AUM

"Seek out the Rajah of the senses, the Thought-Producer, he who awakes illusion. The Mind is the great Slayer of the Real. Let the Disciple slay the Slayer."

—*The Voice of the Silence.*

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. IV NOVEMBER 1933 No. 11

THE GOLDEN MEAN

In this journal have appeared from time to time deliberate conclusions of thoughtful writers, both oriental and occidental, who have bemoaned the present moral state of the world, especially the western, who have recommended that we look once again to the ancient East whence the light ever comes, and who have appealed to modern India not to be beguiled by the decadence of a waning civilization. One such pronouncement appears in our present number from the well-known philosopher and educator, C. E. M. Joad. He writes about the weakened moral fibre of the moderns resulting from a shallow philosophy of life and conduct, and he prescribes a remedy—the Golden Mean. As a fundamental principle the Doctrine of the Mean is true, and its practice in life beneficent; but Mr. Joad's interpretation of it seems incomplete. Therefore in presenting his essay we supplement its ideas, lest its warning is twisted into a recommendation.

The Golden Mean in all things is taught in the *Gita*, by the Buddha, and perhaps there is no fuller treatment of the subject than in the records of Confucius. All agree that moderation is the only way to success, happiness and enlightenment, at every stage of evolution. But moderation in what? How is the Golden Mean to be practised?

Aristippus, the founder of the Cyrenaic school was the first in the western world who taught that the art of life is to crowd in as much enjoyment as possible, and to do so moment by moment. But even he was compelled to admit that certain actions which give pleasure entail more than their equivalent of pain in the future. He therefore insisted that real pleasure belongs only to him who is self-controlled and who

possesses prudence. Thus our modern young people are not even real hedonists; they are sensualists. That is the reason perhaps why Mr. Joad recommends moderation in its quantitative aspect, with his whole attention on the experience of happiness: drink a little; lose your temper on occasion; indulge your senses when you are minded, but not too much. And he adds—avoid satiety like the devil. But little of prussic acid kills; loss of temper, on a single occasion, by a weak-hearted man may prove fatal; by a full-blooded man may cause apoplexy; sense-indulgence colours and captivates the mind, so that more and more people are "minded to indulge". If Mr. Joad says to a voluptuary "Avoid satiety," he will be answered: "Quite, quite, but I am nowhere near the satiety line." The thirst for sense-life cannot be cheated into a permanent moderation by small doses of that which the Buddhist calls "the abomination inspired by Mara". The glutton, sick with his fill, presently is ready to eat some more. Sense-thirst like the worm that fattens on the blossom's heart expands and waxes strong every time it is fed.

At the other extremity there are the rigid ascetics, body torturing contortionists who call themselves yogis; they also suffer from excess due to the same quantitative interpretation of the Golden Mean. They too are after happiness; and one such explained to the seeking Gotama—

> 'Tis written if a man shall mortify
> His flesh, till pain be grown the life he lives
> And death voluptuous rest, such woes shall purge
> Sin's dross away, and the soul, purified,
> Soar from the furnace of its sorrow, winged
> For glorious spheres and splendour past all thought.

In the observance of the Golden Mean the quality of the things indulged in and not only the quantity of indulgence must be taken into account.

That which poisons life disturbs the balance and mars the harmony of Nature. The moral order of the universe is maintained by the law of the Golden Mean just as gravitation holds in form the ever-moving stellar universe. That law works in man, in his flesh, blood and brain, in his thought, will and feeling, in his corpus, psyche and nous. Man attains real happiness only when he establishes harmonious contact with Nature through the Golden Mean which operates within as without himself. Therefore the Chinese sage said that "the life of the moral man is an exemplification of the universal moral order. The life of the vulgar person is a contradiction of that order." Extremists at both ends, hedonists and ascetics, mostly unconsciously to themselves, want to defy Nature and are frustrated. They mistake the goal of evolution. It is not happiness, though Bliss (*Ananda*) is experienced in the reaching of Nirvana, in the realization of Tao, in the attaining of Perfection. That Bliss is one of a pair, creative Ideation (*Chit*)

being the other. Pure Existence (*Sat*) of supreme Peace (*Shanti*) is born of active creative Ideation whose passive aspect is Bliss. Nirvana is not a far away locality but the condition of self-consciousness in which life is creative *and* blissful.

Real happiness is never attained by those who neglect to look at the quality of what is eaten and drunk by body or mind. True philosophy deals with the quality of things in Nature; and numbers themselves which tell us of the quantitative aspect of Nature, have their quality, as Balzac, the unconscious Occultist of French literature, and all true Esotericists have tried to show.

When man's conceptions of Nature and its processes are false, his philosophy of action is false and his practice of the Golden Mean is defective. If it is true that man is a bundle of cells in the process of disintegration, that human consciousness, like a flame, will go out when the candle of brain is finished, then what more logical than that man should strive to enjoy all he can while the brain holds good, and commit suicide when he cannot have "a good time"? A different philosophy of life is necessary for the restoration of order in the present moral disorder. It must deal with the whole of man, and teach him to reintegrate himself. Mr. Joad also recommends development of every side of our nature, but from a different point of view; will not the result be anarchy if man gives "free and equal play" to all his members? In the sincere attempt at reintegration, named Yoga in India, and in developing the virtue of each of our constituents, we may —and do—slip into errors and "lose our temper on occasion," "indulge our senses," "boast," "abase ourselves in worship" and "fight a little". These must be recognized as evil, and not be compromised with as partial good. On the other hand, that sincere attempt may produce excesses of asceticism, the pride of sackcloth and ashes, the holier-than-thou attitude, but these too must not be compromised with. The Golden Mean must produce harmony among spirit, soul, mind and body of man. And that raises the question which modern culture has yet to answer —"What is Man?"

There is only one way for a man to be true to himself. If he does not know what is good, a man cannot be true to himself.

—CONFUCIUS

THE REVIVAL OF HEDONISM

[This is the article by **C. E. M. Joad** on which we comment in the preceding pages.—EDS.]

I.—THE GOSPEL OF "THE GOOD TIME"

The modern reaction from the restrictions and inhibitions of the Victorian age may, I think, be taken for granted. The Victorians made a fetish of self-restraint and were never at a loss for a good reason for refusing to enjoy themselves. Enjoyment, in fact, they viewed with distrust and would never call a pleasure a pleasure, when they could call it a sin.

The moderns claim, and rightly, to have freed themselves from this inhibited attitude to life. They do what they do because they want to do it, and are never at a loss for some principle of self-expression or self-development to justify their actions. Desire, they hold, should be indulged on principle, except the desire for self-control which is exempted on principle. As for conscience, she has been so battered, shocked and put out of countenance that she dare not raise a voice in protest, and we proceed unreproved to devote our lives to the service of the god of "having a good time," which means that *we have escaped from servitude to our consciences in order to enslave ourselves to our passions.*

The modern attitude I believe to be as mistaken as the restrictive Victorianism which it has replaced. Before, however, I proceed to criticize it I propose to consider in a little more detail the gospel of "the good time" in its most distinctively modern expressions. Its main characteristic is an unquestioning conviction that the only object of being alive is to have a good time. A good time means jazz, cocktails, sporadic love making, over-eating, under-sleeping, making a noise and being cheerful. Its most essential ingredient, however, is continual movement. It is incompatible with having a good time to stay in one place for more than an hour, and young people in general, and Americans in particular, seem always to be apprehensively escaping from something which they fear may be lying in wait for them, ready to make its spring, if only they would keep still. But this is precisely what they will not do. They must be always going somewhere, always on the move, always in and out of one another's houses, so that a man who thinks to have founded a home, discovers to his surprise that he has merely opened a tavern for his daughter's friends. As a consequence nerves give way, suicides abound, college girls turn bandits, and preachers rant about the licence of the age. Articles have recently appeared in a well-known American review, *The Forum*, on that most attractive

of subjects, the modern girl. One of these articles, by Miss Temple, makes a number of interesting assertions about what, she assures us, are representative young women of the day. The following quotation from her article will indicate what I have in mind:—

> At college during my first year, there were ten other girls in my section of the dormitory. Some were Seniors, some Juniors; two were Sophomores, and two Freshmen. Only five of the eleven girls there, on their own verdict, were 'pure and undefiled'. Of the six strayed ones, one was a post-debutante from New York City, and another, a girl from the West, with prodigious fortune and inclinations. Two others were doctors' daughters. Of the remaining two girls, one avowedly earned her pin-money by means of her easy-going virtue. The last girl was rather pathetic. Not attractive and not particularly pretty, she nevertheless set out in the most efficacious way she knew to win for herself a share of masculine attention. And she succeeded, in spite of the superior attractiveness of many of her friends.
>
> But college is not the only place where such conditions exist. They are everywhere, admittedly more widespread in cities than in suburbs and rural communities, but even there overwhelmingly prevalent. In the past ten months, for instance, I have made several fairly intimate acquaintances among girls. Some have been in cities, some in a small town. The experiences of five of these girls find counterpart only in Havelock Ellis's six books on "The Psychology of Sex". Concerning their relationships with men, the girls are quite impersonal. They are only too willing to answer any questions one cares to ask; they withhold nothing. I have sometimes even wondered if their most acute pleasure might not lie in their discussion of their adventures, rather than in the relationships themselves.

Miss Temple proceeds to point out that irregularities which twenty years ago would have been sufficient to secure ostracism for the culprit, are now cheerfully accepted as forming part of the normal development, we might almost say education, of young women.

I have given this quotation at length because it affords a vivid illustration of that departure from nineteenth century morals, which is one of the most striking features of the gospel of " having a good time ". The departure involves a complete abandonment of old standards and values, and the establishment, as the sole standard of value, of pleasurable experience. This attitude is, I maintain, particularly characteristic of our age; it dominates our lives and pervades our literature. The works of the two writers, at once the most typical of our times, and the most advanced, Marcel Proust and James Joyce, are characterised by the same ready acceptance of all that comes, an acceptance that refuses to discriminate, precisely because it refuses to assign values, that I have noticed in modern life. The great novels of the Victorian age were pervaded by a sense of big issues in relation to which the characters were ranged. Often the fundamental issue which dominated the book was that of doubt versus belief, and the first question that one asked in regard to a particular character was whether he or she

believed or doubted. To ask such a question of a character in a modern novel would be a patent irrelevance. A modern character is unable to conceive the importance of such an issue, not necessarily because he doubts, but because it never occurs to him to wonder whether he doubts or not; the matter is not sufficiently important. The question of belief or doubt is one that can only be raised in a world of values; but the world of Joyce and of Proust is a world not of values but of sensations, between which the only question that arises is as to their respective pleasurableness. The literature of to-day is conscious not of a world order, is inspired not by an irresistible urge, but is moved by a curiosity to handle and appreciate individual sensations, as a woman turns over parti-coloured stuffs on a tangled and much littered counter. The Victorians prided themselves on taking the world for their parish; we make a merit of taking our emotions for the world.

II.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF HEDONISM

It is one of the paradoxes of thought that the doctrine of psychological Hedonism in its extreme forms has usually been maintained by men of blameless lives, who, like Jeremy Bentham, insisted that it was quite impossible for them to conceive of anything as desirable, and hence impossible for them to desire anything but their own pleasure. The argument is by now sufficiently familiar. Everybody is fundamentally selfish; even the apparently unselfish man is only one who gets more pleasure from denying himself pleasure for the sake of others, than from directly indulging himself. The martyr who goes to the stake for his opinions is usually an obstinate and self-opinionated person; he prefers the enjoyment of having his own way to any other form of gratification; he also has, as a rule, a strong histrionic sense which is gratified by his appearance in the centre of the stage, and a conviction that by five minutes' agony in an earthly fire he will avoid an eternity of torment in an infernal one and win perpetual bliss into the bargain. All those who in the name of religion deny themselves and eschew earthly pleasures, are actuated by motives which are all the more selfish for being far-sighted. They are taking out a long term insurance policy; the premiums are paid in self-denial and mortification in the present, and the rewards are drawn in terms of divine approval and celestial happiness in the hereafter. And so on, and so on. There is no single action which cannot be shown to owe its origin to the individual's desire for his own pleasure; hence it is argued that it is not possible for him to desire anything else.

A variant of this view is the specifically modern doctrine already described which issues in the conclusion, that whether or

no pleasure is the only thing that *can be* desired, pleasure is, quite certainly, the only thing that *ought to be* desired. Pleasure alone, in short, is really desirable.

This attitude to life appears and reappears like a recurrent *motif* in the social history of all materially comfortable societies. It has been from time immemorial the practical working creed of most young men who have had enough money to indulge their instincts, and it has found expression in precepts and aphorisms in which such wisdom as it possesses has been distilled. " The palace of wisdom lies through the gateways of excess." "The only way to get rid of a temptation is to yield to it. " "The only sin is to get found out." "Success in life consists in knowing where to stop and then going a little bit further." "It is an absurd attitude to adopt towards life to go about approving and disapproving of things; we were not sent into the world to air our moral prejudices." "The Failure in life is to form habits." Best of all perhaps, to quote Brandes from Ibsen's play, "To obey one's senses is to have character. He who allows himself to be guided by his passions has individuality." In these and a hundred other sayings the philosophy of self-development has been crystallised. As to the consequences, who cares ? A man's first duty in this world is to himself; and as to the next God will forgive, since, as Heine remarks, "it is his *métier*."

The whole attitude to life finds perhaps its most perfect expression in that wonderful conclusion that Walter Pater wrote to his *Renaissance*, which he caused to be omitted from the second edition of the book lest "it might possibly mislead some of those young men into whose hands it might fall". The conclusion is a dissertation couched in the most exquisite language on the theme, "Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die." In life everything changes, fades and passes; make the most, therefore, of what you have, before it is too late.

> A counted number of pulses only is given to us of a variegated dramatic life. How may we see in them all that is to be seen in them by the finest senses ? How shall we pass most swiftly from point to point, and be present always at the focus where the greatest number of vital forces unite in their purest energy? To burn always with this hard, gemlike flame, to maintain this ecstasy, is success in life.

This is the doctrine that underlies the modern thirst for pleasure; jazz and cocktails being simply the best known modern devices for keeping life at a focus of intensity, and making the most of each moment as it comes.

III.—THE FLAW IN HEDONISM

I do not propose to subject the doctrine of Hedonism to logical analysis. It may, I think, be destructively criticised on logical grounds, so destructively in fact that it has been by most philosophers relegated to the category of definitely exploded theories. I

am here content to take its basis, the basis, namely, that pleasure is the only form of good, for granted, and to ask simply whether the practical effect of Hedonism is to produce pleasure.

In the first place, the tendency to regard our own existence, and as a consequence the universe in which we exist, as a means to our own pleasure, cannot but have the effect of robbing both the one and the other of colour and of interest. The man who subordinates everything to individual gratification will not only regard self as the centre of the universe, but will come to think of the universe as having for its sole function the placing of himself in the centre. Bringing all existence to the test of its ability to minister to his individual desires, he will fashion the universe upon the model of his needs, and devoid alike of the will to subordinate self to a moral ideal or the capacity to lose it in an external interest, will barter all the richness and variety of the world around him for a shade of feeling or a thrill of pleasure. A universe whose centre is a state of feeling and whose circumference is ringed round with a set of desires, is neither an exciting nor even an interesting place; nor are the attempts of those who define the object of existence in terms of self-satisfaction to attain the satisfaction they value, noticeably successful. A life devoted to the satisfaction of the self is a tired and a tiring life; the wretchedness of men and women who have found it intolerable from lack of occupation, far exceeds the misery of those who have been miserable from an overplus of tasks and duties. There have been more suicides from boredom than from overwork.

It is for this reason that the so-called hedonistic cults, so attractive on paper and eagerly embraced by the young, have in the past been abandoned in disillusionment and disgust when called to the bar of experience. An early acquaintance with ethical systems reveals to the student of philosophy the arbitrariness of moral standards and the baseless and divergent dogmatisms of ethical philosophers; a short training in argument enables him, by joining the ranks of the philosophers, to dispose of the standards of his predecessors. Having passed the rapier of his newly acquired dialectic through the ribs of a few lay systems and let out some bran and a little sawdust, having knocked the bottom out of moral obligation and dethroned the categorical imperative from its pedestal, the young philosopher proceeds to the business of enjoying himself without qualm or scruple.

Believing that the only way to get rid of a temptation is to yield to it, he surrenders his mind to every credo that may tickle the reason and his body to every pleasure that may enthral the sense; holding that not the fruits of experience but experience itself is the end of life, he withholds

himself from nothing that will afford a fresh measure of emotion, provoke a sensation hitherto unfelt, or cause him to thrill to the pulsing of a more exquisite excitement. Striving to "burn with that hard gemlike flame" recommended of Pater, he will seek in art and sensuality the means to keep his experience always at white hot intensity. Unimpeachable in theory, the doctrine fails somewhat unexpectedly to work in practice. The recipe for the production of pleasure does not produce pleasure, and servitude to the senses is found to be a more burdensome and exacting form of slavery than servitude to conscience.

THE REMEDY

Happiness may not be sought directly, a fact which all seekers after pleasure persistently ignore. The kingdom of happiness, like the kingdom of beauty, is not to be taken by storm, any more than it is to be purchased by dollars. Hence millionaires and society leaders range the world in vain and restless pursuit of that instinctive satisfaction which comes to artists, workers and some tramps unsought. *Set out to seek happiness and it will elude you; surrender all your energies to a task, throw yourself body and soul into your work, devote yourself to some cause, lift yourself up out of the selfish pit of vanity and desire, which is the self, by giving yourself to something which is greater than the self, and on looking back you will find that you have been happy.* Happiness, in short, is not a house that can be built by men's hands; it is a flower that surprises you, a song which you hear as you pass the hedge, rising suddenly and simply in the night and dying down again.

This result though important is negative; it tells us what we must not do rather than what we must, affirming that if we wish to be happy we must not seek pleasure directly. Can we not add something on the positive side? I am afraid very little. The plain fact is that the recipe for pleasure is not known. The nearer things are to us the less we know about them, less for example about the movements of the weather than about the movements of the stars, less about the composition of our blood than of beer, and least of all about our own psychology. We really know very little about happiness, much less, indeed, than we could wish to; we cannot get it quickly when we want it; we find that the price we have to pay for it outweighs the value of the happiness we have bought, while we find that the things for which we have longed do not, when obtained, bring the happiness we expected.

On the positive side the extent of our wisdom is fined down to a series of hints. The best account of pleasure that I am acquainted with is in the tenth book of Aristotle's *Ethics*. Pleasure, Aristotle points out, is like the bloom on the cheek of a youth in the

perfection of health at the height of his powers; it is a something added, an essence that is distilled only when a fine thing is functioning in the way appropriate to its nature.

We should seek, therefore, to cultivate our powers not for their own sake, but in order that we may increase our effectiveness as living beings, exerting ourselves to the full in those directions in which our natural gifts, improved by training, can be used to the greatest advantage. Not only should we work, but we should work at that which we can do best. To recognise his limitations is said to be the mark of genius; the recognition of his gifts is his distinction. Our *métier* once discovered, our pleasure will be found in its unremitting pursuit, but found only if it is not sought. To do things because you want to do them will bring pleasure; to do them because they will bring pleasure, will bring not pleasure but boredom.

Continuing with Aristotle we may find some guidance to a happy life in his characteristically Greek doctrine of the Mean. Do everything a little and nothing overmuch and you will be happy. Develop every side of your nature; give your mind, your body and your soul free and equal play; work, sleep, drink and eat, think, smoke and make love, lose your temper on occasion, but not too often, indulge your senses when you are minded, but not too much, worship God, but don't abase yourself before Him, help your neighbour, but don't prefer him to yourself, take every pleasure as it comes, but take care to desist before you have had enough, hold any belief that attracts you, but never to the point of being ready to die for it, gratify your tastes, but avoid satiety like the devil—and you will be happy. A good doctrine this, but meet for the middle-aged rather than for hot-headed youth.

Others have held that happiness is chiefly to be found in doing what our ancestors have done from time immemorial; for these activities, they say, there is an instinctive longing in our blood. Pray a little, hunt a little, fight a little, dig a little in the earth, boast, and sing together in chorus, make love and go on the sea in ships, be sometimes alone with Nature and never too far from her—and again you will be happy.

These are hints, nothing more, and they must of necessity be so, since, as I have tried to show, the identification of pleasure with this or that, followed by the direct pursuit of that with which it is identified, defeats its own end.

Knowledge of this truth, which wise men possess instinctively and most obtain only after years of boredom, has never been at so low an ebb as it is in the modern world. But until it has been learned, not all the wealth and leisure with which we have succeeded in over-endowing ourselves, will bring the happiness we seek.

C. E. M. JOAD

INDIA'S MESSAGE IN COLOUR

[**Professor S. V. Venkateswara, M. A.,** is the author of *Indian Culture through the Ages.*

In studying this article it must be remembered that various interpretations of colour-phenomenon are given in the different systems of old-world culture. Not only had different peoples like the Greeks, Egyptians and Indians, their own way of interpreting the colour-scale, but each of them, especially the Indians, had more than one. The magic of Sound (*Vach*) and of Light (*Aditi*) has ever remained esoteric; knowledge to be found in old books, such as is contained in this essay, is neither final nor complete, and above all, as our learned contributor points out, it is symbolic, given in allegory and metaphor, to understand which a key is required.—EDS.]

