

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

KATHERINE TINGLEY, EDITOR

VOL. XXXIV, NO. 4

APRIL 1928


“There is no escape, even through death, from the supreme necessity of self-conquest.”—*Japanese Buddhist Teaching*

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

G. V. PURUCKER, M. A., D. LITT.

(Stenographic report of the eighth of a series of Lectures on the above subject. These were delivered at the request of Katherine Tingley the Theosophical Leader and Teacher, in the Temple of Peace, International Theosophical Headquarters, Point Loma, California, at the regular Sunday afternoon services. Others will be printed in THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH in due course. The following Lecture was delivered August 14, 1927, and broadcast, by remote control, through station KFSD San Diego—680-440.9)

RIENDS: For seven Sundays past we have been laying the foundations for the conclusions which we are going to begin to draw this afternoon as regards the question of human evolution, with its biologic and other relations, of course, to the evolution of the other animate beings now living, and which have lived on our globe in past geologic ages. This question at the present time is what is popularly called a burning one; because, since the conclusion of the great war, thinking men and women have come to realize that there is a moral question involved in the teachings concerning even the physical derivation of the human race.

Such men, for instance, as Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn, Professor of Zoology, Columbia University, and President of the Museum of Natural History, New York, and Professor Frederick Soddy, of the Universities of Oxford and Aberdeen in Great Britain, to mention only two men, have called attention to the fact that the teachings which men mainly based their system of living upon prior to the great war, lacked necessary and essential moral elements, and that that system consistently lacked these moral elements from the day when those particular evolutionary theories were first framed.

If the derivation of man from an inferior animal stock were true,

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

that is, if it were a fact of Nature, knowing as we do that the universe pursues logical courses and that man has in his breast a directing moral sense; then we should say: It is all right; no harm can come from believing in a fact of Nature.

But if, on the other hand, the teaching is based, as it is, not wholly on a fundamental truth but very largely on a speculative theory which is inherently lacking in moral power, and which man in following therefore follows in a necessarily immoral manner, then the case is vastly different; and all thinking men and women find that it is time to call a halt, and to investigate the bases upon which this former speculative thinking rested. Investigate them impartially, not from the standpoint of partisanship nor from the standpoint of a *parti pris*, but making a searching investigation into the actuality of the theory itself — whether it is based on Nature or whether it is one of those many fads or speculations or hypotheses partly based on nature and partly evolved from the speculative imagination of the framers of it or of them.

Now, we have shown during the course of our lectures on these last seven Sundays, that some of the foundations of the Darwinian and neo-Darwinian evolutionary theories are not based on natural facts, but are based very widely indeed upon what the framers of them and the later proponents and popularizers of the former theory and of its later forms thought ought to be the case as regards man's past evolution.

The old idea was, according to the Darwinian theory, which is still flourishing, especially in the United States of America as neo-Darwinism, that man stands as the crown of the evolutionary ladder of life — which, by the way, Theosophy also affirms; but Darwinism taught that man, in attaining that high stand, passed through those entities, or rather through the progenitors in geologic time of the entities, which now stand inferior to him in evolutionary development — that is, in the development of the physical body, from the evolutionary standpoint. Man indeed so stands, says Theosophy, because he is a better and higher expression through evolution of the indwelling mental and psychic forces than the lower creatures are.

It has often been attempted to find bases for a real rather than for a speculative belief in the Darwinian theory; but every time that some capable, experienced investigator into this theory has attempted the task of finding the numerous missing links between the great phyla of beings on the supposed ladder of evolution, the effort has invariably broken down; mainly because the series of beings below is a discontinuous one: there are wide hiatuses between the various phyla or stocks, which no investigation has yet bridged — but which the fervent imagination

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

of convinced Darwinians, such as Huxley and Haeckel, has often bridged to its own satisfaction!

