deductions from assured results of science," almost as if there were an agreed position, to be held at least till the next occasion when Science pauses to take stock of its findings. The Victorian scientist, according to Sir James Jeans, believ-

ed that he was studying "an objective Nature," independent of the perceiving Mind and existent from all eternity, whether perceived or not. But according to the new physics that Nature we study is made up of our perceptions rather than of something we perceive, and there is "no clear-cut division between the subject and object," no room left for "the kind of dualism which has haunted philosophy since the days of Descartes". The perceiving mind was "a spectator" in the old physics; "it is now an actor". In other words, "perceiver and perceived are interacting parts of a single system". It is to be understood further that our knowledge consists only of numbers, of mathematical symbols, from which it appears to follow that our ether, our atoms, our electrons belong to the realm of fiction. Our minds can be acquainted only with "things inside themselves, never with things outside". They are "parables by which we try to make Nature comprehensible". The voice of contradiction has been heard in many places, and there is that among others of Mr. Ivor Thomas,† who affirms (1) that the field of mathematics is only "a small portion of reality and not the most important"; (2) that not the slightest reason emerges "for doubting the real existence of atoms and electrons"; and (3) that the disbelief of Sir James Jeans "is purely an individual opinion" unsupported by Science itself. It is possible, however, to go much further, for

\* *Why I Believe in Personal Immortality*, 1934.

† See *The Nineteenth Century*, October, 1934, s. v. "A Modern Pythagoras".

the Aberdeen Presidential Address proceeds to tell us that our knowledge is at best "a smeared picture of the clear-cut reality which we believe to lie beneath". In this case, it is not easy to see how the several snips of the thesis can be pieced logically together. If there is no objective Nature apart from the perceiving mind, what is this alleged reality beneath the mere daub which perception presents to ourselves? What is that in virtue of which we can be said to perceive at all? If Nature is not "something we perceive," what is the muddled picture made up of our sensations but illusion without meaning; and what and why is the mind, encompassed thus by the mimes of a galanty show? Interacting therewith, is it part also of the nightmare orgy, the denizen of

a cosmic Bedlam, weaving a play-house sorcery? Assuredly we shall elect with Emerson to hold that Nature is a sacred omen and sign; with Saint-Martin that it is "a great parable which sooner or later will give place to a grand morality"; and with Leibnitz that there is a valid correspondence between things phenomenal and things noumenal because of the truth of God. Are there not some of us also who, after another manner than Sir James Jeans, have come to know and realise that all things indeed are within, that there is a subjective infinite within us which subsists for us so far only as it is perceived by exploration, and that it can be explored from more to more—as he himself says, "in our own minds"?

A. E. WAITE

A Correspondent in the September *Literary Guide* quotes Professor Bury as below:—

"If the existence of a world of spirits were ever established, it would possibly be the greatest blow ever sustained by Christianity. For the great appeal of this and some other religions lies in the promise of a future life of which otherwise we should have no knowledge. If existence after death were proved and became a scientific fact like the law of gravitation, a revealed religion might lose its power. For the whole point of a revealed religion is that it is not based on scientific facts."

The correspondent concludes: "It follows, that however delusive the evidence for spiritualism may be, it is a menace to the Church's power over the people."

## MARGAŚĪRSHA AND MAKARA AMONG THE VIBHŪTI IN THE GĪTĀ.

[ S. V. Viswanatha writes appropriately for the month of December.—Eds.]

In the tenth chapter of the *Bhagavat Gītā* on *Vibhūti* (Cosmic Glory), “whatever is glorious, righteous, beautiful and powerful in creation” is attributed to the Lord, and said to emanate from a fragment of His divine effulgence (x, 41). Only three verses (31, 35 and 36) seem to be contrary to the contents of the above stanza. In this short paper I propose to examine the significance of Mārgaśīrsha and Makara, as its publication may be pertinent and opportune in the number of THE ARYAN PATH issued during December.

### I

In śloka 35, Śrī Krishna says, “I am Mārgaśīrsha among the months.” Why should he have identified himself with this particular month? In fact, it is reckoned as a *śūnya-māsa* (month devoid of merit) and ordinarily dreaded for its climatic conditions and especially for the more than ordinary death-roll in it. The simple explanation for this simile is contained in the *Mahābhārata* of which the *Gītā* forms a part. In the period of the Great Epic, Mārgaśīrsha was the initial month of the year, being for this reason also known as *agrahayana* (Anuśāsana, 106 and

109). The Hindu year did not begin then with Chaitra as in later times. Mārgaśīrsha has therefore the significance of being “the first” (*ādi*). Verily, the Lord is the first, the beginning of all, as is stated in the second verse of the chapter.

In Indian astronomy, both the lunar month Mārgaśīrsha and the zodiac sign Makara were represented by the same sign “the Deer-Head” (*Mrgaśīrsha*, *Mrgāsyā*). Mārgaśīrsha gets the name from the *Nakshatra* Mrgaśīrsha with which the Moon is in conjunction on the Full Moon day of the month; while the zodiacal sign Makara is described by Varāhamira as *Mrgāsyā*. It is also understood that the front part of Makara (Capricornus) represents land, like the hind part of Dhanu (Sagittarius), while the back half of the former is a symbol for water (Hora, I, 5). In very truth, therefore, is the observation made in *The Secret Doctrine*, Makara “has the head and the fore-legs of an antelope and the body and tail of a fish”. It is an amphibious animal “loosely translated ‘Crocodile.’” (II, 577, 354; I, 219).