Vedic texts reveal a nice discrimination of colours. Various shades were observed in the heavens: ruddy, reddish, tawny, yellow, bright and blue. In a passage in the *Ṛg Veda* the tongues of fire are described as seven: swarthy, white, orange, blue, fern-bright, yellow and red. Four of these are associated with the sun,—those which appear at the red end of the rainbow and the solar spectrum. It is these colours that are mostly noticed in the early Vedic hymns. This is not wonderful, as Vedic religion is a bright, cheerful religion of prayers addressed to gods as presiding over the brilliant and friendly phenomena of Nature. The outline drawings of primitive man in India are in red ochre as described by Bruce-Foote in his Catalogue of Prehistoric Antiquities. Red and dark colours appear in the pre-historic pottery of Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro. In the Jogimara cave, black and yellow alternate with red and crimson.

Colours were used symbolically, apart from their pictorial significance. It is interesting to note that Indra, in the *Ṛg Veda*, the god of the bounteous sky and father of vegetation, was always represented as azure-chinned, and Varuna, of the brilliant sky as golden-horned and golden-armed. In the Upanishads the colour scheme appears more clearly. The extension of space is symbolised by sky-blue; the eternity of time by golden-yellow. The Infinite is marked by a white radiance. We have analogues in ancient Egypt, where blue denoted the sky and yellow the woman in bliss. In the ideography of pre-historic Peru, red denoted the soldier and green the vegetable world. The blue of the sky which stood for the Infinite came in later times to denote also the passing of the finite. It was the colour of mourning, for instance, at the Mughal court in Mediæval India.

II

It was the glory of India to draw a comparison and frame a correspondence between the external world of phenomena and

the inner world of the Spirit in man. The colour-scheme is used to depict moods of the spirit and states of the feelings. In the Bharat Nātya Śāstra our earliest extant work on dramaturgy, Bharata explains that dark blue is the expression of enduring love, the mark of which is self-denying devotion and surrender to the bosom of the infinite. Yellow expresses wonder, which in its nature is of short duration. Indian literature teems with passages which compare the inconstancy of sexual love (*Śringāra*) to the impermanence of the yellow pigment, especially in its deepest shades. The shifting and changing goddess of Fortune has this complexion, and the matrimonial happiness of woman is indicated by golden bangles which are cast off at widowhood. India's yellow dye-stuff was unsatisfactory and thus contrasted with her indigo which had a world-wide market and reputation. It suffered a sun-change into something strange, and the sentiment of wonderment (*Adbhuta*) was associated with the colour yellow. Similarly the pigeon's colour is used to denote sympathy or compassion (*Karuṇā*). White with a shade of yellow signifies heroism or chivalry (*Vīrya*), and the desire for achievement and action in a spirit free from selfish motive or petty vanity. Red excites anger or passion, as the red rag does the bull; and is made to represent brain-storms and tempests of the spirit. The mind dyed with indigo shows disgust and aloofness from the world and is on the path of retirement and renunciation. The dark hues betray fear or, when black or ugly, excite laughter. Thus each colour represents a dominant sentiment (*bhāva*).

It is stated in the *Sukranitisāra* that white or yellowish colour represents the *sāttvic* quality of the mind, red the *rājasic*, and the darker colours the *tāmasic*. The *sāttvic* quality shows itself in the pursuit of goodness and truth, at peace with oneself and with kindliness to all, in the subdued ecstasy of doing good for its own sake. The *rājasic* temperament shows itself in hot-headed passion, consuming greed and lustful desire. In its higher forms it is self-denying service and purposive sacrifice. It leads to winding, though well-intentioned, marches in the cyclic curves or a see-sawing of the forces of progress and retrogression. The *tāmasic* mind is full of delusive longings and vain illusions, based on the preference for that which is pleasant to that which is for the lasting good. It plunges the individual into distraction and leads to his downfall.

In Indian painting and chromosophy, white always denotes *sāttvic* purity and bliss. It is the colour of Umā, the goddess of unsullied purity, of Siva, the god who has given up all, and of Sarasvati, the immaculate goddess of learning. It is the colour of the heroes who have fought the battle of life from a sense of disinterested duty like

Arjuna, of the Pāṇḍavas. It is the colour of men who hold their heads high above the tossing waves of fortune, like Balarama, the brother of Krishna.

Ruddy and rajasic is the glow of the Sun, the Dawn, and of Fire; of Brahma who labours ceaselessly at the navel of creation, and of Skanda, the ever-watchful and all-encompassing god of the six heads (seasons) and the twelve hands (months) of time. Yellow is the symbol of humanity seen in the robes of the new-married couple, as of the drapery of the Vishnu images. The goddess of beauty and fortune (Śrī) has a complexion of molten gold. Blue is the colour of the firmament, of the god of space (Vishnu) and his incarnations Rama and Krishna, and of the goddess of Time, the myriad-handed Kāli. The last, as Durga, the mother of the Universe, of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, is painted green or draped in russet and green. Black symbolises the yawning depths of hell, the demons and powers of darkness which prey on the happiness of mankind. The demoniacal Rāvana, the monster Kāliyā whom Sri Krishṇa crushes under foot, and the cheat Śakuni, uncle of the Kauravas, are always painted black.

Our classical pictures illustrate these principles. The casual visitor to Ajanta is struck with the contrast in colours in cave 17, for instance. In the royal procession there, royal figures are always coloured red, and the pages and menials are dark or black. The heavenly nymphs and danseuses, the *apsarasas*, are painted ruddy, which has evoked surprise in some connoisseurs of art, who have expected here the charming green. But the green colour represents the vegetable creation of the earth, and the *apsarasas* are aerial beings having no contact with the earth. So also in the beautiful paintings at Sittaṇṇāvāsal in the Indian state of Pudukkottah. The white figure in the "Lotus Tank" there has yellow ear-rings on the large lobes, and lines of yellow armlet and wristlet encircle the arm. This is the goddess Gangā descending into waters that quicken this parched-up world, as shown by the floating figure of a crocodile sporting in the wavy curls on the forehead.

III

The significance of colour is at the basis of Astrosophy. It is believed that every colour has its peculiar influence on the physiological system. The Moon reflects the light of all the luminaries in the heavens, and it shapes the brain-mind and gives personality its versatility. The dark red fire of the Sun stimulates will-power. Mars is red, and incites to activity. Lack of stamina results if he be in the heavens at an angle where his light is lost for the individual. Jupiter is yellow or golden, and his light has a cheering effect on the nerves; while Saturn is blue-black and depresses alike the physique and the brain. The

beautiful blue of Venus turns one to thoughts of love, and the vegetable lustre of Mercury argues sympathy, flow of eloquence, and popularity. The influences of the Sun and the Moon are studied at particular points in the heavens, and in particular angles of vision with reference to the "moon" in the individual *i. e.*, his mental endowment at the moment of his birth. The mind is its own place, and makes for greatness or baseness, a heaven of earth or earth of heaven; hence this system of calculation expounded at length in the *Brihad Samhitā*.

The light of each constellation is considered to have its effect on the human frame, measured along similar lines. Bharani (Arietis) and Ardra (Orionis) pour forth a liquid fire and burn to death. Krittikas (Pleiades) and Magha (Regulus) give a golden excitement. The yellow light of Rohini (Aldebaran) is pleasing to the eye, and promotes social intercourse. Āślesha (Hydrae) and Jyeshtha (Antares) emit a feeble light which only makes darkness visible. The grey light from Mūla (Scorpionis) excites the sexual passion and that of Pūrvāshādha (Sagittari) invites to dalliance. Uttarā Phalgunī (Leonis) and Svāti (Boötes) promote domestic life, and Śravaṇa (Aquilae), and Dhanishṭha (Delphini) conduce to spiritual learning and progress. The beliefs in regard to this matter are worked into a system of medical relief of fevers, in the *Madanaratna*.

The lesser lights have a similar influence. The clusters in the bespangled heavens are arranged in 12 groups of 30° each, marked by the signs of the Zodiac. The first is deep-red and is followed in due order by white, green, reddish, grey, variegated, dark, golden, orange, spotted, brown and crystal. It is believed that the light falling from each group of the stars has its influence according to its colour, as well as the form of the constellation. Greek astronomers went a step further, and divided each sign of the Zodiac into three Decanates with distinctive forms and colours. The first sign Aries, for instance, was dominated respectively by a dark hunter, a ruddy active lady, and a reddish-hued man versed in the fine arts. Virgo looked like a dark accountant between two ladies, one entirely a worlding and the other jasmine-pure in her devotion to the gods. Pisces showed a Flora of sweet seventeen, sailing between one man ruling the waves and another wandering in the wilderness. All these are mentioned by Varāha Mihira.

But the greatest of our luminaries is the Sun. His seasonal hues in the heavens were the subject-matter of incessant observation and careful study. In Winter he was copper-coloured or reddish; parrot-hued or reddish-yellow in the Spring; yellowish-white in Summer, and glossy, white or pearlish in the rainy weather; lotus-hued in Autumn, and blood-red in the dewy season. His rays got soiled by contact with the salt and dust of the earth and the gases of its circum-

ambient atmosphere. When they got dull and grey, they failed to quicken the mental faculties; dark-red, they stirred up passion and military strife; pale and yellow rays indicated that the earth's minerals were scanty and that little trade was possible. Dark and dull rays indicated the poisonous fumes that hovered about the earth; the glossy hue indicated the influence of water vapour, and abundance and prosperity. The moon's light was ashy grey on the surface of dreary soil, and turned red on the russet rock. It seemed to flutter when the earth was quaking with internecine strife.

The most significant points of time in the day were sunrise and sunset. The Aryan bards observed them intently and prayed for the proper light. The first ray of the dawn, which with rosy fingers opens the gates of day, never escaped their attention. It develops a faint ruddyish glow. Then it becomes many-hued, yellow-grey or yellowish-green, and the sky looks spotted. When the colour is deep and sustained, whether a red or a dark-red, it means the dust of the earth is pervading the atmosphere and creating the germs of disease. The dust of the earth contains all ingredients. Those that are red incite to valour, the orange maintain health and stamina, the green sustain the vegetable creation, and the smoky the animal world. The yellowish keep the heat down and help to compose quarrels. A tinge of red is required to move the winds. The white conduce to peace and harmony, the red to valour. The colour of the dust as indicated by the apparent colour of the Sun's rays at sunrise and sunset was the mystic index to the moods of creatures and to the momentous changes impending in this world. Harmony and peace were induced by simultaneous prayer at this time of all, each individual setting his own thoughts on the best and the highest ends in life.

IV

Colour has played a prominent part in the daily life of the Indian people. The choice of a woman's *sari* depends not merely on the colour of her skin or that which happens to catch her fancy, but on the colour which is generally regarded as auspicious. The orange and the lotus-red are the most favoured, and are always insisted on at rites and ceremonies. They are the colours of the ripening fruit and the mellow corn in the field, and are believed to make one's life happy and prosperous. Life is most happy, indeed, when one's energies and efforts run in harmony with Nature's ways and laws. Orange robes are worn by ascetics, men who are free from the deadening love of self-interest, and who devote their lives to social service. Green comes next, but was never regarded as a fast colour, and was seldom patronised. Blue is considered the colour of the coquette, and shaded the elaborate drapery of

the danseuse or the hetaira (*abhisārikā*). The lowest strata of society are always described in Sanskrit literature as wearing clothes dyed in indigo, and there is a suggestion that it served as a cloak for dirty habits. White is pre-eminently the colour of spotless purity. It was worn by active men and by those women whose lives were dedicated to domestic or to social service.

The mark on the forehead, worn by men and women, is invested with a similar significance. The red denotes domestic and conjugal felicity; the black marks the levity of youth and gaiety of adolescence. The yellow is the mark of mature happiness, a life steeped in sandal-paste and perfume. The white spot and the ashy lines are said to illumine the dark corners and blind alleys, of which the spirit of man is so full. It is the colour of the sublimation of all grades of varying hues to the enduring radiance of the Infinite.

S. V. VENKATESWARA

OCCULTISM AND MYSTICISM

The situation which the European mystic does not realise is this :—The Eastern occult philosophy is the great block of solid truth from which the quaint, exoteric mysticism of the outer world has been casually thrown off from time to time, in veiled and symbolical shapes. These hints and suggestions of mystic philosophy may be likened to the grains of gold in rivers, which early explorers used to think betokened somewhere in the mountains from which the rivers sprang, vast beds of the precious metal. The occult philosophy with which some people in India are privileged to be in contact, may be likened to the parent deposits. Students will be altogether on a wrong track as long as they check the statements of Eastern philosophy by reference to the teachings and conceptions of any other systems. In saying this we are not imitating the various religionists who claim that salvation can only be had within the pale of their own small church. We are not saying that Eastern philosophy is right and everybody else is wrong, but that Eastern philosophy is the main stream of knowledge concerning things spiritual and eternal, which has come down in an unbroken flood through all the life of the world. That is the demonstrable position which we, occultists of the Theosophical Society, have firmly taken up, and all archæological and literary research in matters connected with the earliest religions and philosophies of historical ages helps to fortify it. The causal growths of mystic knowledge in this or that country and period, may or may not be *faithful* reflections of the actual, central doctrines ; but, whenever they seem to bear some resemblance to these, it may be safely conjectured that at least they are reflections, which owe what merit they possess to the original light from which they derive their own.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Theosophist*, December 1881.

SOCIOLOGICAL PURITANISM

[**William Seagle** abandoned law for literature; he is the joint author of *To the Pure* which deals with the problem of censorship; on the same subject he contributed a volume to the "To-day and To-morrow" series, *Cato*. He is the assistant editor of *The Encyclopædia of the Social Sciences*. In this article he criticises the method of outer control of masses of men by a few sociological experts. Indirectly he shows the weak plank in the social service platform and the collapse which follows. Sociological experts have not yet come to recognize that the right philosophy of conduct must teach what is good to practise and not merely point out the evils to be fought. The social servant labours for the masses and often neglects the individual; he fights ugliness and poverty without, and greatly neglects the divinity and the wealth hidden in human consciousness.—EDS.]

In the popular mind Puritanism is a bluenose dogma which flourished in its pristine glory in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and since then has at various times manifested itself in outbreaks of moral squeamishness of greater or lesser intensity directed towards such crucial objectives as the denunciation of some daring feminine fashion in conduct or dress, or the suppression of some salacious book or play. The last great period of Puritanism is supposed to have been the Victorian age. The present era of "freedom" gratefully remembers the champions who finally slew the Puritan dragon. The feat is usually attributed to such heroes as Mr. Bernard Shaw in England, and Mr. H. L. Mencken on the other side of the waters.

The popular caricature of Puritanism is one that is very prominent in literary histories. The more intelligent social historians, however, have better understood the nature and origin of Puritanism. They do not see it as a subtly peculiar trait of the Anglo-Saxon mind but as a system of social virtue which was inevitably the reflex of a new economic orientation in the life of the English people. Puritanism flowered in England largely because the country was economically and politically far more advanced than its European neighbours. The English Puritan elevated the virtues of sobriety because it was a necessary condition of industry, and industry was indispensable if he was to get on in a new world. The economic transformation of England could be accomplished only by a sober folk, rejecting such idle and frivolous pleasures as gambling, drinking and dancing. Thus Puritanism simply marked the beginning of the English Commercial Revolution.

The economic interpretation of Puritanism has come to be generally accepted by social histo-

rians. While they acknowledge the absurdities of Puritanism, they dwell rather upon its fundamental nature as a serious view of life. So regarded they see it as a phenomenon that has appeared at the propitious time in many civilizations. Long before English Puritanism there was Hebrew and Roman Puritanism. But it has often been observed that historians are more obtuse when it comes to recognizing the tendencies of their own times. Even while Puritanism was retreating on one front before the bludgeoning of its late Victorian foes it was advancing steadily upon another front where it was meeting with no opposition. This front was paradoxically the domain of sociological theory!

Sociology, the new "science of society," had been ushered into the world by its two apostles, Comte and Spencer, almost simultaneously with the Darwinian enunciation of the theory of evolution. Indeed evolution became also the guiding principle of social development. The newly discovered social "laws" revealed that mankind was progressing steadily towards higher goals. In this perfectionism, in this faith in material progress there was really nothing more than a reaffirmation of the Puritan ethic in a world which under the ægis of science was making ready for the final conquest of nature, and the millenial ordering of human society. The basic tenet of the new sociology was still the Puritan individualism, which for the very reason that it enthroned *laissez faire* had to demand a stern self-restraint. By a curious yet inevitable process Puritan individualism led to a moral tyranny. It is significant to recall that an uncle of Herbert Spencer once remarked: "A Spencer never dances." There spoke again the lugubrious Puritan view of life.

But at least the early sociologist, like the early Puritan, left some room for voluntarism. He was willing to rely upon the obscure societal processes to bring humanity to its happy destiny. The modern sociologist, however, who has abandoned societal evolution is all activist. His ideal of social sciences is pragmatic and empirical. The science of society is to be literally such. It is to proceed by a process of trial and error. Humanity is to be one vast laboratory for testing the sociologist's schemes of social advance. Only the primitive is a slave to custom. The scientific man of the twentieth century must master his social, no less than his physical environment. The most powerful sect in modern sociology is the group that believes in the magic of "social control". Prominent among the early social controllers were the American sociologists, Ross, who indeed invented the term, and Cooley, who studied the process of the social conditioning of the individual. The advancing science of anthropology contributed the necessary technique of objectivity. The complicated and civi-

lized denizens of the great cosmopolitan cities were to be studied by the sociologist with the cold impassivity with which the anthropologist treated the primitives of the African, Australian and South American jungles. The sociologist, as a superior man, freed from family, class and material prejudices, was to probe into the nature and tendencies of human institutions and habits. This became the governing passion of a whole group of institutional economists, of such men as Wood and Hobhouse, Veblen and Mitchell.

It is interesting that the most of the sociologists who have talked so much of "social control" have been Americans and Englishmen from whose souls, it may readily be surmised, the Puritan ideology had never really been eradicated. For what is " social control " but a more scientific term than the hated word "censorship" which has always been associated with Puritanism ? It was all very well for the sociologists to insist upon the importance of conscious direction in the attainment of social weal. Yet somehow humanity went along in its old, blind, stupid way, a slave to custom, living and dying in its haphazard manner, classes and nations arrayed one against the other, fighting wars, and engaging in bitter economic strife. Under such circumstances the mood of the sociologist is easy to perceive. It is one of growing impatience. If the fools will not see, they must be made to see the light. It is idle to speak of individual liberty, of the consent of the governed when the very survival of civilization is at stake. The human robots must be schooled and managed and directed for their own good. Life is real, life is earnest.

In most parts of the world sociological Puritanism has had little opportunity of putting its philosophy into practice. The world, fortunately or unfortunately, is still ruled not by sociologists but politicians who still make it their business to pay some attention to the whims and desires of the multitude. *Yet if one imagines a world revolution engineered by the united sociologists of the world, it is easy to see that censorship under the guise of social control will flourish far more vigorously than in the heyday of Calvinism.* Censorship is inevitable in any drive towards perfectionism. Moreover this censorship is bound to be far more thorough and relentless than ever before. It was Bernard Shaw who once pointed out that the worst possible kind of censorship would be an intelligent censorship. The sociologist as censor would allow little or nothing to escape him. He would recognize deleterious tendencies almost as soon as they made themselves manifest. Even more than the Puritan he would attempt to control not only the freedom of thought but the freedom of action.

While sociological Puritanism still bides its time in Western

democracies, there may already be discerned many significant intimations of the future. What the Puritans called "vice" is a favourite subject of study in sociological seminars. Sociological research surprisingly often results in the scientific rationalization of old Puritan fears. A flourishing branch of sociology is modern sexology. To be sure the modern sexologist's programme aims at a sane and rational sex life, but while he does not talk of the suppression of base impulses, he does lecture on the dangers of excess and the ever present threat of the social diseases. He *preaches* sublimation: a new term for an old-fashioned form of advice.

Perhaps the best test of a man's freedom from Puritanism is his attitude towards leisure. The old Puritan had properly speaking no conception of leisure. It meant to him simply the necessity for rest and recuperation after labour. It was thus only a preparation for more labour. The Puritan believed firmly that "the devil finds work for idle hands to do". He must engage in a ceaseless activity lest he think evil thoughts and be led into evil ways. Curiously there are many modern sociologists who have much the same fears and anxieties. Of course they do not regard leisure as evil in itself. It is, indeed, the ultimate goal of Utopian society. Nevertheless, at least in the present period of transition, leisure is a "problem". It must be "constructively filled". As activist, the sociologist, too, distrusts the possession of spare time. For one thing it may lead to introspection, or to use a term that is sociologically taboo, "soul-searching". In the "underprivileged" it may lead to crime, and in children to juvenile delinquency. In the period of economic boom after the World War or when wages were increasing and working hours were growing shorter, the sociological concern over the problem of leisure became intense. There actually appeared a book which bore the title *The Threat of Leisure.* To cap the climax there was actually held at Geneva an international conference on the problem of leisure.

The immediate future of sociological Puritanism can be glimpsed best in Soviet Russia. Many travellers have reported the almost religious zeal and piety of Communist party workers. The life of the good Communist is not one of gaiety and frivolity but of almost fanatical devotion to a cause. He is far more abstemious than the sternest Puritan of old. Looseness in sexual relations is discouraged; to be drunk is an even worse sin; and gambling, of course, constitutes the most serious crime of all. It can hardly be otherwise if a new economic order is to be built in a few decades. The austerity demanded of party members is greater than is expected of the general population but it, too, is encouraged to adhere to the more sober virtues. It is impossible here to go into the characteristics of Soviet social life. It is

enough to say that not only labour but leisure is organized in Soviet Russia.