Quite apart from the mere question whether the human stock has climbed along this discontinuous series to eventuate in present man: why should it have been taken for granted by the proponents of the Darwinian theory and of the new-Darwinian theory — why should it have been taken for granted, I say, that there is but one alternative explanation of the evolutionary facts of being — which alternative explanation is the religion more or less popular in Western Europe for the last fourteen or fifteen hundred years? The Hebrew Bible, or Darwin the Englishman! There is something quaintly humorous about this contrast.

This is a singularly restricted view to take; yet it was and perhaps still is exactly the point of view taken by most western biological thinkers. There was in those days very little research into the literatures of other parts of the world — those which were produced by the great minds of other ages and even indeed of our own time, who lived and who live even now among the other races of mankind. Why was this so? Was it the fruit of the usual egoism of our occidental civilization — so proud of its achievements along lines of material invention? I think it must have been so.

But why should we follow that restricted view? As a matter of fact, we do not. The Theosophist says that there is another explanation of the facts of life — a far simpler one, a far more coherent one, one which indeed seems extremely complex to the beginner, but simply because he is a beginner.

A beginner in any important study finds that the task upon which he is embarking seems at first very complex, but as he progresses in his studies, he finds the horizons expanding gradually farther and farther as he becomes more familiar with the truths lying in the immediate vicinity; and he takes heart and realizes that with every step that he takes forward he not only sees greater heights to climb in the future, greater by far than those heights that he has already climbed; but he realizes also that his faculties of understanding and comprehension expand with that growing vision.

So was it, as a matter of fact, as regards the researches of biological scientists into the alleged natural bases of Darwinism. After a relatively long period of surprised wonder, contracting into satisfaction, growing knowledge brought the conviction that something was wrong either in the theory itself or in the understanding of the alleged natural facts

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

upon which it was founded. Our innate sense of fitness revolted against the large lacunae which were discovered in that theory; and finally there came the realization, not only of man's own dignity in the ascending series of life-forms, but also realization of the fact that the course or line which it had been said the human stock had followed in evolutionary development was not wholly a true one — at least not true in all its stages, in other words that it was not wholly based on real facts in biology.

Bear in mind, however, that the Theosophist does not say that Darwinism, for instance, or neo-Darwinism or any other possible similar evolutionary scheme, is wrong from A to Z. On the contrary, the Theosophist finds that there is some truth in the explanation of the facts of Nature which Charles Darwin and his followers investigated and supposed that they had found out.

Nor do we say that the theories of de Lamarck, Darwin's predecessor whom Darwin so largely followed, are altogether wrong. We say that there is some truth in them both, particularly in de Lamarck's idea or intuition of the appetite innate in the organism striving in its environment — in other words, the inward urge of the evolving organism towards action upon that environment. Indeed, speaking generally, there is some truth in the larger ideas of all great men.

But what we have claimed and what we have been teaching for fifty years past, more or less, is this: that the evolution of man and of the beings below him, and of the universe itself, cannot be logically and completely explained on accepted scientific lines nor by the alleged facts of science depending solely upon physical and chemical agencies. These are not the only factors working in the evolution of beings; and the main divergence (leaving other important facts aside) between the Theosophical view of evolution and those theories hitherto current in the world, is this: that the latter refuse to admit a psycho-vital engine behind and within the running physical machine — or rather an engineer, call it a spiritual entity, if you like.

We claim that there are designers in the world — designers of many degrees, vast hierarchies of them, infilling the Cosmos, and in fact forming the invisible part of the Cosmos itself. They are the origin of the life-forces working through the life-atoms of all evolving entities; and it is in these designers that we live, and move, and have our being, even as the cells and atoms of a man's body — those small and elemental lives — live and move and have their being in him; further, that the working of these designers is *de facto* neither fortuitous, random, nor haphazard, but is essentially the result of the purposive and teleological striving

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

of these designers towards a larger and more perfect expression of their indwelling and native powers.