### II

Sloka 31, X. describes Him as “the Crocodile\* among fishes”.

\* “The crocodile is the Egyptian dragon. It was the dual symbol of Heaven and Earth, of Sun and Moon, and was made sacred to Osiris and Isis.” (*The Secret Doctrine*, I, 409). “The sign of Makara is connected with the birth of the spiritual ‘microcosm,’ and the death or dissolution of the physical universe” (*Ibid.*, II-579).



Surely this was not the first aquatic creation of the Lord, according to the Brahmanical religious beliefs. What great or ennobling qualities are possessed by this animal, and what does it really represent, for it to be identified by God with Himself?

According to Egyptian mythology, both in the hieroglyphics and in the plan of the Grand Pyramid which has been interpreted as the "Tomb of Osiris," the devouring crocodile stands for the raging passions of humanity. This creature "spoke to man of the time when he should regain the mastery of the passions, and when the last barrier between himself and his glorious soul should be removed for ever."\*

In a popular allegory in the *Mahābhārata*, known as *Gajendra-Moksha*, which deals with the release by the Lord Nārāyaṇa of a wild elephant in rut from the clutches of a crocodile, the latter is given the epithets *dush'atmā* (wicked), *virūpa* (deformed), *durādharsha* (uncontrollable) and *raudra* (terrible), which apply aptly to the unrestrained senses, frequently compared to furious horses in their flight. After his death at the hands of the Lord he becomes purified and subservient to the Self.

The name of this aquatic creature is also met with under the same meaning in such expressions as *Makara-dhvaja*, *Makara-kunḍala*,

*Makara-toraṇa*, and *Makara-vāhana*. Pradyumna who is identified with Kandarpa or Kāma (Cupid), is described as bearing the "Crocodile Flag". Kāma is the embodiment of human passions, particularly of Love, the first and foremost of these; and therefore the standard that is held aloft by this god has the ensign of Makara on it. *Makara-kunḍala* is an ear-ornament of the shape of a crocodile found usually only on the images of gods and at times allowed to be worn by a Brāhmaṇa well-versed in the Vedic lore and in Śrauta rituals. Human passions being coeval with man are not in themselves an evil, but become so when unsubmitive to the Soul. As it is stated elsewhere in the *Gītā* (VII. 2) "the Lord Himself is Kāma not inconsistent with Dharma" (*Dharmā-viruddha*). Similarly the creature figures as an architectural motif in the *Makara-toraṇa*, for the passions when properly kept under restraint indeed form an external ornament, and this festoon of the festival of Cupid helps to remind the onlookers of this principle. The expression *Makara-vāhana*, is applied to Varuṇa, the Supreme Lord in the Vedic religion, who riding over the "raging passions" subdues and renders them fit to subserve the Soul. In later religious literature, Varuṇa is reduced to the position of Lord of Waters (*apām pati*).

S. V. VISWANATHA

\* "The mummy donned the head of a crocodile to show that it was a soul arriving from the earth." (*The Secret Doctrine*, I, p. 220 footnote) "The rising Sun being considered the Soul of the Gods sent to manifest itself to men every day, and the crocodile rising out of the water at the first sunbeam, that animal came finally to personify a Solar-fire devotee in India, as it personified that fire, or the highest soul with the Egyptians. (*Ibid.*, II, 577).

## OURSELVES

This issue of THE ARYAN PATH is concentrated on the subject of Christianity. Some light is thrown on various doctrines so grossly misinterpreted; the churches come in for a share of blame for corrupting the teachings of Jesus and for not following his noble example. The writers are Christians and Non-Christians, Westerners and Indians, and each has to offer some substance of thought and of suggestion. The influence of every religion, not only of Christianity, on its followers is generally speaking deplorable. If reform is to be real it must, *ipso facto*, end the reign of priest and purohit, of mobed and moulvi. The Spirit of Religion can manifest in purity and truth only in the enlightened heart of man. That spirit alone can make all life sacred, invest its prosaic events with beauty, its puzzling events with meaning. That Spirit of Religion—more expressive is the Sanskrit word Dharma—is creative and when practised by the individual, whatever his race and religion, re-shapes him, and increasingly his words and deeds become the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace.

With this number THE ARYAN PATH completes its fifth year. It has maintained itself against heavy odds, remaining true to its ideals.

Recently because of the wrong use of the word Aryan, especially in Germany, a little confusion has arisen in some quarters regarding our programme and policy. Need-

less to say, this Journal has no sympathy with exploitation and interference in the free will of the people anywhere, and considers such treatment as un-Aryan. The term Aryan is used in the ancient and pure sense; it is related to the Order of Noble Souls.

The effort of THE ARYAN PATH is not to proselytize anyone to any creed, but to quicken men's spiritual intuitions, and to point to the bedrock of truth underlying dogmas and sects, rites and superstitions, so that those who will may energize themselves to uncover it. It urges no beliefs upon its readers—in fact, it deprecates beliefs not based on knowledge, pure reason and clear intuition.

THE ARYAN PATH stands for free and open enquiry and discussion—above all for intellectual honesty. All of its contributors enjoy the utmost freedom to express their views in its pages. It is a symbol and a messenger: it symbolizes the Noble Path of all eras and its message to every human soul is—Seek the Way which leads to Enlightenment, to Sacrifice. It is but a humble organ of the Eternal, Spiritual Movement of Wisdom, but that it claims to be, and therefore its function is and ever will be to—

*Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.*



ULT LIBRARY  
BANGALORE.

Accn. No. 128