The sociologist in the rôle of Puritan is a little disconcerting. Here is no long-faced, narrow-minded and bigoted zealot but a child of the Enlightenment and the apostle of modern science. Yet fundamentally he is not free of intolerance. Nothing dies quite so hard as Puritanism.

WILLIAM SEAGLE

In sociology, as in all branches of true science, the law of universal causation holds good. But this causation necessarily implies, as its logical outcome, that human solidarity on which Theosophy so strongly insists. If the action of one reacts on the lives of all, and this is the true scientific idea, then it is only by all men becoming brothers and all women sisters, and by all practising in their daily lives true brotherhood and true sisterhood, that the real human solidarity, which lies at the root of the elevation of the race, can ever be attained. It is this action and interaction, this true brotherhood and sisterhood, in which each shall live for all and all for each, which is one of the fundamental Theosophical principles that every Theosophist should be bound, not only to teach, but to carry out in his or her individual life.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *The Key to Theosophy*, pp. 196-197

The secular philanthropist is really at heart a socialist, and nothing else; he hopes to make men happy and good by bettering their physical position. No serious student of human nature can believe in this theory for a moment. There is no doubt that it is a very agreeable one, because if it is accepted there is immediate, straightforward work to undertake. "The poor ye have always with you." The causation which produced human nature itself produced poverty, misery, pain, degradation, at the same time that it produced wealth, and comfort, and joy and glory. Life-long philanthropists, who have started on their work with a joyous youthful conviction that it is possible to "do good," have, though never relaxing the habit of charity, confessed to the present writer that, as a matter of fact, misery cannot be relieved. It is a vital element in human nature, and is as necessary to some lives as pleasure is to others . . . . . . The social question as it is called, the great deep waters of misery, the deadly apathy of those who have power and possessions—these things are hardly to be faced by a generous soul who has not reached to the great idea of evolution, and who has not guessed at the marvellous mystery of human development. The Theosophist is placed in a different position from any of these persons, because he has heard of the vast scope of life with which all mystic and occult writers and teachers deal, and he has been brought very near to the great mystery.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY, *Lucifer*, November, 1887

THE MYSTICAL AND THE OCCULT

[**Lawrence Hyde** wrote an article "From Authority to Inspiration" in our January 1932 issue; in commenting on it we referred to "the arbitrary distinction between Occultism and Mysticism" made by some. Mr. Hyde returns to that subject. We do not agree with his contentions, but all the more reason why his views should appear in our journal.

The difficulty really arises because his knowledge of the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, whose point he is trying to explain, is not sufficient; she does not recognize the kind of distinction which our esteemed contributor is trying to make. It is true that in so-called theosophical books "the path of the mystic" and "the path of the occultist" are mapped out; but for the most part the writers of such theses are theoretical occultists and theoretical mystics. In interpreting Mme. Blavatsky's position on the subject Mr. Hyde's premise is defective. In her *Secret Doctrine* and other writings Madame Blavatsky distinguishes between Occultism and Occult Arts but no hard and fast distinction is made between Occultism and Mysticism. "Real Occultism had been prevalent among the Mystics," she says in one place. (*S. D.*, I. xl.) Again in her *Glossary* (under Occult Sciences) she clubs together "mysticism, magic and Yoga".

Every true Occultist is a Mystic and *vice versa.* These terms are synonymous, at least in the writings of Madame Blavatsky. Mr. Hyde mentions "the way of Bhakti," but the real Path of Devotion is that of the Occultist also. Confusion exists in the matter of the three and more Paths of the *Gita,* as about the Paths of Occultism and Mysticism. In the same place in the *Glossary* H.P.B. speaks of yoga as the *seventh* Darshana or school of philosophy. This is Gupta Vidya or Guhya Vidya—the hidden knowledge, *i. e.*, knowledge of the Hidden Self, call it Occultism or Mysticism. Of course clear-cut explanations of this branch of knowledge are not available, and the dual reason is also explained there.—EDS.]

In a very suggestive essay on "Occultism versus the Occult Arts" Madame Blavatsky lays great emphasis on the fact that, properly understood, the term "Occultism" signifies something very much more spiritual and fundamental than mere concern with what might be described as super-physical science. It stands, she would maintain, for what is known in the East as *Atma-vidya,* the knowledge of the true self. "This last is the only kind of Occultism that any theosophist . . . . ought to strive after." "*True Occultism or Theosophy* is the 'Great Renunciation of SELF,' unconditionally and absolutely, in thought as in action." And by such Occultism, again, she appears to mean what is known as Raja-Yoga; the title given by the publishers to the volume in which her essay is included is *Raja-Yoga or Occultism**.

But it is evident enough that there are other paths to emancipation besides that to which, according to Madame Blavatsky, every theosophist is committed. Amongst them is that known in the East as the way of Bhakti,

* Theosophy Company (India), Ltd., 51 Esplanade Road, Bombay. The essays were originally published in different periodicals between 1883 and 1891.

and in the West as that of Mysticism. Although she has nothing to say about it in the volume under discussion, one may assume that she recognises its validity. And so, one presumes, do her followers to-day. But one cannot, all the same, escape the impression that its significance is misinterpreted and undervalued by the majority of those who are following the more intellectual road.

I

The definitions of Mysticism are as numerous as they are conflicting. But they do most of them seem to express a recognition of the fact that in the mystical we have to do with a region of being in which the discursive mind is definitely not at home. The mystic is occupied not with those differences and divisions which are created by the analytical intelligence, but with that unity in which they are transcended. The central element in his creed is the affirmation that the Real is one and undivided. The realm of plurality and separateness is the realm of illusion; that which comes into existence through looking at the Universe through the eyes of the finite self. The mystic perceives the One as underlying the forms of the natural world, while he realises it within as the result of an act of introverted attention. In either case—a point which often escapes notice—he gives expression to the consciousness to which he has attained by going forth in action.

Here an important consideration. Because the mystic does not employ pre-eminently the weapon of *intellectus agens* it is not to be concluded that he is relying instead upon "emotion". It needs but a slight analysis of the process of spiritual cognition to elicit the fact that such emotion as is experienced by the individual who is truly seeking the light is of the order of a secondary manifestation, the outcome of a certain kind of vision. The primary factor is an experience of Reality, an experience which *incidentally* may occasion powerful feelings. Even the most extreme type of mystic is before anything else a seeker after knowledge—though of a type of knowledge which cannot be expressed in ordinary rational terms.

It is to be admitted that the untrained mystic's experience of the spiritual is often both precarious and intermittent. And it is true also that in respect of certain departments of esoteric knowledge what is to begin with a vague apprehension, which might possibly be described as mystical, can give place to clear and rational understanding. But we cannot accept the notion that true mystical realization is eventually superseded by reason.

There is a realm of "facts" and there is a realm of "values". The first is susceptible of treatment by the rational understanding. The second is responded to by the "soul". The person who is

expert in dealing with the first is the man of science. The person who is expert in dealing with the second is the poet. In the sphere of the esoteric the scientist develops into the occultist, the poet into the mystic. The occultist attains to a profound understanding of the laws according to which phenomena appear, of the way in which they are interrelated, of the conditions which determine different types of manifestation. He is able to explain the occurrence of a given situation, and knows how to bring it into existence again at will. He therefore very easily becomes persuaded that he has a more secure grasp on Reality than has the thinker of the other type.

Actually, however, he is just as one-sided as the "mystic" whom he is impelled to criticize. For a grasp of the mechanism of existence is not by any means the same thing as a capacity to enter imaginatively into its depths. Let it be granted that the occultist is able to explain with great completeness *how* this or that manifestation is produced. But in the face of the mainfestation itself he tends to be unresponsive and unimaginative. The temper of his mind is inevitably rationalistic. He lacks the contemplative faculty, and only rarely attains to spiritual, as opposed to merely rational, understanding.

Theoretically, of course, discipline of the type practised by the occultist should produce a character in which the mental and the spiritual components are perfectly balanced and unified. Actually, however, practically everybody whom we meet in this field is still developed in a marked fashion in one of these directions rather than the other. Coleridge has said somewhere that every individual is born either an Aristotelian or a Platonist. In the same fashion every student of the esoteric is born with a definite bias towards either the intellectualistic or the contemplative path. He is either for the most part an occultist, with a strong feeling for discipline, science, clarity, rationality and order. Or he is for the most part a mystic, with a strong feeling for the inspirational, the spiritual, the interior and the ineffable.

The occultist is more at home with the anatomy of experience than with its content. We find therefore that the literature of the movement is definitely more scientific than poetic. What we commonly meet with in the writings of the theosophical school is a combination of intellectual competency and emotional immaturity. There may be a great deal of force and a satisfying clarity and logicality. But there is rarely any real penetration to the spiritual. That gentle sweetness, graciousness and purity which we associate with the truly mystical is but rarely manifested. The knowledge of thinkers of this type is rational knowledge, not "soul knowledge". Hence there is very little efflorescence of beauty or mystical elevation. They excel in laying before us the sci-

entific and philosophical aspects of the religious problem. But they are markedly incapable of dealing with that which finally remains when, as Wittengenstein has said, "all scientific questions have been answered". For the capacity to respond to and interpret that revelation of reality which is afforded by pure, unanalysable experience is the fruit of nothing else but mystical unfoldment. The soul identifies itself imaginatively with that which is before it. And that which it apprehends can only be expressed by poetic statement.

Of such statement the great majority of theosophical writers are incapable—for the plain reason that the type of training to which they have submitted has given their minds a definitely intellectualistic bias. Their works instruct, clarify and organize, but rarely in any deep sense inspire. Any attempts they make to draw more sweet and delicate notes from their instruments usually leave one completely unmoved. The last thing one would say about that powerful and attractive personality, Annie Besant, for instance, is that she was an *artist*; her expeditions into the realm of the rhetorical were invariably disastrous. And true poetic feeling is equally beyond such writers as Mrs. Bailey, Dion Fortune, C. W. Leadbeater, or Rudolf Steiner.

In fine the followers of the occult path are just as limited and one-sided in their outlook as thinkers of any other school. The notion that they are offering us something which includes and transcends the knowledge of the true mystic is one which simply cannot be accepted.

Madame Blavatsky was, it is true, possessed of a notable imaginative power. But one cannot with justice say that in her writing she ever struck the more interior mystical note.

III

Perhaps the most important difference between the attitude of the mystical and the occult thinker is that which finds expression in respect to the problem of regeneration. The occultist is an intellectualist. With intellectualism is naturally associated the conscious use of the will. One defines the objective; the other realises it. As a consequence we find in all occult schools a tremendous emphasis on discipline. By using his will the individual must tame and subdue the lower nature until he is freed from bondage to the passions. Madame Blavatsky's book is full of the most uncompromising statements with regard to the "obedience" which is demanded of the aspirant to true adeptship, the high degree of self-control which is called for if the path is to be trodden in safety, the attitude of unflinching determination which is requisite if success is to be achieved. And she refers with approval to that widely read theosophical manual *Light on the Path*, in which the philosophy of the "kill-out" school is set

forth with great clarity and force.

In many respects this philosophy, for all the authority which it has behind it, invites criticism. Leaving aside the obvious point that the person who sets about character building in this self-conscious fashion may easily become an unsympathetic egoist, there is the fact to be reckoned with that the whole weight of the teachings of modern psychology are flatly against this mode of dealing with the baser inclinations. The technique which is advocated to-day by every experienced psychologist is that of suggestion—precisely the opposite of that on which the occult school lays stress. One does not press the point. But one would like to see it followed up.

The attitude of the mystic towards the problem is very much more consonant with the findings of modern science. For he emphasizes, not the "killing-out" of undesirable tendencies, but their "sublimation". By aspiration and devotion he raises himself to a plane on which temptation can no longer assail him. He transcends evil instead of fighting it. It is the old story of the "expulsive power of a new affection". And incidentally it makes for the development of a very much sweeter and more lovable type of character than is produced by ruthless self-assertion.

There will always be a resolute minority, possessed of strong wills and keen intelligences, who will be drawn to the intensive and strenuous path of the occult. But it is that of mystical unfoldment which is at once the most natural and the most safe for the great mass of humanity. The occultist is simply a type among others, excelling in certain attributes, palpably deficient in others. There may be a true Raja-Yoga, in which the mystical and the intellectual are perfectly reconciled. But one cannot fail to perceive that the discipline which is advocated by such thinkers as Madame Blavatsky involves a marked bias towards the second. There is no reason to deplore this fact; there must necessarily be many different roads to the Truth. The only important thing is that we should recognize the theosophical variety of esotericism for what it is.

LAWRENCE HYDE

This philosophy . . . regards Nature as one complete whole, and so the student of occultism may stand at either point of observation. He may from the standpoint of Nature's wholeness and completeness follow the process of segregation and differentiation to the minutest atom conditioned in space and time; or, from the phenomenal display of the atom, he may reach forward and upward till the atom becomes an integral part of cosmos, involved in the universal harmony of creation.

—W. Q. JUDGE, *U. L. T. Pamphlet* No. 3, p. 9

LIBERATION AND LIBERATED SOULS

A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN THE UPANISHADS AND SPINOZA

I

MOKSHA

[**Professor Mahendranth Sircar** of Calcutta Sanskrit College is the author of *System of Vedantic Thought and Culture* and *Mysticism in Bhagavat Gita.*—EDS.]

The greatest attraction of spiritual life lies in its promise. Spiritual life embraces and yet transcends moral and æsthetic life; it exhibits life in its fullness. Moral enthusiasm and æstheticism are of the fine fabric of our being, but spiritual experience has in it something which is unique, and which is its own. Holiness and æsthetic joyousness are invaluable possessions that should find a place in spiritual life, but to identify such life with them is to miss its significance. Spiritual life has in it something which is not probed by fine æsthetic feelings or dignified moral virility. Spiritual life presupposes all these since it is the fullest unfolding of life; and where it has its finest expressions, there the chords of life sound in finest harmony. It touches the very core of our being and therefore transcends all else. Its essence lies in numinous experience. It is neither intellectual, nor emotional. It includes them, but it transcends them.

The discovery of this "something" is the unique privilege of mysticism. This "something" is so near and intimate to us that it escapes our observation. The wealth of life hides its essence; and the intellectual, the moral and the æsthetic aspects of life become sometimes so dominant and overpowering that unless the seeker can resist them, the visit from the Living Soul does not take place.

Moksa, or release, has been the catchword of Indian mysticism to indicate the promise of the mystical life. Generally a certain amount of indifference to life and its achievements is associated with Moksa; and Indian systems, especially the one accepting the avowed ideal of Moksa, have been accused of denying life, its struggles, its defeats, its successes. In short they are accused of insisting upon fleeing from life and evading its responsibilities.

This torturing of life is no part of the teaching of the Upanishads. And rightly understood it has not been the ideal among the Upanishadic seers. The ideal of detachment and a forsaking of the claims of life have been used, not to deny and avoid life, but to invite a better and a fuller life. The delicate touch of spirit is felt in

the fine repose of being and not in the madding crowd. And the seeking of silence is uniform among the mystics, for the psychic being must recover itself from the claims of life before it can feel the rapturous music of life and the calm dignity of the soul.

The mystic is a solitary being, because solitariness gives him the most and the best of life. The mystic is anxious to enjoy the finest urge in life. He passes by, therefore, ordinary claims and duties. He moves in an atmosphere of complete freedom and serene silence. This is his divine privilege. He is brave enough to forego partial delights in order to enjoy the fullness of life.

The fullness of life suddenly dawns upon receptive souls. It can alone come to him who has the proper attitude; and this attitude is nothing but a silent watch of the soul. Constant watchfulness helps the soul to be receptive to the finest expression of life. This watchful silence unties the knots of our psychic being, and makes it responsive to the soul. It also makes it responsive to the currents of Life, revealing its divine orientation. The seeker is reborn. This is the great claim of mysticism.

Few indeed are the souls who can prove fine enough to be fit recipients of the direct currents from the spring of life. Fewer still are those who give themselves up completely to such a life of reception, transformation, transfiguration and continuous living in the divine. Mystical experience is the *amor intellectualis Dei.* It is vividly joyous, finely intellectual and fully divine. In it the soul is touched from within by the silent hand of spirit.

But even now the meaning of Moksa has not become clear. It may be claimed—and it has been claimed by some—that such contemplation of and impress from the divine life upon us do not only give us the positive enjoyment of the aroma of divine life, but induce us to forsake the wonted course of life which seeks joy in flesh and blood. This forsaking is natural, for the real touch of Spirit redeems the soul from flesh and blood. The adept is transferred from death to life. Even if he carries a tabernacle of flesh he does not feel its weight. The flesh can no longer torment the spirit.

But even such a life has its play (*lila*) and that divine play has also its stings. Spiritual drama cannot be free from the stings of life, otherwise it cannot be played. Even divine love has its stings; and the saintly lives bear witness to it. The plan of life in manifestation is based on contraries, and the spiritual life is not free from them. The spirit in essential being must be something different. It must transcend all contradictions. It enjoys its undivided nature—its impartiteness. The Upanishads hold out this promise as the summation of spiritual life. What is it?—The ideal of Moksa. That state is

not a paradise regained, for the soul realises that it was never lost.

When knowledge breaks all the spells of life, the ever-shining reality of Self becomes evident to us. The great asset that wisdom gives is the Love of Self or Truth and not the love of shadows of Self or expressions of life. To this, love at its highest, wisdom which even the gods envy and mortals fear, is at once vouchsafed. "The wise becomes free from forms and names and attains the effulgent, the supreme being—the being of beings." The *Mundaka* has it: "Behind the veil exists the ineffable Brahman without parts. It is transparently shining. It is the light of lights, the self-knower only knows it."

But Moksa should not pass for a state in which the whole existence is reflected and stands revealed. Such a state is, indeed, a blessed existence which allows the finest realisation of our being and the finest cosmic intuition. It is an ideal development of the human mind, which is then free from contraries and conflicts. It has vivid feeling and knowledge of the totality, and peace and tranquillity of the soul. Such a consummation approaches Spinoza's ideal of the free man. The free man realises his place in the scheme of things, and his whole being is interpenetrated with the love of God which arises from the clear knowledge of himself and all things. Spinoza's *scientia intuitiva* is a kind of cosmic intuition which presents the vision of God and His immanence. The Love of God fills his being, which rises to the highest point of seeing God in all things and all things in God. Spinoza's intuition has in it an exquisite feeling, the feeling and the blessedness that follow the removal of the limitation in knowledge and being. But the Upanishads soar beyond an immanent vision of the divine.

The Upanishads are not satisfied with Pantheistic exaltation which still keeps us confined to God, nature and man. The barrier is for the moment overshadowed. The immanent God becomes prominent before our vision. This vision is cosmic, but not acosmic. The Upanishads emphasise the acosmic intuition, and where Spinoza has laid emphasis upon it no difference exists between his acosmic intuition and the transcendent intuition of the Seers.

Spirituality is high knowledge and not only fine feeling. In the last stage it dispenses with all relativities of ethics, knowledge and experience. It gives us the blessed freedom in the transcendent. Knowledge is here intuitive, delight supernal, and life free from sub-conscient, conscient and superconscient ways. It is not the freedom associated with the silence of our being. This silence is the accomplished fact. It is not the silence of the urges. It is not even the silence of sleep. The former is artificial, the latter is natural. But this freedom is neither artificial nor natural. It is the silence permanently residing

in the Heart of Being.

The human soul can feel itself identified with this silence when it is freed from the psychic urges with possibilities to fascinate. Life is best enjoyed when there is a fall in the psychic dynamism, for it allows us to see and feel the dignity of silence. The constant agitation in our psychic being shuts out the Truth from us, and the greatest sacrifice is called for to realise the highest Truth. And this sacrifice is the sacrifice of life—for who can ever dream of the conquest of Truth with the claims of the little ego prominent before him. The finest realisations of mystical exaltation are still a play upon the fine psyche, but Truth transcends all psychic possibilities and delights. The supreme sacrifice gives the supreme Peace. Happily Truth is more forceful than error, and if once the supreme Truth has been realised in the heart of being, it never leaves us. "The conquest of truth is slow and laborious, but once the victory can be gained, it can never be wrested back again." (Schopenhauer)

Moksa is the state of Being which is beyond all real or ideal creative projections, and represents Being in its independence of the creative relativity. The human mind is so much engrossed with actualities of life that it cannot habitually rise to this height and go beyond the delights of creativeness to welcome the delight supernal of Silence. Moksa is the release from the sense of relativity in all its forms, ethical, spiritual or creative. It is, therefore, indicated by the negative term of release from bondage, but it is the presentation of the Absolute in its uniqueness, in its independence of all kinds of relativity.

MAHENDRANATH SIRCAR

II

THE IDEAL MAN

[**M. S. Modak, M. A., Ph. D. (London)** is in the Educational Service in India and is the President of " The Plato Club " in Nagpur.—EDS.]

The ideal Upanishadic sage is one who represents in himself the "acme of moral perfection," connected with a realisation of the Absolute. He believes in the possibility of greater or less mystical realisation for every being, according to the worth of his character, belief and endeavour. We cannot do better than translate several relevant passages from the various Upanishads so that a composite view of an ideal Upanishadic sage might be presented.

> For a man to whom all things have become the Ātman or the Self, what grief, what infatuation can there possibly be when he has seen the unity of all things? (*Isopanishad*, 7).
>
> He reaches the end of sorrow, tearing asunder the "ether-like skin" of desire

that had enveloped him till now in darkness and despair. (*Svetasvatara Upanishad* VI, 20.)