This again is one of the largest differences between the Theosophical and the accepted scientific view of evolutionary development. We assert that natural forces, the indwelling powers in these designers, work towards a definite or purposive end; while, on the other hand, the popular scientific theories avoid or disregard this vitally important question, and, usually tacitly, postulate fortuity, chance, or the random, haphazard origination of species and biological variations.

However, Charles Darwin himself, in the opening words of the fifth chapter of his first book, published in 1859, *The Origin of Species*, explicitly declares that he wrongly uses the word 'chance' in connexion with the origination of species, saying that it is a "*wholly incorrect expression*" (his own words), but that this word 'chance' nevertheless suffices to set forth our ignorance of the actual cause of specific variations. Strangely enough, he then immediately proceeds to set forth the cause of which he has just confessed he was completely ignorant — 'Natural Selection,'— resulting in the survival of the fittest.

Now I do not quite understand, nor do I fully know, what 'Natural Selection' is as explained by Mr. Darwin; although I do understand what the 'survival of the fittest' is; but my instinct tells me that the 'survival of the fittest' does not necessarily mean the survival of the best in the sense of the superior or most evolved.

To illustrate: a man in the water and a shark in the water are two entities in the same environment: the latter is 'fit' and the former 'unfit.' The shark will therefore survive but the man will drown. Here is obviously a case of the survival of the fitter; but is it the survival of the better or the superior, or the more evolved? Obviously not.

Let us continue with our main theme. In illustration of our theme of the last two Sundays, and of today also, we pointed out that in order properly to understand the physical derivation of man's body and its evolution along the truly uninterrupted series which the course of that evolution must certainly have taken; that is to say, the really uniserial course which man has run in his physical developmental history: we must first understand that man is in his origin an exceedingly primitive entity; that instead of being the last fruits, the final development, as the scientific theory of transformism alleges, of the discontinuous series of beings which we see below us — that is, the anthropoid apes, the monkeys, the lemurs, the quadrupeds, etc., down to the vertebrate animals or animals with a backbone, followed still lower by the invertebrates or animals without a backbone, — I say that instead of being the results of

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

the last fruits of a supposed serial evolution passing through all these, from the protozoa or one-celled animals up to present man: Theosophy teaches that man is the original and therefore most primitive stock of all, and bears even today, in his physical body, primitive arrangements of bones and of muscle, in order and in articulation, which are in these instances found only in the most primitive of the mammalian animals; yes, more: in some cases found in animals ranking even below the mammalia, as is seen in the fossils of animals who lived as far back as the Mesozoic or Secondary Age of geology.

We mentioned on last Sunday, in pointing out a few of the host of primitive features or characters of bone or of muscle that man still retains, only some nine instances, and then had to pause in our enumeration of others on our list, because the time for ending our study had come. This our list contains nearly a score of such instances. I shall briefly recapitulate those specified on last Sunday and then speak of the remaining ones that I have brought together as instances of such primitive features or characters in skeleton or in muscular system that man still retains.

1. We pointed out first, in connexion with the bones of the human skull, that they articulate both at the base of the skull and on the sides of the brain-case in a manner characteristic of primitive mammalian animals; and that this manner of articulation forms a marked contrast with those same articulations as found in the anthropoid apes and the monkeys. However, the human skull in these respects exactly resembles the same handiwork of Nature, if you choose to put it in that way, as is found in the case of the lemurs, a curious tribe of little beasts preceding the monkeys in evolutionary development and time, according to the Darwinists.

2. We pointed out the extreme primitive simplicity of the human nasal bones, the bones of the nose, and that the case is quite different in this respect as regards both the anthropoid and simian stocks.

3. We read a quotation from Dr. Wood-Jones, Professor of Anatomy in the University of London. In this quotation, Dr. Wood-Jones points out five more instances of the primitive simplicity of the bony structure of the skull and face, such as the back wall of the orbit, the metopic suture, the form of the jugal bone, the condition of the internal pterygoid plate, and the teeth; and he remarks that they all tell the same story — that the “human skull is built upon remarkably primitive mammalian lines, which have been departed from in some degree in all monkeys and apes.”