All his desires are at an end, because he has attained to the fulfilment of the highest desire, *viz.*, the realisation of the Atman, the Self. (*Mundaka Upanishad*, II, 9.)

As drops of water may not adhere to the leaf of a lotus even so may sin never contaminate him. (*Chandogya Upanishad*, IV, 14,3.)

There is no feeling of repentance for him ; for he never is in need of justification for his actions. He never bethinks himself as to why it was that he did not do good actions, or why he did only evil ones. (*Taittiriya Upanishad*, II, 9.)

Having come to learn the nature of Reality, he has thus gone beyond the reach of these duals [good and bad etc.]. (*Taittiriya Upanishad*, II, 9.)

If ever anybody intends injury or persecution to him such an intention will be shattered ; for the sage is an unpenetrable rock and anything dashing against this rock will shatter itself to pieces. (*Chandogya Upanishad* I, 2,8.)

He attains to eternal tranquillity or peace, for he has "collected the Godhead". (A literal translation of *Svetasvatara*, IV, 11.]

All his senses along with the mind and the intellect become steady owing to his contemplation of the Absolute and this is the process which goes by the name of Yoga. (*Katha Upanishad*, II, 6, 10, 11.)

His alone is the eternal happiness since he has realised the Atman—Self ; none else can get it. (*Svetasvatara Upanishad* IV, 12.)

A pen-picture of the ideal sage of the *Bhagwad-Gita*, is to be found in the second discourse ; Arjuna is anxious to learn from Krishna as to what constitutes an ideal man. The answer of Krishna may be compared with the above quotations.

According to Spinoza the first essential for an ideal man is that his ideas must be adequate. That is to say, all his desires and actions—practically all his life—are based on his adequate ideas. His is a rational and an intelligent life. In an ideal life man transcends good and evil. Good and bad have no meaning for him. Spinoza says in his *Ethics* :—

Whatever the mind conceives under the guidance of reason, it conceives under the same form of eternity or necessity and it is affected by it with the same certitude.

This amounts to saying that the good of an ideal man is *an absolute good*—"a good which cannot be diminished by distance or lapse of time and which is the same for all minds." (p. 273, Caird's *Spinoza*). Good and bad in their ordinary relative connotation are inapplicable to him. Being perfectly rational, he is essentially and fully active and free. He has an unbroken consciousness of his own energy and as such he must be a stranger to pain. He has an adequate knowledge of all the passions of the mind and is hence free from their influence. He is entirely led by reason, which ensues in a perfect "equanimity of mind". Desire and aversion, hope and fear, pride and humility, timidity and daring, exultation and remorse, fail to influence him even to the slightest degree. He is a free man since he acts with full knowledge of the importance of things. He aims and acts with a view to making others lead a rational life. A perfectly wise man would

fully understand the passions and therefore be absolutely free. He "would hate no man, envy no man, be angry with no man," and for the same reason "would love and pity no man". In proposition 73 of the fourth part of *Ethics* we are told :—

> The man led by reason is freer when he lives as member of a community under compact and bond of law, than when he lives in solitude, when he obeys himself alone.

An active social life is therefore preferred by the rational man to a life of solitude and renunciation. Spinoza writes :—

> We are liable to be affected and influenced by external causes in a great variety of ways and that like the sea agitated by opposing winds and currents we are tossed about unconscious of our destiny and the issues of events Under such circumstances the rational man stands firm. Because he is rational, he is most useful to his fellowmen. (Prop. 37, Part IV, *Ethics*.)

His life is religion itself, for he only desires and acts in so far as he has an idea of Deity in his mind. He has abundance of piety, which is the desire of doing well, and this is engendered by a life in accordance with reason. He is the friend of all. He repays hatred, anger, contempt, with love and good will. Commiseration or pity which is in itself evil is useless to him, since reason and pity cannot go together. Ordinary men entertain the feeling of pity to the extent to which they lack reason, but the man who has neither reason nor pity is truly inhuman. Spinoza who has placed life in community, higher in the scale than the life of solitude, also advocates self-contemplation. Proposition 62, Part IV, says "Peace of mind" self-content or acquiescence may spring from reason ; and that that self-content alone is the highest that is possible.

> Inward peace or acquiescence is indeed the sum of all we can look for in life. This acquiescence or peace of mind is indeed a logical result of reason. There does not arise any occasion for a rational man to practise humility, and so also haughtiness is impossible in him. They are to be classed in the same category as pity and shame so far as rational life is concerned. A rational man never gives a thought to death, his wisdom is meditation of life, not of death. His virtue appears as distinctly in shunning as in encountering and overcoming danger. (Prop. 69.)

(I) The goal and consummation of morality in both the philosophies is something mystical. In the Upanishads it is self-realisation, which means the realisa- of the identity of the individual self with the universal Self. In Spinoza it is intellectual love of God—which is realisation of God by man in and through his essence, which as postulated at the very start by Spinoza, is the affirmation of God in Man. Man's "intellectual love" towards God is that with which God loves himself.

(II) Mental equipoise is insisted on, in both philosophies. In Spinoza, knowledge based on adequate ideas is made possible by means of knowledge of the passions. When the passions are known adequately man attains equipoise of the mind. In the Upanishads, passions are to be

controlled by means of "Yoga" or by means of knowledge, or by disinterested action. Self-contemplation is the method advocated in both the cases.

(III) The completely free and rational man of Spinoza and the ideal sage of the Upanishads are both alike beyond good and evil and all other relative terms.

(IV) To master and harmonise the passions by means of an adequately rational view of things which alone gives a perfectly balanced understanding, has been taught by both Spinoza and the Upanishadic thinkers.

(V) Eternity is made the standard of valuation in both.

(VI) Spinoza's completely rational man "endeavours himself to walk, and strives to lead others to walk, under the guidance of reason". The *Bhagwad-Gita* has also explicitly laid down that the ideal man even though he be a free man *i. e.*, a liberated soul, has to live and act in the world so that the masses would follow him. He is to be the guide of the masses. Active life therefore is preferred both by Spinoza and the *Bhagwad-Gita*.

There are several striking minor resemblances. The free and rational man has no need of the feeling of remorse or repentance. In identical terms the same is said of the ideal Upanishadic Sage.

SELF-REALISATION

Writers on the Upanishadic ethics have often misread the celebrated passage in the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* (II, 42-5):

> It is not for the sake of the husband that the husband is dear, but for the sake of the self . . . it is not for the sake of the wealth that wealth is dear, but for the sake of the self ; it is not for the sake of everything that everything is dear, but for the sake of the self. This self [the Sanskrit word is Ātman] ought to be seen, ought to be heard, ought to be thought about, ought to be meditated upon, for it is only when the (Ātman) self is seen and heard and thought about and meditated upon, does all this become verily known.

This passage must not be interpreted in the interest of an egoistic theory of morals. The meaning is not that the wife or the husband or the sons are loved for one's own sake. The Ātman or Self must be translated as *Self proper* or the ultimate reality, since it is in this sense that the word is used at the end of this passage —*Ātma va arè drashtavyo, i. e.*, the self ought to be seen etc. This forbids any egoistic interpretation of the word in the previous sentences. We have therefore to understand this passage to mean that the love that one bears to the wife or the husband or the sons is only an aspect of, or a reflection of, the love that one bears to the Self. It is in fact for the sake of this Self that all these things are endeared to us. This Self, the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* enjoins upon us to realise by means of contemplation. Self-realisation therefore is one of the theories of the moral ideal in the Upanishadic ethics. When it is said that the Self is to be realised, we are asked to take into account the whole ethical and mystical process by which

the allurements of the non-self, naturally ingrained in the human being, are to be gradually weaned away, and the Self to be made to stand in its native purity and grandeur. By self-realisation, is meant the unfoldment and the visualisation of the *Ātman—Self* —within us (*vide*, p. 302, Ranade's *Constructive Survey of the Upanishadic Philosophy*). Since everything is dear to us not for our own sake, but for the Universal Self in us, then all our feelings of love and other pleasant emotions really emanate from this deep-laid source. And the Upanishads ask us to realise this fact by means of contemplation. A passage in the *Chandogya Upanishad* (VII, 22–25) concerns itself with an inquiry as to what it is that induces a man to perform actions. We are given the answer that it is the consideration of happiness which impels him to act. It is argued that had he encountered unhappiness in his pursuits he would not have gone in for the actions at all. He would have turned away from actions in that case. A desire for happiness therefore is at the root of human action. Happiness is the spring of human action. But the human being is easily misled. Man mistakes false happiness for true, the perishable for the everlasting or, to speak in the words of the *Chandogya Upanishad*, he mistakes the "small" for the "great". It goes on to tell us that the real happiness is that which one enjoys in the vision of the Infinite, and that every other kind of happiness is only so-called and of really no value as contrasted with it. These are two radically different kinds of happiness. A translation of the major part of this passage from the *Chandogya Upanishad* will make the idea more clear:—

People say that cows, elephants, horses, gold, servants, wives, lands and houses—these constitute greatness. But no, these rest in something else but *the Infinite rests in itself.* Great happiness is experienced when the *Infinite* is seen above and below, before and behind, to the right and left and is regarded as identical with everything that exists, when the Being that calls itself the I within us, is realised above and below, before and behind, to the right and to the left and is regarded as identical with everything that exists, when the Ātman is seen above and below, before and behind, to the right and to the left, and is regarded as identical with everything that exists.

It is clear that the Infinite, the I and the Atman are to be realised as identical, when alone this great happiness could ensue.

In Spinoza too we find considerable emphasis laid on self-affirmation, and critics are not wanting who dub this theory as an egoistic one. But here, too, the same mistake is made. The self-maintaining impulse which is the ground for virtuous conduct is not interpreted in the proper sense. For Spinoza expressly asserts that the affirmation of self which constitutes this impulse is the affirmation of God in us. (p. 235. Caird's *Spinoza*). Proposition 45 in Part II of the *Ethics* has a scholium that says "the force by which each individual perseveres

in existence follows from the eternal necessity of the nature of God". In demonstrating the fourth proposition in Part IV of the *Ethics*, Spinoza writes: "The power whereby each individual thing, and therefore man, preserves his being is the power of God or nature. Thus the power of man, in so far as it is explained through his own actual essence, is part of the infinite power of God—that is part of His essence." The affirmative element which in the self-maintaining impulse is ascribed to the nature of man is according to Spinoza a thing in and through which God realises Himself. To quote Caird:—

> The self of selfishness is not maintained but destroyed by the self-affirmation of reason. In other words, impure element vanishes from self-seeking when the self we seek is that whose essence is reason and the knowledge and love of God. That reason, or a purely rational nature should love others for its own sake rather than for theirs, means that we cannot truly love another if we do not "love honour more".

So the impulse to persevere in one's being is not the selfish affirmation, but the negation of the individual (selfish) self as such. Now according to the 9th proposition of Part III of the *Ethics* "the human mind consists of adequate and inadequate ideas". The power to think, therefore, is the essence of man. Even in its lower stage, that is, when inadequate ideas have the upper hand, the true essence of mind manifests itself "in the pain of repression," by this alien element. In the stage of reason, the mind is purely self-active. The good or happiness of the mind at this stage is an objective good common to all. And finally, in the stage of "intuitive knowledge," the mind views all things "in the light of that which is Universal and Absolute". The good or happiness at this stage of the mind is absolute. Therefore, "he who loves God cannot seek that God should love him in return." "Thus at last the Ego, disclosed at first in darkness and fear and ignorance in the growing babe, finds its true identity. For a long period it is baffled in trying to understand what it is. It goes through a vast experience. It is tormented by the sense of separation and alienation—alienation from other people and persecution by all the great powers and forces of the universe; and it is pursued by a sense of its own doom. Its doom truly is irrevocable. The hour of fulfilment approaches, the evil lifts, and the soul beholds at last *its own true being* (Edward Carpenter, *Teachings of the Upanishads*, p. 26).

The important point to be noticed here is that the theory of self-realisation taught by the Upanishads and the theory of self-affirmation in Spinoza lead to a remarkably similar ethics. Self-realisation is not selfishness.

M. S. MODAK

TIME AND TIMELESSNESS

[**Arthur E. Lloyd Maunsell, B. A., LL. B.,** is the author of *Between Two Worlds* and *Moods and Lyrics.* Those of our readers who are interested in this subject are referred to an article on "Time" in the series "Modern Science and *The Secret Doctrine*" by Dr. Ivor B. Hart published in this Journal last April.—EDS.]

What answer do we give if we ask ourselves "What is Time; and what are our relations to it?" We may say either that Time is a dominant factor of our existence —that it is money—that it is a definite ring of light in which, as it were, we exist, and depart from and are dead.

Or we can say "Time is nought."

Either view is, of course, only a partial expression of our reaction to our own nature and to the universe as a whole, and either view is false though it contains a truth, or rather part only of the truth.

If we take the first view, we are right in saying that Time is real in so far as it concerns our avocation and that part of us which lives physically and intellectually. Roughly Time *does* ring us round in those spheres of action and *qua* them is a *real* thing, though its value is of course dependent on our actions. It is what we put into a day's work which "is money," and not the mere passing of so many hours. It is the opportunity for value rather than a set value itself. But if we take the second view of time—that it is nought,— then we have also a partial truth. Emotionally—and by that we mean all which we apprehend more by other than a purely intellectual method—we transcend Time.

To say that a day does not exist as a day is as misleading as to say a day has no connection with the following day. Three hundred and sixty five we lump together knit as one year, and one hundred years we knit as one century and so on till all Time is knit to all eternity and merged in it. Time is that part of eternity which our senses—or some of them—observe and of which they are aware and serve. If the search-lights of a battle-ship illumine a minute part of the sea, that gleam does not in any way separate the waters though some we see and most are veiled by the darkness, and yet, since the bar of light *does* show some to our eyes and not others, since we must find a name to distinguish what we see and experience from what is hid, we have a right to divide what really is one.

If Time is only real because it is part of eternity, it is also real to us or to a different part of us to that other reality which eternity gives our spiritual self. If in one sense there is no Time, in another that focus of light concerns finite actions and controls them to a very considerable extent. Much of our life is held

within the ticking of the clock—we do not live here physically beyond a certain span—bodily we are only in one place at a given time—and so on. Yet if we measure life only by the clock, by an uncertain number of years, we disregard our relation with and our dependence on what is Timeless. If men were only finite and temporal, their diversity would be infinitely less varied. Roughly we should spiritually approximate much as we do physically—being more or less of a standard height and build—a matter of inches not yards, a matter of tint rather than structure. Our experience of days would be more even and uniform, our growth more steady and our decay assured. Yet all our experience of life shows us that no day of ours can be measured by our physical growth only, or even that of our intellectual. We know that emotionally we can develop more in one minute of time than in all our preceding years and we know that in such development Time is relegated to Eternity. We do not seek to weigh an act of heroism by the clock but by the intensity of self abrogation and, as we phrase it, "Such a man was carried out of himself, forgot himself." We instinctively feel that he has expanded—that neither Time nor fear of temporal things has weighed with him. He has, as it were, lived visibly for us on a plane which is not temporal but eternal, and yet if his heroism did not cost him his life he is alive in our sense of Time. Emotionally we live in eternity just as physically, and largely intellectually, we live in time and no man who has lived and known—as he must—love or hate, joy or fear can have felt no moment an hour, or no hour pass as a flash. And from this dual realization of influence of both Time and Eternity we grow—each part of us taking that nourishment most suited to its welfare, acting and reacting each on each, so that among others, one question suggests itself and its answer. It is this: What of those who by some accident or abnormality exist here in a condition which precludes their obtaining what "Time" gives and teaches us? The unconscious, the imbecile etc? Does the distortion of Time to them rob them of real life? We think the answer is contained in the vitality of the infinity of all life with its roots growing, not in Time but in Timelessness. Such a one is as a man whose arm is in a sling for a while but he is not dead. He is cut off from some occupations but not all. He is still master of eternity and slave of Time—perhaps even less a slave to it. If we had no emotional capacity should we be wise in being other than a miser of minutes—and what man is? Whatever part of us respects or fears Time it is not that of our spiritual self, for we stretch out eager hands and grasp it with a gesture that flings all Time from us.

ARTHUR E. LLOYD MAUNSELL

THE ASIATIC ELEMENT IN SWINBURNE

[**Ranjee G. Shahani, B.A., D. Litt. (Paris)**, is the author of *Towards the Stars*, and *Shakespeare Through Eastern Eyes*.—EDS.]

In literature, says Léon Shestov, we often act like the Fuegians, among whom it is a practice for the young and vigorous to replenish their larders from the mortal remains of their defunct elders. This is only too true, especially when we restrict our purview to artists of the Western world. In Asia this method of disposal is not in fashion: there, on the contrary, the tendency exists to appraise the artist in proportion to his antiquity, as though he were an egg matured for the Chinese palate. For example, Rabindranath Tagore is in no small danger of being transformed into a stone image even before he joins the choir of heaven. Thus, between dutiful cannibalism and apotheosis of the elders, the spirit of modern criticism fluctuates.

It is best to study the work of an artist objectively and impartially; to elucidate his spiritual adventure; and, whenever possible, to determine his reaction with the pulse of life.

Envisaged in this spirit, Swinburne appears far removed from the *trouvère* of an idle lay. Is it not incumbent on us to regard him as an intellectual force, perhaps one of the few English poets to whom the title metaphysical can properly be applied?

Coleridge undoubtedly was both scholar and thinker; but, unlike Swinburne, he was unable to infuse his poetry with thought. Wordsworth can scarcely be charged with speculative originality. Shelley is steeped in Platonism, but leads us nowhere, and merely cries and flies round us like a storm-tossed sea-bird. Keats shows a happy indifference to, almost a placid unconsciousness of, problems of deeper import. Did he not say ?—

> All charms fly
> At the touch of cold philosophy.

But had the youthful poet been spared a little longer by the gods, not crabbed would have seemed to him divine philosophy, but musical as is Apollo's lute. Browning is credited with almost a plethora of intellectual penetration, but is his poetry really more than a palestra of academic gymnastics ?

So that, as we look back, Swinburne stands out, from the philosophic point of view, as the only unchallenged English poet of the nineteenth century. Three or four of his pieces are amply sufficient to establish this. It is just these poems to which I would appeal, because they possess the ethos and aroma of Eastern thought.

The prevailing sentiment in the early work of Swinburne is Eastern rather than Greek. This

appears in the domination of life by fate. The first *Poems and Ballads* are coloured by this thought; but the resultant pessimism, natural in the circumstances, is more a form of rebellion than genuine despair. It is quite unlike Byron's—

Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen,
Count o'er thy days from anguish free;
And know, whatever thou hast been,
'Tis something better—not to be.

It is, as we see in "Atalanta in Calydon," an arraignment of the gods, much in the spirit of Fitzgerald's Omar.

As the years pass, this attitude of revolt gives place to one of submissive acceptance. The conception of a malignant fate is transformed—by a sort of spiritual *tour de force*—into the callous indifference of Nature, of which man himself is part. This new *credo* finds utterance in "Tristram of Lyonesse":—

How should the storms of heaven and kindled lights
And all the depths of things and topless heights
And air and earth and fire and water change
Their likeness, and the natural world grow strange,
And all the limits of their life undone
Lose count of time and conscience of the sun,
And that fall under which was fixed above
That man might have a larger hour for love?

But even here we are far removed from the kismet-theory of the East. So far, we have found only a distant kinship between Swinburne and Asia. A closer affiliation—almost an interpenetration of thought—is discovered in three remarkable poems: two possibly showing the influence of Hinduism, and one that of Persia.

With the "Hymn of Man" Swinburne passed from temperamental disquietude to metaphysical speculation. Superb as is this poem, it is, as he himself asserted, but a pendant to the "Hymn to Proserpine"—a poem which, for our present purpose, is much more important.

This poem may be called the *threnos* of a departed faith. In its attitude towards the gods it is at one with Hinduism. In India, be it remembered, the incessant flux and change of religious ideas inevitably suggests a similarity between things human and things divine. The gods appear as ephemeral as mortals—though a Supreme Being is postulated throughout. The "Hymn to Proserpine" embodies in music the attitude of the Asiatic votary who declines to abandon the old gods despite their overthrow; feels assured that the reign of the new creed will be as transitory as that of its predecessors; rejects the new divinity, and regards all appearance of Truth as a shadow on the surface of *Samsara*. Such is the inmost spirit of philosophic Hinduism. And it is this attitude that we find in Swinburne. Thus he sings in the "Hymn to Proserpine":—

O lips that live blood faints in, the leavings of racks and rods
O ghastly glories of saints, dead limbs of gibbeted Gods!
Though all men abase them before you in spirit, and all knees bend,
I kneel not neither adore you, but standing, look to the end.

But Swinburne's central ideas are all crystallised in "Hertha"—a truly philosophic poem—a poem that might well have come from a Hindu bard. Swinburne himself set great store by this effort and even went so far as to claim for it "a great deal of clarified

thought." It is, however, seldom recognised that the English poet—here at least—was drawing directly from Hindu sources. He has confessed it himself in his essay on Blake. And we have further evidence of his debt to Hinduism in the Rossetti Papers. "Swinburne," we are told, "is excessively enthusiastic about the Mahabharata which he has been looking at in a French translation under the auspices of Bendyshe."

Now, what is the subject-matter of "Hertha"? Nothing less than the relation of man to the universe. This is a topic that, in its metaphysical aspect, is too seldom handled by Western poets, but in Eastern poetry is omnipresent, and nowhere more pervasive than in the *Bhagvadgita*. It was from this spring that Swinburne drank, not, be it noted, from the pools of Schopenhauer or Emerson. The following verses invite comparison with innumerable parallels in the Hindu masterpiece:

> Though sore be my burden
> And more than ye know,
> And my growth have no guerdon
> But only to grow,
> Yet I fail not of growing for lightnings above me or death-worms below.
>
> These too have their part in me,
> As I too in these;
> Such fire is at heart in me,
> Such sap is this tree's
> Which hath in it all sounds and all secrets of infinite lands and seas..

The pantheism of our poet is nearer to the spirit of the *Bhagvadgita* than is that of either Schopenhauer or Emerson. Can anyone doubt the source of Swinburne's inspiration?

The central thought of the poem is entirely Hindu: surely nothing less than Vedantic. It consists in the belief, expressed in a hundred places in the literature of India, that the inward principle of creation resolves ultimately into man. In the words of Swinburne himself—

> Man, pulse of my centre, and fruit of my body, and seed of my soul.
>
> One birth of my bosom;
> One beam of mine eye;
> One topmost blossom
> That scales the sky;
> Man, equal and one with me, man that is made of me, man that is I.

So speaks Hertha—"the vital principle of matter". This is a dialect of thought that is entirely familiar to the Hindus: it is the famed *Tat tvam asi* (That art thou) in a new garb. "Man," says Sankara, "is one with the creative principle." This is precisely what modern thinkers have come to say. Neutral monism is the name they give to this creative unity.

With "Genesis" we enter upon a new adventure of thought and feeling. Although the poem undoubtedly owes something to the marvellous "Hymn of Creation" in the *Rigveda*, yet it is, in essence, unmistakably Manichæan. The influence of the Vedic hymn in the opening stanza is beyond dispute.

> In the outer world that was before this earth,
> That was before all shape or space was born,
> Before the blind first hour of time had birth,
> Before night knew the moonlight or the morn;
>
> Yea, before any world had any light,
> Or anything called God or man drew breath,
> Slowly the strong sides of the heaving night
> Moved, and brought forth the strength of life and death....

Are not Swinburne's words an echo of the words of Prajapati?

Here the Hindu influence ends. The rest of the poem draws from a different source—a source that no critic seems to have pointed out. Let me attempt to make this clear.

At first it would seem that there is an element of "Christian pessimism" in a portion of Swinburne's "Genesis"; but a closer scrutiny reveals that this portion is entirely Persian in its inspiration. There is nothing more characteristically Persian than the contrast between the two souls, of light and darkness, of which the germs exist in all. This was no doubt known to the Greeks, and Xenophon in his romance on the education of Cyrus—(Cyropaedia)—introduced it as a touch of "local colour". One of the early Greek philosophers, Parmenides, expresses a similar idea in his philosophy: "All is full at once of light and unapparent night, both equal." (This concerns the distribution of phenomena. In actual truth "Being is, and not-Being is not.")

The "pessimism" in "Genesis" consists in making a universal law of what has always presented itself as a paradox: the good fortune of the bad and the bad fortune of the good—

> And he that of the black seed eateth fruit,
> To him the savour as honey shall be sweet;
> And he in whom the white seed hath struck root,
> He shall have sorrow and trouble and tears for meat.

Swinburne was thinking of the particular cases of the mythical Jesus and the actual Mazzini. Plato, in his *Republic*, book ii., put the case—already probably a popular symbol, like the "suffering servant of God" in Isaiah—of the just man who is thought to be unjust and suffers evil accordingly; and argues afterwards that he is really much happier than the successful tyrant. Doubtless he had in mind the fate of Socrates.

Shakespeare probably held, with Ecclesiastes, that "Time and chance happen to all men," and that there is no universal law! Such seems Swinburne's persuasion also:—

> And each man and each year that lives on earth
> Turns hither and thither, and hence or thence is fed;
> And as a man before was from his birth,
> So shall a man be after among the dead.

The "pessimism" of Swinburne is unequivocal and, in type, is Persian.

Doubtless much could be said of the appeal that his other writings make to the more sensuous temperament of the East; but this is foreign to our present purpose.

I have concerned myself not with any sweeping charge of plagiarism but with the growth of a sensitive mind. And in the thought that no small part of this growth is traceable to the fertilising contact of alien cultures there can be nothing but interest. Swinburne became a free spirit under the influence of the East.

RANJEE G. SHAHANI

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

A LINE OF INDIAN MYSTICS*

[Our readers are already familiar with the criticisms of **Hugh I'A. Fausset**—born of sympathy and insight—on Indian philosophical and mystical works. In printing this review, we append a Note which is bound to interest many, especially in India.—EDS.]

The "History of Indian Philosophy" of which *Indian Mysticism* is the penultimate volume is planned on comprehensive lines and, judging by this volume, has been placed in very competent hands, since Professors Belvalkar and Ranade are not only Sanskrit scholars but well versed in European philosophy. Their method will appeal particularly to Western readers because they subordinate both their criticism and exposition to copious quotation from the saints or sages whose works they are considering. At the same time they provide short biographical introductions to each and conclusions which sum up the chief characteristics of the period or of the outstanding personality under review.

The Maratha mystics, with whom Professor Ranade is here concerned, represent only a section of the great mystical community in India. But it is a richly significant section and it would be superfluous in such a history as this to study more than one in detail. For in the experience of every true mystic we find essentially the same drama enacted, the same path trodden, and the same revelation given. So much so that a reader might even complain of this volume that the constant reiteration of the same theme becomes after a time a little wearisome and that the man who has devoted his life to throwing off his egoism is in this way even more self-engrossed than the worldling. There is, of course, all the difference between a single-minded devotion to the Kingdom of Heaven within and the blind self-absorption of egoism. Yet, if we are to believe the testimony of these mystics, the unitive life of spirit can only be attained by the road of extreme introversion. It is not enough to refine or restrain the physical senses. They and the coloured, diverse world of forms which they reflect and at which they grasp must, at a certain point at least on the path, be wholly denied. For unless the sensible is sacrificed, the supersensible cannot be known.

Turning resolutely, therefore, from the transient surface of the outer world, these mystics sought the unseen principle of life within. And although, when they found

---

* *History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. Seven : *Indian Mysticism*: *Mysticism in Maharashtra*. By R. D. Ranade (Poona, 4. Rs. 10.).

Gita Explained by Dnyaneshwar Maharaj. Rendered into Marathi by Pandit Govind Ramchandra Moghe. Translated into English by Manu Subedar. (Palli Hill, Bandra. Rs. 2.)

it, when the Atman and Brahman were at one, they could give forth spiritual virtue as no man still tied to the five physical senses could, many Westerners would doubtless consider that they had attained only to a characterless and ineffective bliss.

This view of the mystic and particularly of Eastern mysticism is so prevalent that all who know it to be essentially a false one must study Professor Ranade's volume with particular concern lest the lives and teaching of the mystics with whom he deals should lend support to it. For admittedly the man who is seeking to realise his true Self has often enough the appearance of cultivating a subtle kind of self-interest. The quest of the spiritual life is, indeed, hedged about with paradoxes. Take, for example, the quality of self-forgetfulness. Of all the virtues this is considered, and rightly, among the highest. Yet from one aspect it is a vice, fatal to true growth. For to forget the real Self, even in devotion to a Cause, is to abide in ignorance and to be the slave of illusion. This is only one of many examples which might be cited to demonstrate how dangerous it is to generalise even about apparent virtues. And where the East has, for the most part, been wiser and profounder than the West, is in its recognition that the religious life involves, not merely good will and the following of certain general precepts, but an exact and subtle science which must be mastered and applied. Its mystics discovered or rediscovered this science and practised it. They put the metaphysical ideas of the Vedanta to the test of actual experience and experiment. We may think that those ideas were too absolute to be applicable to the conditions of earthly existence. We may even feel that in some respects they were perverse. But we cannot withhold admiration from men and women who refused, in their pursuit of reality, to compromise.

The Maratha saints, whose lives and teachings Professor Ranade presents so fully, extended in a remarkable line from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century. The line begins with Jñānadeva or Jñāneśvara and is continued through Nāmadeva, Ekanātha and Tukārāma, to end with Rāmadāsa. These are of course only the outstanding figures in each period, and although Professor Ranade devotes most of his attention to them, he summarises briefly but adequately the characteristics of their attendant satellites. Essentially, as I have said, each of these great mystics trod the same path and what is common to them is more impressive than what distinguishes them. Yet although the goal of the mystical life is to outgrow completely the limitations of personality, even the saint who has achieved that pure identity which is beyond all differences expresses it in the key of his own nature. The universal speaks to us through particular embodiments and not through charac-

terless abstractions. And so the reality which these Maratha saints affirm is coloured to some degree by the temperament of each. Professor Ranade classifies them as follows :—

Jñānesvara is the type of an intellectual mystic; Nāmadeva heralds the democratic age; Ekanātha synthesizes the claims of worldly and spiritual life; Tukārāma's mysticism is most personal; while Rāmadāsa is the type of an active saint.

In a very general way this classification suggests the mystical emphasis of each and of the groups which surrounded them. Yet the words "intellectual," "democratic," "personal," or "active" must be interpreted spiritually or they will be misleading. None of these saints were intellectual, democratic, personal or active in the sense commonly given to these words by the modern world. They lived and taught out of a deeper centre of being than intellectuals, democrats or active social workers, and their value to us to-day lies in the light they throw upon the nature of that real being and the path to its attainment. The foundation of this mystical edifice, to quote Professor Ranade, was laid by Jñāneśvara in his commentary on the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, entitled the *Jñāneśvarī*. This remarkable work which has been described as the "most mystic of all mystic books" and which, although grounded philosophically in the *Gītā*, is rather an original creation than a commentary, was composed at the age of nineteen. But if its poetic quality and the wealth of metaphors and similes in which it abounds, reflect the inspiration of youth, it reveals, too, an astonishing depth and maturity of spiritual insight. Professor Ranade quotes generously from it, but he remarks that the world will await the day when the whole of it may be translated into English. And this has now been in a measure accomplished. For by a happy coincidence the second book under review is an English rendering of Jñāneśvara's great work. It is not a translation of the original, but of a version in modern Marathi by Pandit Moghe and the portion dealing with practical Yoga in the sixth chapter has been omitted.* But although it may not completely satisfy scholars, and Mr. Subedar's style is in some ways rather too fluent, he has performed his task with skill and a real devotion.

Professor Ranade claims for the Maratha Saints in general and for Jñānadeva in particular, as the genius who laid the intellectual foundations of the Mahārāshtra school of Mysticism, that they succeeded in reconciling Advaitism with Bhakti, Wisdom with Love, Monism with Pluralism. Jñānadeva, he remarks, did not affirm "the utter unreality

* Curiously enough so far back as January 1854 an anonymous writer in *The Dublin University Magazine* gave a lengthy extract from this sixth chapter which was reprinted in January 1880 in *The Theosophist* (I. p. 86) conducted by H. P. Blavatsky. She also in *The Voice of the Silence* calls *Dnyaneshvari* "that superb mystic treatise," and "that king of mystic works". See Note following this review.—EDS.

of the world," but he "points out unmistakably the unreality of existence in this mortal world, and he calls the minds of the people back to the spiritual life which alone is the true reality".

The doctrine of Māyā is, indeed, that upon which all Western judgment of the East has turned and although it has been grossly misunderstood and misrepresented in the West, it is difficult at times not to feel, even in studying the teaching of these Maratha Mystics, that their conviction of the unreality of the world and the bodily senses led them to perverse extremes. Granted that true knowledge resides within the Self and that until the tree of unreality has been cut down by the sword of Self-knowledge, we are the slaves of false appetite and illusion, is it necessary to view the world of sense with such an extreme distaste or even horror as some of these mystics suggest? The acme of happiness, for example, Jñānadeva tells us in one place, is that of the man whose mind has become so full of the happiness of the Self that it does not dare to move out of itself to the world of sense; while Ekanātha who is claimed to have reconciled the claims of worldly and spiritual life and who was actually married tells us that—

> One should not sit among women, one should not look at women, one should not speak with women, one should not allow the company of women in solitude. . . . One should never have anything to do with these, and even where one's own wife is concerned, one should call, and touch, and speak to her only as much as is necessary.

It is such passages as these that provoke the suspicion of the Westerner and give substance to his argument that the mystic is as sense-enslaved in his denial of the senses as the hedonist in his indulgence of them, or that he is inhumanly "engrossed in the happiness of his own Self". Such quotations, taken alone, are of course very misleading, since they generally refer, not to the completely liberated man, but only to one stage in the path towards liberation. And if the Easterner has tended to overstress the conditions of dying to the body and the material world, that we may be reborn in the unity of the spirit, the Westerner has accepted far too easily a superficial compromise. Certainly Jñānadeva did not teach that the knowledge of Self culminated in a merely introverted bliss. For the liberated man, he wrote, "the whole world becomes a temple of happiness". For "the visible world and Brahman are inextricably mixed up". But only the God-realizer was in a condition to perceive Brahman in the visible world, to enter into it and yet to be physically unattached, to suffer and enlighten it, and yet to be unmoved. Jñānadeva wrote:—

> He is firmly fixed in the form of God internally, but behaves like an ordinary man externally. He does not command his senses, nor is he afraid of the objects of sense; and whatever is to be done, he does at the proper time. He does not feel any necessity for training up his sense-organs while doing actions, nor is

he affected by their influence. Desire has no power over him. He never becomes infatuated, and is as clean as a lotus-leaf when it is sprinkled with water. He lives in the midst of contacts, and looks like an ordinary man. But he is not affected by them, as the Sun's disc is not affected by the water in which it is reflected. If we look at him in an external way, he looks like an ordinary man; but if we try to determine his real nature, we cannot really know him. It is by these marks that one ought to know the man who has conquered the thraldom of Samsāra.

Doubtless many Westerners would deny that "there is nothing greater" than this sublime equanimity. They would commend in its place an active love. But in doing so they fail to realise that ultimately a beneficently active love must presuppose and flow from a perfect enlightenment. The basic condition of such enlightenment, as all these mystics emphasise, is an absolute devotion to and identity with God. But God must not only be served and worshipped. He must also be known. And He can only be known through the realisation of that true Self which the modern Westerner is generally too active and superficial to begin to discover. Of self-knowledge of the Socratic kind the West has, indeed, admitted the virtue and the necessity. But it has failed to recognise that true Self-knowledge involves a transformation of being, and that it is not merely a process of logical self-analysis but of spiritual reintegration, of growing in being as well as thought out of error into truth. And these two books are of immense value because they contain a wealth of exact information concerning both the sacrificial and psychological nature of this process. We may recoil from the demands which some of these mystics make upon us, and we may even think that they at times fall into perversely negative extremes. But their science is not lightly to be put aside. For they proved it by living it. And only those who have devoted themselves to the spiritual life with something approaching their intensity are really in a position to judge whether they were perverse in insisting that "the body is the ocean of evil". It may at least be necessary to pass through this complete disillusionment of the physical, before the body can be known as the "Temple of the Holy Ghost".

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

A NOTE ON THE PRECEDING ARTICLE

In the first volume of *The Theosophist*, conducted by H. P. BLAVATSKY, was published the following:—

YOGA PHILOSOPHY

(*By Truth seeker*)

[The following communication, from a European Theosophist, will be read with attention and interest by Hindu students of Yoga. The reference to 'Vital air,' 'wind,' 'tubular vessels,' 'moon-fluid of immortality,' 'chambers of the body,' and such like, may be incomprehensible to the materialist unfamiliar with the figurative nomenclature of mystics; but he who has advanced even a single pace along the road of self-development towards spirituality will comprehend easily enough what is meant by these terms.—ED. THEOS.]

In the *Dublin University Magazine* for Oct., Nov., Dec., 1853, and Jan. 1854, is a series of papers, entitled "The Dream of Ravan," containing much that is curious on this subject.

In the fourth paper, Jan. 1854, speaking of an ascetic it is said: 'Following his mystic bent he was full of internal visions and revelations. Sometimes according to the mystic school of Paithana, sitting crosslegged, meditating at midnight at the foot of a banyan tree, with his two thumbs closing his ears, and his little fingers pressed upon his eyelids, he saw rolling before him gigantic fiery wheels, masses of serpent shapes, clusters of brilliant jewels, quadrats of pearls, lamps blazing without oil, a white haze melting away into a sea of glittering moonlight, a solitary fixed swanlike fiery eye of intense ruddy glare, and, at length, *the splendour of an internal light more dazzling than the sun*. An internal, unproduced music (anahata) vibrated on his ear, and sometimes a sweet mouth, sometimes a whole face of exquisite beseeching beauty, would rise out of a cloud before his inward gnostic eye, look into his soul, and advance to embrace him.'

'At other times he followed the path laid down by the more ancient and profounder school of Alandi and strove to attain the condition of an illumined Yogi as described by Krishna to Arjuna in the sixth Adhyaya of that most mystic of all mystic books, the *Dnyaneshvari*,

'THE ILLUMINED.

'When this path is beheld, then hunger and thirst are forgotten, night and day are undistinguished in this path.

* * *

'Whether one would set out to the bloom of the east or come to the chambers of the west, *without moving*, oh holder of the bow, *is the travelling in this road*. In this path, to whatever place one would go *that place one's ownself becomes!* How shall I easily describe this? Thou thyself shalt experience it.

* * *

'The ways of the tubular vessel (nerves) are broken, the nine-fold property of wind (nervous ether) departs, on which account the functions of the body no longer exist.

* * *

'Then the moon and the sun, *or that supposition which is so imagined*, appears but like the wind upon a lamp, in such a manner as not to be laid hold of. The bud of understanding is dissolved, the sense of smell no longer remains in the nostrils, but, together with the *Power** retires into the middle chamber. Then with a discharge from above, the reservoir of moon fluid of immortality (contained in the brain) leaning over on one side, communicates into the mouth of the Power. Thereby the tubes (nerves) are filled with the fluid, it penetrates into all the members; and in every direction the vital breath dissolves thereinto.

**Note from 'Dublin U. M.:*—This extraordinary power who is termed elsewhere the World Mother—the casket of Supreme Spirit, is technically called Kundalini, serpentine or annular. Some things related of it would make one imagine it to be electricity personified.

'As from the heated crucible all the wax flows out, and it remains thoroughly filled with the molten metal poured in,

'Even so, that lustre (of the immortal moon-fluid) has become actually moulded into the shape of the body, on the outside it is wrapped up in the folds of the skin.

'As, wrapping himself in a mantle of clouds, the sun for a while remains and afterwards, casting it off, comes forth arrayed in light,

'Even so, above is this dry shell of the skin, which, like the husk of grain, of itself falls off.

'Afterwards, such is the splendour of the limbs, that one is perplexed whether it is a self-existent shaft of Kashmir porphyry or shoots that have sprouted up from jewel seed or a body moulded of tints caught from the glow of evening, or a pillar formed of the interior light.

'A vase filled with liquid saffron, or a statue cast of divine thaumaturgic perfection molten down. To me it appears Quietism itself, personified with limbs.

'Or is it the disc of the moon that, fed by the damps of autumn, has put forth luminous beams, or is it the embodied presence of light that is sitting on yonder seat?

'Such becomes the body; when the serpentine power drinks the moon (fluid of immortality, descending from the brain) then, O friend, death dreads the form of the body.

'Then disappears old age, the knots of youth are cut in pieces, and *The Lost State of Childhood reappears.* His age remains the same as before, but in other respects he exhibits the strength of childhood, his fortitude is beyond expression. As the golden tree from the extremity of its branches puts forth daily new jewel-buds, so new and beautiful nails sprout forth.

'He gets new teeth also, but these shine inexpressibly beautiful, like rows of diamonds set on either side. The palms of the hands and soles of the feet become like red lotus flowers, the eyes grow inexpressibly clear.

'As when, from the crammed state of its interior the pearls can no longer be held in by the double shell, then the seam of the pearl oyster rim bursts open, so, uncontainable within the clasp of the eyelids, the sight, expanding, seeks to go outwards; it is the same indeed as before but is now capable of embracing the heavens. *Then he beholds the things beyond the sea, he hears the language of paradise, he perceives what is passing in the mind of the ant.* He takes a turn with the wind, if he walk, his footsteps touch not the water.

'Finally,—

'When the light of the POWER disappears, then the form of the body is lost, he becomes hidden from the eyes of the world.

'In other respects, as before, he appears with the members of his body, but he is one *formed of the wind.*

'Or like the core of the plantain tree standing up divested of its mantle of outward leaves, or as a cloud from which limbs have sprouted out.

'Such becomes his body, then he is called Kechara, or Sky-goer, this step being attained is a wonder among people in the body.'

The process here described seems similar to that described in the *Ouphnekhat.* 'With your heel stop the fundament, then draw the lower air upwards by the right side, make it turn thrice round the second region of the body, thence bring it to the navel, thence to the middle of the heart, then to the throat, then to the sixth region, which is the interior of the nose, between the eyelids, there retain it, it is become the breath of the universal soul. Then meditate on the great Ome, the universal voice which fills all, the voice of God; it makes itself heard to the ecstatic in ten manners.

'The first is like the voice of a sparrow, the second is twice as loud as the first, the third like the sound of a cymbal, the fourth like the murmur of a great shell, the fifth like the chant of the *Vina*, the sixth like the sound of the "tal," the seventh like the sound of a

bamboo flute placed near the ear, the eighth the sound of the instrument *pahaoujd* struck with the hand, the ninth like the sound of a small trumpet, the tenth like the rumbling of a thunder cloud. At each of these sounds the ecstatic passes through various states until the tenth *when he becomes God.*

'At the first all the hairs on his body stand up.

'At the second his limbs are benumbed.