4. The same anatomist, famous in his profession, likewise points

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

out that the human skeleton, especially in its variations, shows exactly the same condition of primitive mammalian simplicity.

5. As for the muscles, the same story is here again told, for man retains many primitive features which are lost in the rest of the Primates. Professor Wood-Jones even speaks of a 'host' of primitive features in man, some of them possessed by none other of the mammalia; typically human, or what the scientists call specific human characters. I instanced under the last head, that is the muscular system of man, the *pectoralis minor* muscle, and showed how its attachment to the coracoid process is the original and primitive mammalian attachment, very different, however, from that found in the apes and monkeys, and still more so in many of the quadrupeds, through which, according to the old-fashioned Darwinian theories, man was supposed in far past time to have evolved; and further that many of the quadrupeds have an attachment of this muscle which shows wide evolutionary divergence from the primitive mammalian insertion of this particular muscle. Man has retained this very ancient type of attachment in common with some exceedingly primitive animals.

6. The human tongue is very primitive in type. No ape or monkey has a tongue like the human tongue. The chimpanzee's resembles the human tongue in some slight degree, but the human tongue is far more primitive even than that of the ape, the nearest to man of the animal entities beneath him in the supposed ascending but yet discontinuous scale of evolution, through which, according to the Darwinists, the human stock evolved.

7. The human vermiform appendix is strangely like that of some of the marsupial or pouched animals of Australia. It is very different in the anthropoid apes and in all the monkeys.

8. The great arteries which arise from the arch of the aorta in man, have the same number, are of the same kind, and they are arranged in the same order, in him and in a curious little beast, supposed to be the only representative today of its kind, and to be the lowest of all the presently existing mammalia --- the *ornithorhynchus anatinus*, or Duck-billed Platypus of Tasmania and Australia. The apes and monkeys have not this arrangement.

9. We then spoke of the human premaxilla, the front part of the upper jaw-bone, which carries the incisor or chisel teeth. In man this does not exist as a separate element. But in all the apes, in the monkeys, and in all other mammals, the premaxillary element is shown on the face by suture-lines, outlining its junction with the maxillary bones; and the interesting thing about this is that, according to a biological law which we

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

spoke of on last Sunday, that is, the law of Embryonic Recapitulation, this human character must be a very ancient one.

You will remember that according to this law of embryonic recapitulation, the embryo passes through in its growth the various stages which the stock to which it belongs had passed through in preceding biological time. The human embryo shows this as a human specific character when the embryo itself is no longer than three-fourths of an inch; indeed, it is already outlined when the future bones of the face are still merely nuclei of cartilage.

You doubtless know the logical consequence of all this. It means that according to the law outlined in this theory, the biologic law of recapitulation as they call it, the earlier a specific character appears in the embryo, the farther back in time must it be searched for in the evolutionary history of the stock to which the embryo belongs. Further, you will recollect that the embryo repeats in its growth first the grand features of the Class to which it belongs; they come first; then come the features, as the embryo grows, of the Order to which it belongs; then those of the Family; then those of the Genus; then those of the Species to which the embryo belongs — and these specific characters come last of all.

That is the law; hence, if we find any character, any specific feature, which appears in the early age of embryonic growth, this law says that we must search far back in the evolutionary history of the stock to which the embryo belongs, in order to find its first appearance there. Please remember this fact.

Having thus recapitulated today the nine instances of primitive human characters which I spoke of on last Sunday, I shall now take up the remaining ones that I find on my list.