'At the third he feels in all his members the exhaustion of excess.

'At the fourth his head turns, he is as it were intoxicated.

'At the fifth, *the water of life* flows back into his brain.

'At the sixth this water descends into and nourishes him.

'At the seventh he becomes master of the vision, he sees into men's hearts, he hears the most distant voices.

'At the ninth he feels himself to be so subtle that he can transport himself where he will, and, like the Devas, see all without being seen.

'At the tenth he becomes the universal and indivisible voice, he is the creator, the eternal, exempt from change; and, become perfect repose, he distributes repose to the world.'

Compare this with Vaughan—*Anima Magica Abscondita.* 'This mystery is finished when the light in a sudden miraculous coruscation darts from the centre to the circumference, and the divine Spirit has so swallowed up the body that it is a glorious body shining like the sun and moon. In this rotation it doth pass, and no sooner, from the natural to the supernatural state, for it is no more fed with visibles, but with invisibles and the eye of the creator is perpetually upon it. After this the material parts are never more seen.'

Can any of the correspondents of the *Theosophist* give any account of this *Dnyaneshvari*? Who was Alandi? It would be a great boon to Theosophists if Dayánand Saraswati Swámi would give to the world a translation of this work, and also of Patanjali's *Yoga Shastra*, of which in English we know only the imperfect summaries of Ward and Thompson. Can, also, some competent Buddhist give an account of the *Kasina* of which I know only Spence Hardy's imperfect account? We Western Theosophists earnestly desire information as to all the best modes of soul-emancipation and will-culture, and turn to the East for Light.

[The attention of those interested in the above is drawn to Mr. Fausset's article "Spiritual Psychology," on *The Dream of Ravan* which appeared in THE ARYAN PATH for September 1931; also to "The Co-operative Commonwealth," by Manu Subedar (May 1933), whose translation of *Dnyaneshvari* is now reviewed. Again, in the second volume of *The Theosophist*, May 1881, p. 173, the following appeared.]

THE BOOK FROM A TOMB.

By the Hon. RAO BAHADUR GOPAL RAO HURREE DESHMUKH, *Vice-President, Theosophical Society.*

There is a Samadhi or tomb in the village of Alundi near Poona, of a celebrated saint and Yogi, named Dnyaneshwar or as Marathas pronounce it "Ganoba." The tomb is a sacred place of pilgrimage of the rising sect of Warkarees who follow the precepts of Dnyaneshwar and Tookaram. The latter is believed to have ascended to heaven in the presence of a crowd at Dehoo in 1649 as mentioned in the life of Tookaram attached to the *gatha* or poems edited under the patronage of the Bombay Government. Dnyaneshwar wrote his celebrated commentary on Bhagawat Gita in 1290. He is said to have gone alive with his book in the tomb, and was buried alive. Three centuries later he appeared in a vision

to another saint, Eknath of Pyton, and told him that his book of commentary was fully revised and directed him to publish it. So Eknath came to Alundi and dug up the tomb. He found Dnyaneshvar sitting with his book which he gave to Eknath. Such is the story of the book called Dnyaneshwari. It is written in "*onvi*" form of poetry. It is printed in Bombay and is extensively read in the Deccan.

The Warkarees in their Kirtans exclude all poetical authors, except those composed by five poets whom they regard as true Sadhoos. Even Ramdasa, the spiritual preceptor of Shivajee, is excluded. They make no account of Waman and Moro Pant. They consider them as attached to the world and patronized by Government. The great Sadhoos whom they respect are Namdewa, Dnyaneshwar, Kabir, Eknath, and Tookaram. The verse which gives their miracles is as follows :—

कलिमाजी संत, जाहाले अनंत
परि पटाईत, पांच जण ॥ १
रेडा बोलविला, धोंडा जेवविला
मरोनिया जाहाला, तुलसी फुले ॥ २
स्वर्गींचे पितर जेणें जेवविले
देहासहित गेले, वैकुंठाशी ॥ ३
ऐसा हा तुका त्याचें महिमान,
वर्णिल कोण, जगामाजी ॥ ४

TRANSLATION

In Kaliyuga, there appeared many saints, but among them, five are most revered. The first made a he-buffalo utter Vedas. The second made the Idol of Vitthal at Pandharpoor eat dinner. The third died, but his body became *tulsi* leaves and flowers. The fourth evoked the deceased ancestors of certain Brahmans, and gave them a feast at his house. The fifth ascended to heaven with his mortal body. This is Tookaram; who can describe his sanctity in this world!

Dnyaneshwar is said to have ordered a wall to walk, and it did so. This wall is shown now in Alundi. The tomb is endowed with the revenues of the village by Mahadajee Scindia.

In the sixth chapter of Dnyaneshwari, the author describes the Yoga as inculcated by Krishna who is regarded both as an *avatar* and Yogeshwar.

The following verses, extracted from Dnyaneshwar, will show the achievements of a Yogi. The language is the old Marathi of the thirteenth century.

आइके देह होय सोनियाचे ॥
परिधवधवे वायुचे ॥
जे आप आणि पृथ्वीचे अंश नाहीं ॥ ५८
मग समुद्रा पलिकडील देखे
स्वर्गिचे आलोच आइके ॥
मनोगत ओळखे मुंगीयाचे ॥ ६९
पवनाचा वारि कावलघे ॥
चाले तरि उदकी पाउल नलगे ॥
येणें येणे प्रसंगे ॥ येती बहुता सिद्धि ॥ ७०
तेथे सदैवा आणि पायाळा ॥
वरि दिव्यांजन होय डोळा ॥
मग देखे जैसि अवलिळा ॥ पाताळ धने ॥ ७१
इये अभ्यासि दृढ होति ॥
ते भरवसे निब्रह्मत्वा येति ॥
ते सांगति याची रिति ॥ कळ्लेमज

TRANSLATION

His body becomes a mass of light. Wind, water and earth are absent. He sees what is beyond the sea. He hears what passes in heaven. He knows the mind of an ant. He can ride upon the wind, and walk on water without touching it. He sees what is hidden in the earth. In short, by the study of Yoga, a man becomes Brahma.

The sixth chapter of the work is well worth the study of those who enquire into Yoga and its achievements.

THE MYSTERY OF THE HOLY GRAIL

[**Arthur Edward Waite** is a recognized authority on the subject of the Holy Grail. He has recently published a book entitled *The Holy Grail* (Rider and Co. 30*s.*). His quarterly letters on "The Land of Psyche and of Nous" are familiar to our readers.—EDS.]

There must be set aside in the first place the time-immemorial stories of eastern mythological Goblets, of Greek Cups for the wine of gods, of Waters of Life poured forth from Ewers and Basins set upon inaccessible mountains. These things are everywhere, and some are of deep significance. So also are Talismanic Stones: there is one at the centre of the universe, hallowed in the lore of Israel. They do not belong to the subject with which it is proposed to deal. Let us remember only that all the wide world over the human mind has created Myths concerning familiar things, the multiplicity of which does not mean that they have been borrowed from one another, except in occasional cases. Things conceived independently, wear each others' likeness because of the kinship between all minds. Thoughts which arise within me are not drawn of necessity from A and B of the past because they prove on comparison to be in their image, nor will C and D, who may produce their seeming reflection hereafter, be indubitably in debt to myself. We draw more often than not from a great well of images. The remarkable literature which arose in the late twelfth century about the Holy Grail, and developed subsequently, described it variously as a Dish, Chalice and Stone; but the object so denominated is differentiated from other Stones, Chalices and Dishes which are found in the lore of the past. Later on the growing Legend borrowed something from its immediate environment of Celtic Fable; but the derivations served only to confuse issues and cloud its real origin.

The texts which constitute the literature proper of the Holy Grail are in Northern French and German, the canon—so to speak—closing in the third quarter of the thirteenth century. It originated in French, and the French branches are divisible into three groups, being (1) that of the *Conte del Graal*; (2) the Cycle ascribed to Robert de Borron; and (3) the Vulgate Cycle, so called as the most widely diffused version of its own text series.

The *Conte del Graal* is a vast poem on Perceval le Gallois, constituting a Cycle in itself and the work of several hands, namely, (1) Chrétien de Troyes; (2) a first and anonymous successor called pseudo-Wauchier, having been long identified with (3) Wauchier de Denain, who followed him; (4) Manessier, who completed the work. To these must be added Gerbert de Montreuil, who either

interpolated 15,000 lines between the sequels of Wauchier and Manessier or produced an alternative completion, the end of which is wanting. The Borron Cycle comprises three texts: (1) a Metrical Romance of Joseph of Arimathæa, extant also in a prose version; (2) an Early History of the Prophet Merlin, originally metrical but represented by a transcript in prose, only 500 lines of the original verses remaining; (3) a prose Romance concerning Perceval le Gallois. The Vulgate Cycle is exceedingly large and comprises (1) a text entitled the *Grand Saint Graal,* extended from the Joseph poem of Borron, (2) a Romance of Merlin developed from the *Early Merlin*; (3) a Romance of Lancelot of the Lake; and (4) that of Galahad. A long prose History of Perceval —known as the *Perlesvaus*—alternative to and exclusive of that ascribed to Borron and to that of the *Conte del Graal*, connects with the Vulgate Cycle, because it claims to have been written by a son of "Arimathæan Joseph," who is unknown to the other groups.

The German Grail texts are (1) the *Parzival* of Wolfram von Eschenbach; (2) *Diu Crône* by Heinrich von dem Türlin; and (3) a *Titurel* by Albrecht which incorporates certain fragments of Wolfram, passing under the same title and left unfinished. It is the latest of all Grail texts. It is to be understood that, as time went on, the Grail of Northern France became known in other countries and is represented by versions or imitations in Spanish, Portuguese, Italian and Dutch. They do not demand consideration in the present study.

From another point of view the Grail literature in Northern French falls into two broad groups, being (1) that of the texts containing the Legendary History of the Sacred Vessel and other Hallows connected therewith; (2) that of the Adventurous Quests undertaken in search of the Grail. It is not a good classification because Quest matter is found in the historical *Perlesvaus*, while historical matter is found in nearly all the tales of Quest. It ignores moreover the later *Merlin* and *Lancelot* which incorporate Grail matter but are neither Quests nor Histories.

The Grail is that Vessel in which Joseph of Arimathæa is said to have received the Precious Blood of Christ at the Crucifixion, and there is no real question that for Robert de Borron, the first Grail historian, it was the Cup used at the first Eucharist after the Last Supper on the eve of Good Friday. For this, however, the late *Grand Saint Graal* substitutes the Paschal Dish in which the Passover Lamb was eaten at the Supper itself. As the greatest of Christian Reliquaries, it stands alone in the Metrical Romance of *Joseph;* but in later texts it is associated with a Bleeding Lance, identified with the Spear of Longinus, which "pierced the King of Sacred Majesty". Other Passion Relics collected about

these, the Crown of Thorns, the Nails which pierced the limbs, the Shroud, the Reed of mock-Royalty, not to speak of accessory memorials like the Sword which beheaded the Baptist, and so forth. Of the Hallows "there was right great plenty," says one of the late texts. It might appear, therefore, that the Legend of the Holy Grail belongs to the cultus of Christian Relics and that its gradual development through a century is a literary event of that cultus. It is this on the surface and yet it would be the worst description possible of the Grail Books, having regard to all that was drawn into Romance therein. The Quests for the Sacred Vessel are Quests of High Adventure, and it was known that the object in view was a sacro-saintly thing; but why and after what manner no one in all the Chivalries could have told when his work began. No one went forth to find the Holy Grail because it was a Reliquary containing the Precious Blood. The purpose of the Perceval Quests was to know the Secret of the Grail, that which it was and how it had come from a great distance into the realm of Logres. The end of the Galahad Quest was to find the Grail in the most catholic sense of the words, alluding to the attained knowledge of its deep inward Mystery. Throughout it is a tale of many aspects, representing a most curious development from one symbolical object.

The historical side of the texts is of prime importance, outside Reliquary questions. Joseph of Arimathæa is imprisoned by the Jews, and the Master comes to him bearing the Holy Grail. He explains its correspondence with the Chalice of the Mass and communicates certain Secret Words of Power and Grace which must be transmitted only to the next Keeper of the Sacred Vessel, and so on in succession. Their application is not clear in the sole extant codex of the Metrical Romance; but in the prose version —which draws from another text —they are to be pronounced over the Elements on the Altar, and were therefore some peculiar form of Consecration, as if the Grail Mythos emanated from a Hidden Church. Joseph abode in his prison for forty years, contemplating the great Palladium, and was released ultimately by Vespasian. The Grail was a Divine Oracle as well as a Reliquary, and the Voice of the Holy Spirit spoke therefrom, instructing Joseph to proceed westward, with those whom his story had converted. In this way the Grail was brought into Britain, Joseph remaining, however, somewhere on the continent, presumably in *la bloie Bretagne*, and delivering the Reliquary by command into the keeping of his son-in-law Brons, to whom he entrusted also the Secret Words.

The Vulgate Cycle, as now arranged, opens with the late *Grand Saint Graal*, reciting the Joseph story with many variations and great extensions. It knows nothing of Secret Words; but in place of these it represents the

Blessed Master consecrating and enthroning a son of Joseph as first Bishop of Christendom, with power to appoint others, which he proceeds to exercise, creating in this manner an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy unknown to the Church at large. Joseph the father delivers the Grail to his son, who is also his namesake and may be called Joseph II. They proceed with a great Company to Britain and convert thousands. It is again like the claim of a Secret Church presented in the vestures of Romance, and the two Cycles suggest alternate versions of the same strange story. But it is to be noted, notwithstanding the Secret Words, that there is no Mass of the Grail in the Borron Cycle, whereas in the *Grand Saint Graal*, the *Lancelot*, the *Queste*—which is that of Galahad—and the *Perlesvaus*, the Grail Service exhibits Transubstantiation on its gross material side, as if the Romances were designed to introduce, maintain and promote the 1215 definition of the Council of Lateran on the Sacrament of the Body of the Lord. From this point of view the Borron Cycle looks like a remnant of Berengarian or Low Doctrine on the Presence in the Eucharist: it is a Guiding Voice. And when the Grail is placed on a Table in the *Joseph* because food is failing, that which it supplies to those in the grace of the Grail is a spiritual refection, which supports the body because it has refreshed the soul; while in the *Lancelot* and the *Queste* it provides a material feast of good things, such meats indeed as each who partakes loves best. It seems evident that these texts have drawn upon Celtic Fables concerning Cauldrons of Plenty.

The historical texts and the intermediaries by which they are followed lead up to the Grail Quests, which exist to carry on the story of the House and its Hallows by the appointment of a new Keeper, except in the case of *Diu Crône*, which is a Quest without meaning. The successor in most cases is a Son of the House, the heir-at-law and the one eligible person. In the Perceval Cycles the House is a place of sorrow, because the reigning Keeper is in sickness or has suffered some kind of maiming. He who would know the Mystery of the Grail must ask a certain Question—for example, Who is served of the Grail? It heals the King, and Perceval reigns after him. In the Galahad Quest he must heal a stricken Keeper of the past. The German *Parzival* is the story of a family heirloom which is never to pass therefrom, and its Quest is intelligible only as a preparation through years of the last Son of the House so that he may be made worthy to inherit the Grail. He also must ask a Question and heal him who preceded. But the Grail is a Stone, the explanation being that Wolfram misunderstood his source in Chrétien, who describes his Talisman so vaguely that it might be taken for a Radiant Stone, a Lamp, almost anything

except a Reliquary or a Mass Chalice. There is no Precious Blood in the *Parzival*, and no Joseph Legend. The Stone came down from Heaven at the Fall of Lucifer, and in a much later text it is said to have been detached from the crown of the rebellious Archangel.

The term of the Quest is always the removal of the Grail. It is taken into deeper concealment in the Borron Cycle; it ascends into Heaven in the *Conte* and the *Galahad*; it is carried to an unknown island in the *Perlesvaus* and to the far East in the *Titurel* of Albrecht, completing the *Parzival*. It is to be understood in most cases that the world was not worthy for the Sacred Palladium to continue longer therein.

Scholarship has proposed that the Grail Mythos is to be regarded in the light of Eleusis, the Mysteries of Adonis, Seed-Time and Harvest or the Cultus of Vegetation Gods. But it has nothing in analogy with the rape and restitution of Proserpine; there is no God who dies and rises, except the Christ of Nazareth at the back of the Legend; there is no failure of crops, though a state of enchantment in Logres—according to one text—causes waters to lose their course and a vague blight to fall on the land. It has sought alternatively to explain the literature by pre-Christian folk-lore; but folk-lore knows nothing of Masses. It has connected the Grail with the Order of Knights Templar; but one charge against it was that the Words of Institution or Consecration were left out of its Masses. It has turned for light on the subject to persecuted Sects of Southern France, Paulicians and Albigenses especially. But to assume that Romances which centre on advanced Transubstantiation Doctrine and the Veneration of Relics were put forward as veils of their radical opposites and came forth from a rival religion which denied the Latin Mass, which hated the Cross, rejected the orthodox Incarnation, and seems either to have practised a simple form of blessing its Bread and Wine or believed alternatively that the metaphysical change took place in the Minister and not in the Elements, is assuredly a frantic hypothesis. We must look therefore elsewhere.

The Galahad Quest is the crown of all the literature. The persecuting Roman Church destroyed the Sacramentaries of the proscribed Sects, but it did not destroy the *Queste*. And after all the marvels of miraculous Masses it takes Galahad through the Mass itself and shews the *haut prince* that which is called —but as if almost evasively—"the spiritual things": one would say rather, a deep well of being—beyond the seeking and the sought, beyond the world of images—and the end of soul therein. Galahad died in the body and his soul ascended—I must not say, beyond all separation of divided life into the state of unity, but into the Blessed Vision, from "the

gold bar of Heaven". St. Bonaventura knew something of this state, at or about the Grail period. And whether in Cistercian monasteries or otherwhere among cells and hermitages, there were some who had read strange things in John the Scot and his contemplation of the pseudo-Areopagite. They also knew. It is, I think, out of such knowledge that the great moment came at the end of all to the author of the great *Queste*. He saw behind the Symbols and the Sacraments a little way into the Secret Mystery; and he closed in simple words that which the beloved printer Caxton called in his rubric "a story chronicled for one of the truest and holiest that is in this world".

There is no more illuminating Quest "drawn into Romance" than to read over the Grail Cycles when the last message of the Galahad High Romance has been absorbed by mind and heart. It transmutes the old pages or brings out all the precious metals from their earth and ore. It suggests new codices, too sacred for any editing; and after the greatness of the written word there is glimpsed afar the infinite of the word unwritten.

ARTHUR EDWARD WAITE

SHELLEY: KARMAYOGI*

[**J. S. Collis's** review recalls some interesting comments made by H. P. Blavatsky on Shelley in *Lucifer* for May 1889 in an article on "Our Cycle and the Next." We reprint them here.—EDS.]

What biographies shall be written of the famous infidels of to-day, one can foresee in reading those of some of England's best poets; *e.g.*, the posthumous opinions passed on Percy Bysshe Shelley.

Yea, he is now accused of what he would have otherwise been praised for, because, forsooth, he wrote in his boyhood "A Defence of Atheism"! *Ergo*, his imagination is said to have carried him "beyond the bounds of reality," and his metaphysics are said to be "without a solid foundation of reason." This amounts to saying that his critics alone know *all* about the landmarks placed by nature between the real and the unreal. This kind of orthodox trigonometrical surveyors of the absolute, who claim to be the only specialists chosen by their God for the setting of boundaries and who are ever ready to sit in judgment over independent metaphysicians, are a feature of our century. In Shelley's case, the metaphysics of the young author of "Queen Mab," described in popular encyclopedias as a "violent and blasphemous attack on Christianity and the Bible," must, of course, have appeared to his infallible judges without "a solid foundation in reason." For them, that "foundation" is in the motto of Tertullian, "*Credo quia absurdum est*."

Poor, great young Shelley! He who laboured so zealously for several years

* *The Life of Shelley* with an Introduction by HUMBERT WOLFE, 2 Vols. (J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London, 15*s*.)

of his too short life in relieving the poor and consoling the distressed, and who, according to Medwin, would have given his last sixpence to a stranger in want, he is called an *Atheist* for refusing to accept the Bible *literally!* We find, perhaps, a reason for this "Atheism" in the *Conversations Lexicon*, in which Shelley's immortal name is followed by that of Shem, "the eldest son of Noah . . . said in Scripture to have died at the age of 600 years." The writer of this encyclopedic information (quoted by us *verbatim*) had just indulged in saying that "the censure of extreme presumption can hardly be withheld from a writer who, in his youth, rejects all *established* opinions," such as Biblical chronology we suppose. But the same writer passes without a word of comment and in prudent, if not reverential, silence, the cyclic years of Shem, as indeed he may!

H. P. B.

A favourite device for disposing of poets is that of calling them dreamers. But in order to dream it is necessary to go to sleep. Real poets are more awake than other men. They are more intensely alive. They are continuously in touch with the reality of the world; and are therefore more astonished than other men at what they see. Hence, to those who have become subdued to what they work in, poets are mad or dreaming. Of these Shelley is the prototype.