10. I want to speak of the human foot. The human foot is another very primitive characteristic or rather character of the human race,— of man. Have you ever looked at the foot of an anthropoid ape, or of a monkey? Do you realize that an ape's foot is actually, in some respects, more like the human hand than its own hand is? Instead of being a foot in its function, it is really a hand in function, because it operates like one on account of the great opposability of the big toe, which can be made to diverge or stick out almost at right angles to the digits of the ape's foot.

But turn to the beast's hand, to that of the gorilla, for instance, and you will see that the thumb is but a stump, so to say, as compared with the human thumb; and if you have ever watched an ape or a monkey attempting to pick up a pin or a needle, you could not have done other-

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

wise than have seen the difficulty it has in doing what a man can do instantly, on account of man's opposable thumb.

If you will look at your hand, you will find that the third finger, the third digit, is the longest of the five digits; it is likewise so in the hand of the ape, and in the hand of the monkey. It is likewise so in the foot of the ape, and in the foot of the monkey.

It is for this reason that I have always preferred the old descriptive term given to the anthropoid apes and the monkeys in 1791 by Blumenbach, who called these beasts *Quadrumana*, or four-handed creatures, because the feet of these beasts can be used as hands as readily, or perhaps more readily in some respects, than the hands themselves. The hand of the ape or the monkey often functions rather like a hook than in the manner of a grasping prehensile hand. 'Quadrumana,' therefore, is an extremely graphic descriptive term; and the placing of the monkeys and apes under the more modern general term of Primates, unfortunately tends to hide this extremely specific character of both ape and monkey.

I have always felt that there was some hid reason, perhaps working unconsciously in the minds of scientific systematists, for apparently wishing to cover the fact that the ape's foot and the monkey's foot were so different from the human foot.

T. H. Huxley in his enthusiastic championing of the Darwinian theory did a great deal to belittle the unique and specific character of the human foot, and this work must be thoroughly undone. Man's foot is, as just said, unique in Nature, and no other animate entity has a foot that can compare with the typically specific features of the foot of a man.

If you will look at your foot, which I take for granted is very probably a typical human shape, you will find that the typical human foot is arranged in this wise: The big toe is the longest of all the five digits; the next, or second toe, is somewhat shorter; the third toe is shorter still; the fourth toe is still shorter; and the little toe is the shortest of all. You see immediately that this arrangement of digits is very different, as just pointed out, from the shape of the foot of the ape, or of the monkey.

It has been said that this specific shape of the human foot is the result of wearing shoes,— and I cannot but feel that this rather extravagant guess is a most extraordinary and desperate effort to attempt to account for the wide divergence of the human foot from that of the apes and monkeys and of the supposed monkey-ancestors of man. But it is obviously untrue; the attempted explanation is both gratuitous and false.

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

A baby's foot shows exactly the same character that I have just spoken of; the unshod savage's foot shows exactly the same character that I have spoken of; and while it is true that on some old Greek statues of the gods or of human beings, the second (but not the third) digit is sometimes occasionally slightly longer than the big toe, that happens also today in some living individuals; these instances seem to be exceptional cases. The typical human foot is as I have outlined. But in any case, it is not the third digit of the human foot which is ever the longest of the five, which it invariably is with the apes and with the monkeys.

Let us now turn to the human embryo in search of further proof of our point. An examination of the growing infant *in utero* shows that from the very first period when its foot is outlined in embryonic growth, exactly the same unique character is seen as in the foot of the human adult; and please note further that this fact is seen early in the embryo's development. Hence, following the biological law of recapitulation, of which we have spoken before, it must have appeared early in the evolution of the human stock.

Further, the foot of the embryo is never, at any time in its growth, an ape's foot or a monkey's foot; it is typically human from the time of its first appearance, which is an extremely significant fact, for it shows that the human foot is a specific human character, and must have been acquired early, and perhaps very early, in the evolution of the human stock.

Therefore, according to the famous biologic law of recapitulation, which is made so much of by the Darwinists themselves — and we feel that they have truth and fact with them in this instance — we must conclude that the human foot in all details of its architecture, or in all details of its form and type, is an exceedingly primitive character or feature, and, as I have just said, that the human stock, that early man, must have acquired it in the very beginnings of his evolutionary history.

11. Let us now turn to another example, to the *peroneus tertius* muscle or third peroneal muscle of the leg, leading down into the fifth metatarsal of the foot, into which its tendon is inserted. Now this is one of the important muscles which aid a man to stand upright and to walk; but it is found in no other animal whatsoever, not merely not in the apes and in the monkeys, but in no mammal whatsoever. It is purely human. Further, it is found in the human embryo early in its development. Therefore, it, like the foot to which it belongs, must be a specific character evolved early in the growth of the human stock. From this we are again obliged to draw an extremely significant conclusion, which is that man's upright posture, following these biological facts which we

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

have just set forth, must have been his posture from the very origin of the human stock, or nearly so.

The old theory was, as you know, that man, only a relatively short time ago, was but an improvement upon his alleged ape-ancestor, which, in its halcyon days of freedom from any moral responsibility whatsoever, ate fruit and insects between intervals of swinging from branch to branch of some primeval forest-tree; and which, on the rare occasions when it came down to the ground, ran around on its knuckles as the ape does today. All that, we say, is not true.

This picture of the Saturnian Age of man, in late Miocene or in the Pliocene Ages, may be humorous, and interesting as an exercise of human ingenuity; but we search in vain in the geological record or in the skeleton and muscular system of man himself, for any real proof of it. There is no foundation in the facts of Nature for it, nor in embryonic development, nor has any such entity — between man and ape — ever been discovered in the geological strata which have been explored. It was a theory, it was a speculation, it was a hypothesis, doubtless enunciated in good faith by the extremely vocal proponents of Darwinism in their efforts to trace man's ancestry through the anthropoids.

A man may be very enthusiastic and very sincere, and yet not be a truthful exponent of the facts of Nature, if he allow his imagination to run before his scientific caution. Enthusiasm and truth do not necessarily hang together.

But when we consider the human foot, and this particular muscle of man's leg, both very ancient in his evolutionary development, both very primitive indeed, therefore, and both solely human, what conclusions must we draw? That man almost from his beginning, perhaps indeed from his beginning, was an entity with upright posture and walking around on his two feet, as he does now.

12. The human hand and forearm are likewise exceedingly primitive in many features. Professor Wood-Jones, whom I have so often quoted,— but who, by the way, I shall have to pay my compliments to shortly in another manner,— says, concerning the human hand and forearm, that in their muscles, in their bones, and in the joints, they are astonishingly primitive, and therefore could not have been evolved at a late date in man's evolutionary history; and, as a matter of fact, if you have ever examined the pictures as given in scientific books, of some of the extinct reptiles, fossils, which are occasionally dug out from the rocks of the Mesozoic or Secondary Age, you will see that the hand or the paw, and the fore-limb, or whatever you like to call that limb, of those exceedingly primitive creatures, bears an amazing resem-

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

blance in general appearance, to the human hand and also forearm.

The transformists of the modern school have often told us that the line of evolutionary development of the human stock ran back through the apes and the monkeys into the quadrupedal mammalians, which means that if this theory were true man should even today show, in his forearm and hand, distinct traces of his passage through that alleged line of ancestry; in other words, that man's arm and hand today should still bear some remnants or traces of his having formerly used his forearm and hand as a support for his body in the times when he is supposed to have been a pronograde mammal like the horse and the dog and the ox, etc.

In fact, however, that idea has now been given up entirely by transformists, as far as I know, thus creating another wide hiatus in the supposed ladder of life given in the Darwinian or neo-Darwinian theories setting forth the ascending evolution of man. No anatomist today, as far as I know, would do or could do otherwise than reject the idea, for it is impossible of credence, because man's forearm and hand, from the anatomical standpoint, were obviously never built or used as the supporting fore-limb of a mammalian quadruped.