We have here in these two fat volumes, amounting to some 800 pages, a necessary work. The books written by his three contemporaries, Hogg, Peacock, and Trelawny are brought together into a narrative which really covers the whole life of Shelley. Thus for the first time Hogg can be read with profit. His is far the longest and most important contribution, but if read by itself does harm to Shelley; for it was written by an exceedingly able novelist who did not like Shelley any more, and had a too great affection for Hogg. It cannot be trusted. It so displeased the Shelley family that Lady Shelley withdrew the materials she had put at the disposal of Hogg —the result is that the book ends in the middle of its course, which is very strange, for most of the materials were in Hogg's memory, and it is extraordinary that he did not carry on in spite of Lady Shelley. However in this volume Trelawny and Peacock provide sufficient correctives to make Hogg safer reading. The Editors of this edition have made doubly sure by getting Mr. Humbert Wolfe to write a summing-up Introduction. It is even more highly skilled and amusing than Hogg himself, and as just as a judge. The whole thing has been well worth doing.

After a perusal we feel that we know something about Shelley; we see him clearly. He was one of the greatest of mankind. In what way *greatest?* Not as a thinker, not as a poet, not as a whole man,—but owing to his intense response to reality. If we do not understand this about Shelley we do not see him at all. He read far too much to find time to think. He used to hold a loaf of bread in one hand and a book in the other, and devour them both at the same time; but whereas he soon finished his bread he never stopped reading, even when walking in the street or sailing in a boat. There was no question of his digesting what he had read, and a great deal of his poetry suffers from indigestion. He was always in a hurry, the victim of a great unease. He had no idea of accomplishing anything by a wise passiveness, for when he was not reading or writing he was *arguing* in a ferment of excess. He knew no repose.

Nevertheless he was not an idealistic bore. For to be with Shelley was to be in contact with reality. Other men (and great ones), are not always actively distressed at that which is distressing: the blind beggar, the lost child, the empty priest conducting a ghastly service in the name of Christ, the fagging master at school, the rich man's table, the words and demeanour of

politicians—to these things most of us become accustomed. We do not accept them, but we do not feel a fresh surge of pity or disgust when confronted with them. Shelley not only always reacted to the world with the truth of a first occasion, but *acted.* If he felt pity or disgust he took immediate steps to supply a remedy by some deliberate deed of charity or self-sacrifice.

It is always Shelley the realist, Shelley the sane man in a world of madmen, dreamers, and sleep-walkers, who emerges from these pages. And with it also there emerges the other great fact about Shelley—that he was without egoism. He did not care about himself as others do, as Byron or Wordsworth did. The letters of such a man are inclined to be unreadable, but he himself is a light to all who know him. Very likely Shelley was the only man whom Byron really respected.

No words can say how great is the need of Shelley's spirit to-day—for again we must insist that it was a practical spirit. Do not let us be mistaken about this. He meant what he said in the Mask of Anarchy :—

> And if then the tyrants dare
> Let them ride among you there,
> Slash, and stab, and maim, and hew—
> What they like, that let them do.
> With folded arms and steady eyes,
> And little fear, and less surprise,
> Look upon them as they slay
> Till their rage has died away.
>
> Then they will return with shame
> To the place from which they came,
> And the blood thus shed will speak
> In hot blushes on their cheek.

Such words are and have been dismissed as idealistic in the West. But as the century closed a young Indian, M. K. Gandhi, translated that verse into action in South Africa by a non-resistance campaign which was a unique event and one of the greatest battles in the history of the world. That victory and subsequent victories of the same nature prove decisively that the East can teach Action to the West as well as Contemplation. We can still take the hint. There is now only one way of swiftly altering the social injustice of starving men in the midst of plenty. That is by heroic self-sacrifice on the part of those who are weakest and worst off. A deliberate mass-movement of hunger-strikers for food would make such a psychic atmosphere that the present social order would be broken down. Such practical heroism would be inspired by Shelley in the West and Gandhi in the East.

J. S. COLLIS

British Social Services: The Nation's Appeal to the Housewife and Her Response. By the REV. J. C. PRINGLE. (Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, and Toronto, and Charity Organisation Society, London. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

Launched with the ambitious programme of abolishing destitution and charity, the British social services are alleged to have developed within twenty-two years into a well-nigh intolerable burden, bearing most heavily upon the very masses they sought to succour. The problem is viewed from the angle of the long-suffering home maker—the effect of the situation upon her, who, as the ultimate consumer, cannot pass along the tax burden for maintaining these services ; and her reactions to them. Many are the evils for which Mr. Pringle holds them responsible, from the national financial crisis of 1931 to the serious demoralisation of large numbers of the poorer classes.

The thesis upon which they were founded sounded plausible enough : prevention of pauperism through social

insurance for the classes of the population most prone to drift into dependency—the aged, the sick, the widows and orphans, the mentally afflicted, the blind, the unemployed. The principle of voluntary insurance, as a business proposition, for which the beneficiaries pay and the benefits of which therefore involve no loss of self-respect, is sound. But universal and automatic compulsory insurance, even though nominally contributory, involves the state in a gigantic charitable enterprise which, in practice, encourages thriftlessness and worse.

Unfortunately, it proved impossible to legislate a sense of responsibility into the beneficiaries of the scheme. The lawmakers reckoned without the common human proclivity to lean when a good prop is provided, and there is no occasion for surprise that pauperism, instead of being diminished, has greatly increased. Removing the stigma from unnecessary dependency has weakened the morale of the working classes, while the lack of effective co-ordination among the politics-ridden public services has facilitated their exploitation by the unscrupulous. Hundreds of millions gathered in taxes to support the various state insurance schemes are reported to have gone to enrich a mushroom growth of "pleasure"-purveying industries.

Not the least interesting point made by Mr. Pringle is that "*the nation cannot finance itself without joint family liability and pooled income*". Must the tide soon turn, from the individualism so long rampant in the West, to the family group as the ultimate economic unit?

Mr. Pringle holds no brief against organised charity in general, but would not an impartial judgment bring under a like condemnation the Poor Law which he defends and many of the large-scale charitable projects supported from private funds but staffed by paid workers, hireling shepherds, "whose own the sheep are not"?

Much present-day social service springs from failure to heed the warning sounded by Krishna in ancient India: "The duty of another is full of danger!" To relieve individuals of responsibility for their own maintenance is to weaken moral integrity and self-respect; to relieve them of the duty of providing for their natural dependents is to strike a blow at family unity and the spiritual values of family life; to teach the people that the relief of misery is the function of the state and no concern of the individual is to encourage the most callous selfishness. How shall responsibility and compassion grow but by exercise?

Granting that the bettering of physical conditions alone can never make men good or happy, and that indiscriminate charity may do harm, what of the effect upon the beneficiaries of wholesale as compared with personal benevolence? Even receiving help, when it is necessary, may have its spiritual lessons. It is good for a man who needs help to feel gratitude to his benefactor, but what gratitude does the state poor law or great charity organisation society evoke?

It is individual and not collective action that is most needed—active application of the Christian command, "Love the neighbour as thyself," and of the Northern Buddhist precept, "Never let the shadow of thy neighbour (*a third person*) come between thyself and the object of thy bounty."

Can we doubt that if every man did his whole duty, that he could and ought to do, the sum of human misery would be greatly diminished, and that in no long time? Does not, therefore, the practical cure for suffering lie in the development of altruism, of the charity which of its own accord manifests itself in works, and of the wisdom which makes it possible to do good works without danger of doing harm.

Ph. D.

The Supernormal. By G. C. BARNARD, M.Sc. (Rider and Co., London. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

As so many other books on psychic phenomena, this volume contains a mass of facts and assumptions without any satisfactory explanation regarding what are called psychic phenomena—hypnotism, mediumship, materialization, telepathy, clairvoyance, etc. The author does not appear to be clear about his own theories. Take, for instance, the following clumsily expressed and not quite intelligible statement on p. 104:—

> The body is the instrument of the soul; in particular the brain is the instrument which is used by the mind. It is not the machine which creates mental phenomena, but the machine which is driven by psychological forces—

and put it side by side with the following on p. 237:—

> The mistake of the Spiritualists, as I understand it, is that they confuse the personality with the soul (assuming that there is a soul) and consequently they invest it with a value and significance which, *sub specie aeternitatis*, it simply does not possess.

In the first the author definitely recognizes the existence of "the soul"; in the second he appears to hold a different view. Besides, he has nowhere defined the terms "brain," "mind," "soul," "personality". An unfortunate thing about writers on mental and psychic phenomena is that they seem to forget that not only were these phenomena known to the ancient Eastern sages, but were also rationally explained by them. We cannot help remarking that our present-day experimenters in séances and writers on psychic phenomena would be saved from many a pitfall and would have their labours considerably lightened if before tackling psychic subjects they would carefully study, if not the original ancient texts, at least the synthesis to be found in the writings of Madame Blavatsky. We shall illustrate our meaning by a reference to Mr. Barnard's book. After laborious study, observation and reasoning, our author has reached the correct conclusion that "the popular spirit-theory is not by any means satisfactorily proved, and is usually based on quite insufficient grounds." (p. 19.) But is he aware that so far back as 1889 Madame Blavatsky in her *Key to Theosophy* clearly explained this? What use is there in reiterating negative knowledge that every student of the subject knows?

But if our author is right in rejecting the spiritualist explanation of the phenomena of the séance room, namely, that they are produced by the conscious spirits of the departed ones, he is quite illogical in disbelieving on that account any survival after death. On p. 19 he hints that such disbelief may be due to his own "sceptical or agnostic prejudices," but surely a writer who discourses on this vast subject of the supernormal is first expected to divest himself of such prejudices.

On several other points Mr. Barnard appears to be quite at sea. A careful study of Chapter XII of Madame Blavatsky's *Isis Unveiled* would bring home to him the necessity of revising several of his notions, *e. g.*, his dogmatic assertion on p. 244 that hypnotic trance, mediumistic trance, and mystical ecstasy are "essentially mere variants of one and the same state of four-dimensional consciousness". The ecstasy of a true Mystic or Adept is known as Samadhi, and the statement that there is no essential difference between this and the "trance" of an ordinary medium will provoke a smile from the merest tyro in occultism.

On p. 211, our author makes the following somewhat queer statement:—

> Nevertheless, in my opinion, there is no definite ground for supposing that an etheric (or ectoplasmic) double is a permanent constituent of our being—still less for the multiplication of such bodies, each one less material than the last, which seems to be the hobby of some theosophers.

Of course he means Theosophists—but let that pass. Picking this up from some manual of pseudo-theosophy, he has not taken the trouble to verify what is the true teaching on the subject.

In the last two chapters of Mr. Judge's excellent book, *The Ocean of Theosophy*, our author will find in very small compass the main teachings of Theosophy on psychic laws, forces and

phenomena, and a perusal of these chapters will serve to dispel many misconceptions from his mind, solve his puzzles and difficulties, and open up a new and more profitable field of study than the one which has resulted in his present very unsatisfactory book.

J. P. W.

The Individual and The Community. By WEN KWEI LIAO, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, University of Nanking. (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, London. 15*s.*)

This volume is a historical survey of European and Chinese social philosophy, undertaken to focus attention on the relation between "legalism" and "moralism" as "motivating factors of social conduct". The substance of the book consists of brief but lucid sketches of leading thinkers from Plato to Karl Marx, and from the Confucian Classics to Dr. Sun Yat-San. The perusal of this learned book leaves one with a strong impression of human unity. There is not a single type of thought evolved and defended in the West for which a parallel cannot be found in the long course of Chinese speculation. Professor Liao might have brought out more prominently this approach in type after type, had he put them side by side or called attention to the fact in some suitable manner. Instead, he has contented himself with the mere juxtaposition of European and Chinese systems of culture. Hence he has not reaped the full benefits of his painstaking effort.

Further, the attention he has paid to Hinduism is inadequate. He gives a very brief account of it only as a background to Buddhism. The *Mahabharata* and the *Bhagavad-Gita* would have given him ample material to illustrate his central thesis of the relation between law and morality. The Hindu scheme of values is embodied in the key concepts of *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma*, and *moksha*. Dharma indicates a perfect synthesis of external law and internal freedom. The physical basis of life referred to by artha and kāma is to be sublimated in accordance with the principles of dharma. And dharma or social righteousness includes two aspects: *āsrama* or the duties flowing from the stage of life, youth, manhood or old age; and *varna* or the duties flowing from one's position in society as determined by *karma* (action) and *guna* (character). Dharma is the principle of synthesis linking the individual and society, time and eternity, for it is the bridge that leads to moksha or absolute freedom of self-realisation. The principle of dharma envisages the whole process of the education of the spirit from the "minimum" morality of bodily control to realisation of the Atman or *sarvātma bhāva*—(all-self-ness), mediated in the central phase by social contribution. The author refers to Roman piety as a species of paying debts to the gods. A comparison with the Indian conception of *Ṛna trayas* (the three debts) suggests itself—the dues to the gods or cosmic powers, to the *pitris* or ancestors of the race and to the *rishis*, the authors of our culture and civilisation.

A comparative study of the types of perfection indicated by Plato's philosopher-king, embodied in the lives of the Christ and the Buddha, the Stoic and the Chinese sages, and of the character of the Christian saint and the Hindu jivanmukta would be an alluring prospect. But where so much is given it would perhaps be ungracious to ask for more. The book is sure to be welcomed widely for the rich fare it offers, particularly for the striking account it gives of the landmarks of Chinese speculation set forth in the context of world culture. The last stage of national awakening inspired and organised by Dr. Sun Yat-San is full of poignant, interest, especially to Indian readers occupied as they are with problems of an equally fateful character.

M. A. VENKATA RAO

The Book of the Master of the Hidden Places. By W. MARSHAM ADAMS, edited by C. J. L. Garstin. (Search Publising Co., London. 12*s*. 6*d*.)

Even after a century of exploration and discovery in the land of the Pharaohs, the inner meaning of the monuments of Egypt remained buried in oblivion, until the veil was lifted in 1895 by the little brochure of Mr. Adams, *The House of the Hidden Places*, supplemented four years later by his *Book of the Master*. The compact volume under review is an amalgamation of these books into one continuous whole, ably edited by Mr. Garstin.

The author interprets that the Great Pyramid of Khufu represents the Light of the Unseen World, and contains in solid structure what the Scroll of the Secret House, commonly called the Book of the Dead, records in writing. They reveal the same doctrine, that after death the departed passes again into the Light of Immortality, the path taken being identical in both cases. Getting into the "Light" at the seventeenth course, which contains the "Gate of the Great God," the Postulant is led through innumerable gateways and passages, channels and chambers. Many are the trials and ordeals that await him. The Soul is then born into new life. These are analogous to the doctrines contained in Brahmanical texts. The Egyptians had faith in the Doctrine of Transmigration, the cornerstone of Hindu religious and philosophical belief. The difficulties and dangers that beset the Soul on his path recall those that, according to Brahmanical doctrine, are described in the *Garuda-Purāṇa*: and strangely enough, originally the *Purusha* of the Indian Sānkhya system is seen described as the seventeenth *tatva*.

Only a few more of the clues presented in this veritable storehouse of Egyptian symbolism can be indicated here. The Great Pyramid houses a tomb, not of a dead man but of a living God, the "Great Osiris". This symbolism seems similar to the Brahmanical conception of "Sacrifice of the Self within the Self," contained in the *Purusha Sūkta* hymn, for instance. "The political framework of Egypt is the envelope of its spiritual theosophy," the 42 divisions of the country, the flow of the Nile, the companions of the King are represented in the Pyramid and its contents. The temple of the Virgin Mother Hathor or Isis is the "starry universe of which she is the queen," and "there is no chamber in the Great House that does not reflect the path of the just in the mystery of the heavens". The unit of measurement used in the construction of Egyptian monuments is discovered by the author to be 25·025 inches, that of one of the casing stones in the base-circuit of the Pyramid. With this, the length of each side of the pyramidal base remains revised at about 761 ft.

It must be said this attractive and remarkable book shows a masterly grasp of the wand of science, both exoteric and esoteric, and the author's efforts have been crowned with the success that is possible for mortal intellect to achieve in a task so difficult as his. Two small printer's errors have crept into the work, one 'of' too many on p. 32, and '2' for '3' on p. 120, in the number of days of the Solar year.

Only as mysteries clear, do doubts arise. "If the whole country represented," as the author says, "the various stages in the Path of the Deceased," do the portions of the papyri found in different parts of Egypt correspond to these stages? To the Egyptian, the South is "the great quarter"; statues of the dead face southward and the holy dead are there in "blessed company". These are familiar ideas in Vedic religion. Could they be taken as pointing to a southern origin for Egyptian civilization?

S. V. VISWANATHA

Child Psychology. By BUFORD J. JOHNSON. (Baillière, Tindall & Cox, London.)

One is inclined to wonder how far the jargon in which experts in various branches of knowledge indulge and rejoice, is necessary, and how far it is the survival of the medicine man's methods, who employed quaint terms and practices to inspire the ignorant with awe. The language of Spinoza or Bergson or Nietzsche is simple compared with treatises written by experts to expound the meaning of their philosophies. The words of the Gospels are easy to understand; yet a special training is needed to follow the windings of theological commentary. The simplest and most practical of all sciences, namely psychology, has developed a jargon which is the most difficult of all to master: and every psychologist of note is continually inventing new terms for states of mind which are more or less common to all humanity. Some of these are doubtless necessary to differentiate various delicate reactions; but the vast majority are not. And very often a learned professor seems to delight in obscurity for its own sake (forgetting Voltaire's dictum that the first essential of all writing was *La Clarté*; the second also and the third), as when Professor Johnson allows himself to state :—

> The recognition of the fallacies of clear-cut differentiations of such processes as attention, perception, and thought, with allocation of specific neural patterns to each process has led to attempts to study the whole child by methods that omit analysis of behaviour into major components.

Why should a specialist (and no other) be permitted to write a sentence which so topples and so sprawls?

It is a great pity that the results of much careful and useful observation should be recorded in this unfortunate manner; for no subject so repays study as that of The Child, and in no field of enquiry are such valuable results being obtained. Slowly but surely mankind is learning how to allow the new life, born in every child, to develop to its own shape and make its contribution to society; and unlearning the bad superstition that a child must be moulded into a shape, dictated by society. The psychologist is laboriously, step by step, working out the vision of great poets and great teachers, so that the applications of their great truths may become a part of our everyday consciousness. He has taken a step in knowledge who knows for certain whether it is himself who is cross or the child who is naughty, and a further step, who realises that all fault-finding, every *don't* is a confession of lack-of-understanding. In reading such a book as Professor Johnson's one is made more aware than ever that the problem of the child rarely exists: the problem almost invariably is to be found in the elders in authority over it. They cling to the errors of acquired folly and refuse to be re-educated by the young rightness and honesty of the new life which challenges them. The book is illustrated by photographs of infants and children in movement which add greatly to its interest and value.

HUGH DE SÉLINCOURT

The Laughing Christ. By PEARSON CHOATE. (Ivor Nicholson and Watson Ltd, London. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

The Laughing Christ! Such was the elusive image that sent the protagonist of this story searching through the paintings of the old masters, to find there only sentimental vacuous Christs, heavy listless Christs, or pale and effeminate weaklings; Italian shepherds, Spanish peasants, lay figures posed on crosses, putty corpses, spouting blood into be-jewelled cups, "the Jewish, the savage, the barbaric and pagan sacrifice idea: the spilled blood of the human sacrifice fetish". But he found no trace of the laughing Christ, that should encourage and inspire, for the Man of Sorrows was the only credibly human Christ depicted. Yet, in the end, this

portrait haunted him— "a weathered sunburnt bearded face, the shoulders squared... rather full human lips and good white teeth... a virile, valiant, manly man... the divine man. A man raised to the nth degree... a suggestion of tremendous power, latent, and in reserve..." A painting that "was to hang on the line at the Academy; and be bought for the nation; and slay all the dragons of depression and discontent and fear,"—this painting turns out to be an unconscious self portrait. As one of the characters says, "All of us are only too apt... to dress up Christ in the uniform we most admire."

Was there only one Christ, one Son of God, and he dead some nineteen hundred odd years ago? The Christian Scriptures themselves proclaim the Christ within, which is no man, indeed, to be portrayed with earthly features, but the Divine Principle in every human being. He who attempts to limit it to one form alone will inevitably fail, for, the laughing Christ, the sorrowing Christ or any other anthropomorphically qualified Christ will always, as in this story, be the mirror of one's own personality. Yet when man rises above that personality, opens his spiritual eyes, he finds the God, the Christ within himself. He needs no outside God, no dead sacrifice, no priest, no painting, contemporary or otherwise, to energise and sustain him.

E.W.

Enquiries into Religion and Culture. By CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. (Sheed & Ward, London. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

We have read with pleasure and profit the fifteen essays which Mr. Dawson has written during the last fifteen years. The essays, treating as they do of different topics, do not form an organic unity, but they all exhibit, in a more or less pronounced form, the moral outlook of the author. When the clamour for material goods is likely to make us deaf to the inner voice it is well to be told that economic values are not the only, or even the highest values in life; that mere material progress cannot satisfy human needs. When the world is frantically trying to save itself by economic adjustment, the author makes bold to say "There is little ground for supposing that the world can be saved by machinery or by any external reform" (p. 293). It is certainly well to recognise that science and economic organisation "are but instruments which may be used for death instead of for life, if the will that uses them is disordered" (p. 343). What we need is spiritual vitality and that can come only from a communion with Divine Life. The author has emphasised the fact that there is no real culture without a religious basis. Religion is not a pious sentiment but a dynamic force which should be made operative in all walks of life. A merely secular life is a life without substance.

There are appreciative references to Indian thought and culture. The oriental solution of the conflict between physical and spiritual life, however, is condemned as one-sided, inasmuch as it denies the body in the interest of the spirit (p. 307). But if the conflict is real, how else is it to be got rid of? And after all it is the soul that has to be saved. The body perishes here and cannot be saved. Moreover no one is asked to kill the body; we have to go through many bodily disciplines for the greater realisation of the spirit. We have only to realise the supremacy of the spirit and its difference from the body.

The author writes as a Catholic Christian, and is not free from Christian bias; for instance, when he says "The Christian faith alone offers man a perfection which is not relative and transitory, but absolute and eternal" (p. 345). But in spite of this bias most of the essays are distinguished by a high moral tone, and a sane outlook.

RASVIHARI DAS

CORRESPONDENCE

BIO-CHEMISTRY AND ANCIENT INDIA

[In the following article **B. N. Sastri**, **M. Sc.**, **A. I. C.**, of the Department of Bio-chemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, shows that knowledge of Bio-chemistry was not absent in ancient India.—EDS.]

Presiding over the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Sir Frederick Hopkins chose "Some Chemical Aspects of Life" as the theme of his address. The subject has received great attention during recent years and Sir Frederick himself has contributed not a little to its development. His utterances therefore bear an authoritative character.

According to Sir Frederick, Bio-chemistry, which deals with the chemical aspects of life, is of very recent origin. The modern history of Bio-chemistry is short but glorious, and belongs exclusively to the present century. Its inheritance from the experimental physiologists of the past century has not been large and, thanks to the intensive interest focused on biological sciences, it has now been possible to interpret the processes of the living cell in physico-chemical terms.

It is refreshing to turn our attention to the books of the ancient Hindus, and examine the nature and extent of the knowledge they had acquired. There are several limitations to a correct assessment of the views held by them; in the first place many of the ancient records have been lost and the few that are extant are difficult to decipher and understand. No doubt some of them have been studied but it must be emphasized that their interpretation in modern terminology is difficult and sometimes may prove even misleading. For an intimate understanding one has to think in terms of the ancient Hindus, which is a feat almost impossible to perform. Be that as it may, at the time of Charaka and Susruta, several aspects of life had been studied with such attention to detail that, considering their antiquity, their works are a source of wonder and dismay to the present-day scientist. The patient attention and natural shrewdness of the ancient Hindus rendered them excellent observers and their scientific methods recognised rigorous experimentation assisted by a highly evolved system of logic.

The ineludible complexity of the biological system was recognised from the earliest times, and attempts have been made to interpret these factors in simple terms of known observations regarding the origin of life itself. Speculation has run riot among scientists and philosophers alike, and all that we know to-day is that we know very little about it. Regarding evolution, the theories of modern physiologists are but a return with new light to the evolution theory of Kapila who advanced the Sankhya system of philosophy.*

Speaking of vital activity, Vignana Bhikshu explains that, far from being independent, it is "originated and maintained by the combined operation and fusion of different sensory and motor reflexes of the living organism".† This shows that an attempt was made to interpret the vital activity in terms of recognisable factors. From Vyasa Bhashya written as early as the sixth century A.D., we read "inorganic matter, vegetable substances, and animal substances do not differ from one another, especially in respect of potential energies and ultimate constituents".‡

* *Indian Gazetteer*, p. 214.

† Sutra 32, Chap. II.

‡ *The Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus*, Brajendra Nath Seal, p. 55.

What this precisely conveys, it is not easy to say, but, evidently, an unsurmountable boundary between the inorganic and the organic, which was postulated by the scientists of Europe (and held sway until as recently as 1928) was not suspected. Matter had the inherent property of undergoing change either spontaneously or due to a combination and interaction of other substance and such changes occurred rapidly in all living matter.* A living organism could be viewed as a collection of different parts in each of which a definite and directed type of reaction proceeded. Thus, when food is taken it goes down the gullet by the action of a bio-motor force—*prāṇa vāyu*, and reaches the stomach where it gets acidulated and mixed up with the gastric juice. Then it undergoes change with chyme due to the chemical action of the gastric juice. The partially digested food enters the duodenum due to the biomotor force—*Samāna vāyu*, and then to the small intestines (*ama pakvasya*). In these the digestive substances contained in the bile act, and the food is converted into chyle—*rasa*, which is pungent. By now the food is decomposed and metamorphosed into organic substance essential to tissue building, heat and energy generation, etc.†

रसाद्रक्तं ततो मांसं मांसान्मेदः प्रजायते ।
मेदसोस्थि ततो मज्जा मज्जायाः शुक्रसंभवः ॥‡

[Chyle turns into blood, blood into flesh and flesh into fat; fat is transformed into bone; bone produces the brain tissue and this, in its turn, the semen.]

This serves to show that the ancient Hindus possessed a fair conception of metabolic processes and a knowledge of the function of the digestive juices. Modern Bio-chemistry recognises the ordered and directed chemical reactions in relation to life activities. The view of the ancient Hindus mentioned above, indicates that attempts to take cognisance of such conceptions were not lacking.

The chapter in *Amarakosha* on the human body and its diseases presupposes an advanced knowledge of medical science. The classification of foods into *Sattvik*, *Rajasik*, *Tamasik*, and their relation to the human activities show that the science of dietetics had advanced to a great extent. The nutrition of farm animals which has received attention only in recent years in Europe, had made vast advances in ancient India. The book *Kurrat-ul-mulk* (1381 A.D.?) pertaining to veterinary science, which is a translation from an ancient Sanskrit work, contains two chapters, one on food and diet, and another devoted to feeding for purposes of fattening.

Sir Frederick Hopkins has drawn attention to the elucidation of several vital functions such as muscle contraction, stimulation of vagus nerves etc. The specificity of enzymes has served to explain the ordered and directed course of chemical reactions in the living organism. The discovery of hormones and vitamins has clarified and expanded our knowledge of several physiological processes. As an outcome of nutritional research we now recognise that nurture can aid nature, a fact which was not conceded a few years ago. Chemistry has scored several triumphs in interpreting life activities.

It is a matter for sad reflection that the logical development of science in ancient India, which had made phenomenal advances hundreds of years ago, was arrested (after the glorious rule of Vikramaditya) due to the disturbed atmosphere created by warfare, foreign invasions and domination, etc. The decline of India's glory may also have been a natural reaction from her great eminence in sciences and arts, for as Goethe said :—

> The race of mortal man is far too weak.
> To grow not dizzy on unwonted heights.

B. N. SASTRI

* Nyayabodhini on Annambhatta's Tarksangraha.
† *The Positive Sciences of Ancient Hindus*, Brajendra Nath Seal, pp. 205-207.
‡ *Sarngadhara Samhita*, Chapter V. Sloka, 13.

KHABARDAR, THE PARSEE POET

The object of this study is to acquaint readers with the latest work of Ardeshir Framji Khabardar, one of the great poets of Gujarat. He is not only a thorough master of the standard style and diction but he is also at home in Hindu religion and philosophy.

The poet's life and works are fully appreciated by his countrymen, as may best be seen from the Memorial Volume and Special Numbers issued in his honour on the occasion of his Golden Jubilee in 1932.

In July 1929, Mr. Khabardar suffered a heavy loss in the tragic death of his eldest daughter, and it was this sorrow which inspired him to write his great philosophical poem—*Darshanika*. It was begun on December 15th of that year and finished on March 31st, 1930. Thus in the very short time of three months and a half, some six thousand verses were composed by the poet, and that too in spite of his busy life and poor health. Most of the work was done during the quiet hours of the night. Religion, philosophy and science have all contributed to the poem.

Darshanika is divided into nine parts: The Instability of the World, the Dance of Death, the Song of Life, the Pain of Evolution, the Fog or Mist of Religious Creeds, the Chain of Eternity, the Unity of Universal Spirit, the Work or Duty of Life, and the Universal Religion of Love. These headings by themselves give a fair idea of the poet's views; but as he is a poet and not the writer of a scientific treatise, they are not in strict logical order of development. Wherever we happen to open the volume we can understand and enjoy it. It is written in the popular metre Jhulana Chhand. Simplicity of diction and clarity of thought—two general characteristics of the poet—are preserved in a wonderful degree even in this philosophical poem. His similes and metaphors are taken from everyday life and from nature, and this makes his lofty ideas easily and effectively comprehensible. Our regret is that we cannot reproduce all this in translation, which can only give the more or less literal meaning of the original without those other factors which constitute poetry—especially oriental poetry.

Let us begin with the exquisite lines in which the poet compares human efforts for higher knowledge with a child's endeavours to learn the alphabet.

Brahma (the Supreme Power) takes the man–child
and makes him write the higher (spiritual) letters;
He guides his hand a little and then
he leaves the child to his own fancy;
The hand would not be steady, the child is fearful and perplexed,
yet he tries to settle his hand in writing;
The hand slips off every moment, the Power wipes off again and again,
and the child at last fills his eyes with tears.
The child writes on, the Power keeps wiping off:
how will the fund of letters be finished?
When will he learn all the higher signs?
or will he keep on this labour of the slate for ever?
Will this writing and wiping go on forever?
Will this knowledge never be gained?
Will the man–child remain forever forgetful?
Will he end his life in the same sad effort? (39)

The poet later sings of Life and Death drawing an analogy from the river:—

Birth and Death in this life
are like the source and the mouth of a river;
The source of the river appears in the mountain,
but the sources of this source are quite different,
The path of Life begins with birth,
but birth is only its door this side;
The ultimate source of the river is in the great ocean,
so is the source of life in the Greater Life.
And like the mouth of the river is also death filled to the full,
having attained the accomplishment of the flow of Life:
Will not the tide of life be brimful
when the door of death opens into the Greater Life? (64)

The poet thus meditates upon former lives:—

Is this our first life on earth,
or have we lived many a life like this?
This world-cloth is being woven from before,
could not have Life done its sewing therein?

This light of life, did it start from birth,
or was it here forever ? (79)

Pantheistic ideas are very beautifully expressed in the section called the Unity of Spirit. As a natural corollary the poet also sings of our attaining that unity when the divine essence within us is developed and cultivated.

The universal spirit resides as soul within us,
we all should increase its supreme light;
It is like an invaluable pearl in the shell,
in the deep darkness at the bottom of the ocean.

When this wondrous inner eye will be opened in the heart,
nothing will remain then after.

At last our poet gives his message, of love :—

There will surely come a day at last,—
may be after millions of years, but it will,—
When the true empire of love
will spread over all the world.
Then human life will really shine,
and the glory of life will pour forth light.
Where the sun of love will shed forth beauty.
There will be heaven on earth below !

Hamburg, Germany

J. C. TAVADIA.

SUFISM AND REINCARNATION.

At the beginning of the year Dr. Margaret Smith, the Orientalist, who is an authority on the writings of the Sufi poets and philosophers, published in THE ARYAN PATH an article on Sufism and the doctrine of re-incarnation. To this the editors prefixed a note suggesting that though, ostensibly, Sufism denies the possibility of re-incarnation, very probably its esotericists had some teaching to give on the matter in private.

This suggestion impelled me to take up the question, and I endeavoured to discuss the Sufi attitude in full in the June number of the same journal. To my remarks, however, the editors added a statement to which I took exception, and they have now, most courteously, offered me an opportunity of replying to their criticism. At the same time they have allowed me to see an extremely able letter from one of their contributors, a Mr. J. S., dealing with various points in my article and to which I may now refer.

The editors found that the description I gave of the process of re-incarnation was not a happy one, which, of course, from a Theosophical standpoint, it was not. But Sufism and Theosophy are widely different in their conceptions of the nature of the individual, and, without drawing invidious distinctions, we may say simply that these two conceptions are hard to reconcile. Which brings me to the second point in the editors' criticism, a rock in the sea of argument whereon the ship of agreement between Sufi and Theosophist has many times foundered. The editors complain that I do not properly distinguish between *personality* and *individuality*, with consequently incorrect reactions to the mortality or immortality of both phases. The Sufi, however, uses the words in a sense entirely different from that intended by the Theosophist. *Personality*, according to Madame Blavatsky, embraces all the characteristics and memories of one physical life, while *individuality* is the imperishable *Ego* which re-incarnates and clothes itself in one personality after another. For the Sufi, there is no such thing as individuality except as an illusion fostered by the lower consciousness. To him, all is one and his separation illusory. *Personality*, nevertheless, an attribute of the Deity, is reflected in man and remains his possession so long as he exists. It acquires, moreover, in some sort, a new lease of life when it casts the mantle of its influence upon some in-coming and naked soul, contacted on the way out from this material plane. It is not, therefore, as the editors suggest, that I have failed to grasp the ordinary interpretations of Buddhist

teaching on this matter but that, quite simply, I do not accept them.

Mr. J. S. accuses me of paradox. Seeming paradox there is, but no doubt blame is due to me in that I have not made myself clear. Officially and actually Sufism rejects re-incarnation. It does not allow that the soul returns to earth. Moreover, for the reasons given in the article under discussion, the Sufis, searchers after Unity, consider occupation with such notions a waste of time. Esoterically, however, an explanation of the idea may be given in private by the *murshid* to his *murids*. He would say, I think, that men when they die are roughly divisible into two categories: those who, as the Chinese explain it, have identified themselves with their *yang* or spiritual selves, and those who are all *yin*, *i. e.* have no existence outside their perishable emotional individuality. The former continue life on higher and higher planes until absorbed again into the One, while the *yin* of them falls away. The latter, who have not conformed to the precepts of the Higher Self, lose their *yang* which goes back into the One alone, whilst they, living only in their *yin*, seek to return to earth with some new in-coming soul. In other words, the soul itself never returns, but the worldly personality of one who has never identified himself with his Higher Being impresses itself as a cloak upon an impressionable body and comes back to the interests it had been forced to leave behind. Now the mass of men are actually, whatever they pretend, identified with worldly interests. That is why I say: "the mass of men reincarnate." I do not mean by that that the theory of re-incarnation is true, but that it *seems* to be true because most men think they are what they are not, *i. e.* they identify themselves with externals. They are not themselves; they are an illusory something which comes back while the soul goes on.

The ideal, no doubt, is to pass with growing consciousness to the true Self-consciousness, and not, as are most men, to be pulled, with back turned, to the Source, their eyes fixed outwards on the fading joys of *Mâyâ*, missing the inward ecstasy of each step towards the Goal. But to those who set store by individuality Sufism will not appeal.

Geneva RONALD A. L. ARMSTRONG

[We gladly make room for the above explanation. It raises several points which we would like to see fully discussed. At present we shall only say this: the Sufistic exposition of Mr. Armstrong is not very different from that of the orthodox southern Buddhistic church. We have good reasons to contend that the real Sufi teaching and the real Buddhistic doctrine are identical with the esoteric instructions of H. P. Blavatsky. To-day one of the main difficulties about such systems of thought and practice as Sufism and Yoga, or such occult arts as astrology, is that real teachers who *know* are very rare. There are many so-called yogis, Sufis and astrologers who teach what they themselves have not thoroughly understood. We do not imply that all of them are insincere men; while some are only money-makers, there are those whose sincerity and earnestness cannot be questioned but whose knowledge of their subject is very partial and the understanding of what they have studied topsy-turvy.

One of the objects of THE ARYAN PATH is to encourage study and discussion of various doctrines comprising the Esoteric Philosophy and the Science of Occultism. The real Sufis taught that Science-Philosophy, and between them and other real Esotericists there is the bond of aim, purpose as well as of teaching.—EDS.]

ENDS AND SAYINGS

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

HUDIBRAS.

This year's Presidential Address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science was on "Some Chemical Aspects of Life." It was given by Sir Frederick Gowland Hopkins, the chief founder of vitamin chemistry and an authority on the dynamics of living matter. Much of the address is technical, containing information and comments for which many a scientist and research worker will be grateful. We shall confine ourselves here to considering some of Sir Frederick's more general remarks.

The ancient axiom of the Esoteric philosophy that "Nature unaided fails," finds an echo in Sir Frederick's reference to the evidence produced by recent nutritional research to show that "Nurture can assist Nature to an extent not freely admitted a few years ago". What is true in the field of human nutrition is no less true in other departments of life. Sir Frederick applies this idea of the possibility of assisting nature, in the reconstruction of society which the progressive replacement of human labour by machinery will entail. He sees the desirability of planning ahead for the coming social changes, and especially of providing education in the wise use of leisure.

Admittedly, science cannot accomodate its pace to the halting steps of humanity in the mass. Sir Frederick insists that the replacement of labour by machines must continue, even though

> no one can say what kind of equilibrium the distribution of leisure is fated to reach ..... Most of us have had a tendency in the past to fear the gift of leisure to the majority. To believe that it may be a great social benefit requires some mental adjustment, and a belief in the educability of the average man or woman.

He rightly contends that it is not the machine that is primarily responsible for our present-day difficulties, but the faulty adjustment of society to the problems which the machine has introduced. He puts it graphically:—

> I see more present danger in the case of "Money versus Man" than danger present or future in that of the "Machine versus Man" ! . . . . I confess that if civilisation escapes its other perils, I should fear little the final reign of the machine.

Sir Frederick realizes the necessity for something more than statecraft and opportunism in dealing with immediate and pressing problems. He visualises, at admitted risk to his reputation as a realist, a reservoir of synthesised and clarified knowledge, upon which those who have to solve the problems of the future may be able to draw. It is a modern-

ization of Bacon's dream of Solomon's House—

> an organisation of the best intellects bent on gathering knowledge for future practical services . . . . a House devoid of politics, concerned rather with synthesising existing knowledge, with a sustained appraisement of the progress of knowledge, and continuous concern with its bearing upon social readjustments . . . . an intellectual exchange where thought would go ahead of immediate problems.

Is not this a faint adumbration of the fundamental tenet of Esotericism, that a body of wisdom exists in which are synthesized all branches of knowledge,—scientific, religious, and philosophical?

Sir Frederick attempts to clear science from all responsibility which his immediate predecessor, Sir Alfred Ewing, put upon it (cf. THE ARYAN PATH, November, 1932, pp. 790-793), *viz.*, that the command over Nature's forces has been put in man's hands before he knows how to command himself. To call this an indictment of mankind but not of science is like blaming the child who plays with a stick of dynamite and excusing the man who put it within his reach. Must not such a group as Sir Frederick pictures have it as one of its functions to judge the suitability of giving out publicly or withholding the fruits of its research?

The objective of the church missionary in heathendom is proselytizing; towards its attainment many devices are employed. The blatantly open preaching of the superiority of Christianity to all other religions has ceased; more subtle methods are now in vogue. Thus, for example, commenting on an article by P. K. Mok in the August *Atlantic*, Charles Fiske, Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York, writes :—

> I cannot conceive of myself, as a missionary to the peoples of the East, attempting to do my work without sympathetic appreciation of their ancient religions. I think it is a fairly good point to make of these ancient world religions that they are, for their races, what the Hebrew religion was to the Jews, a schoolmaster leading them to Christ. I know that that must be the way that the better type of missionaries present Christianity now.

This is a clear statement by a responsible ecclesiastical authority to which Japanese, Chinese, Indians, Persians and Arabians should pay attention. When philologists and orientalists interpret the religious, philosophical, or mystical texts of Asia there may creep in an indirect bias; but when the missionary of any church denomination interprets Taoistic, Buddhistic, Brahmanical, Zoroastrian, or Islamic doctrines, a direct play of the forces of bias and prejudice must be looked for, if what Bishop Fiske says is true,—and we do not see how it could be otherwise. His very conscience, education, and enterprise would lead the missionary to adopt that superior attitude. No longer can he say, "all heathen religions are of the devil"; more in con-

sonance with the spirit of this age is the view that there is truth and beauty in every religion, and for his own purpose the missionary has to assert, however diplomatically, that Christianity contains the final word of precept on, and the most sublime example of, the Life of spiritual significance. If Christian missionaries were to accord equal status to all religions, including Christianity, the very *raison d'être* of their own existence would cease. But this they cannot do. The monetary and other help they procure from their co-religionists is in the nature of munition to be used by the "soldier of Christ," who is out to demolish the idols of wood and stone which one class of the heathen is said to reverence in his blindness, or to drive another class from the fanaticism which cries the name of its prophet as the highest and the only true one. Those, like ourselves, who befriend the true in every creed and are not blind to the fact that each religion is overlaid with blemishes, can well ask Bishop Fiske a plain question: "In what is Christianity superior to any other religion?" For its one Sermon on the Mount, with its beauty and profound power to inspire, there are half a dozen sermons in the Buddhist Canon and another half a dozen passages from the texts of other religions equally inspiring. Christian theology, philosophy, and mysticism can be easily matched by non-Christian systems; even the life labours of great Christians from Jesus down, can be equalled and even excelled by those of non-Christian prophets, apostles and saints. One of the claims made on behalf of Christianity is that it preached the golden rule for the first time in the history of religious thought. It is only too little known that eras before the first century A. D. that teaching was given. Thus:—

"Cross the passes so difficult to cross; cross wrath with peace; cross untruth with truth."—*Sama Veda.*

"Hatred ceaseth not by hatred at any time; hatred ceaseth by love; this is an old rule."—*Buddhist Dhammapada.*

"Let a man overcome anger by love, evil by good; let him overcome the greedy by liberality, the liar by truth." —*Buddhist Dhammapada.*

"If a man attempts to do me wrong I will return to him the protection of my ungrudging love; the more evil comes from him the more good shall go from me."—*Buddhist Sutras.*

"To those who are good I am good and to those who are not good I am also good—and thus all get to be good. With the sincere I am sincere and with the insincere I am sincere—and thus all get to be sincere.—Lao Tzu's *Tao Teh King.*

No, Bishop Fiske's claim will not hold water; his device may encourage those who work for proselytising the "heathen," but it also makes it necessary for the latter to beware of the missionary and his subtle tactics.