Professor Klaatsch, of Heidelberg University, also has put most definitely on record this truth, in stating that man never was a quadrupedal mammal like the horse or the dog or the elephant.

Professor Wood-Jones of London University, who is a courageous and honest scientist, an anatomist by profession, nevertheless believes that while man never was a quadruped in his past evolutionary history, he was at some very early period of his developmental line an arboreal animal of small size — an insectivorous little beast, I take it for granted, eating insects and fruits, living in the tree-tops because it was safer to live there than on the ground.

Wood-Jones points out that in the forests of Malaysia there is a curious little monkey, which he calls the lowest of the monkeys, the Tarsius. Tarsius is still a very primitive creature showing small development from the type of its remote ancestors geologically speaking; and is represented in the early Eocene Age of the Tertiary Period by *anaptomorphus*, a creature closely resembling the present-day Tarsius in all essential respects.

Professor Wood-Jones, if I understand him aright, seems to think that man originated from some creature, arboreal in habit, closely resembling the Tarsius of today, or the *anaptomorphus* of the American Eocene. I fail to see, in view of the facts that he himself has brought forth as regards the primitive features in man, how this can be so. However, such is his argument. He points out — and it is advantageous to our

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

theme — that the Tarsius-monkey and man: that is to say the lowest monkey known; and the highest of the Primates, Man; are astonishingly alike in a number of primitive features, such as the primitive architecture of the skull; also in respect to the peculiarities of the arteries which arise out of the aortic arch; and also that the kidney of the Tarsius is formed on the same type that the human kidney follows.

When we remember that, as just said, the Tarsius-type goes back to the very base or beginning of the Eocene-period, and that the true anthropoid apes appeared in the next following period or the Miocene, we have a most persuasive suggestion that man himself must have existed in Eocene times — which, indeed, is the teaching of Theosophy, which says that even in that remote age man was man in all respects, and had developed one of the most advanced civilizations that the earth has seen, on a continent now sunken beneath the waters of the stormy Atlantic.

I wish to say here, friends, that when we speak of the human body, man's physical vehicle, as containing so many primitive features or characters, I do not mean by that — Theosophy does not teach by that — that primitive man was physically fashioned as he now is fashioned, that is to say that his then appearance was identical with his appearance at present. That supposition is entirely different from my meaning, and nothing that I have said could lead anyone rightfully to imagine that such was the case. On the contrary, man himself has evolved from a more primitive to a more perfect form even as other and lower creatures have so evolved.

As we have frequently pointed out, evolution proceeds in all cases by means of two agencies: the inner drive or urge in the evolving entity, acting upon surrounding circumstances or environment, which react against the creature expressing that inner drive or urge. The resultant of these two forces or conditions is the animal at any moment of its developmental course.

Let us take an instance: Look at the wide and divergent evolution of the mammalian apes, for instance, from the primitive mammalian stock; consider again the wide divergent evolution of the whale. The whale is a mammal, and at one time must have been a land-animal which for some unknown reason went down to the sea; and yet it looks like a fish and passes its life in the water of the ocean. These are illustrations of how widely a stock or sub-stock may wander in its evolutionary course from the primitive stem.

We might also instance the bat. The bat is likewise a mammal; and yet it has all the appearance and many of the habits of a bird; in

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

fact, it is more of a true flier than any bird is, because virtually its sole mode or means of easy locomotion is flight. All birds have legs and in some cases strong and powerful legs, and can stand and walk with ease and in some cases can run; but the bat, as you must have noticed yourself if you have ever watched one, is almost helpless unless it is in flight. Its movements on the ground or on the floor are extremely awkward. What induced the bat to leave the ground and take to the air? What was the cause of this wide divergence of form and habit from the ancestral mammalian stem? Who can say?

To return to the whale: If you have ever seen a picture of a whale or of a dolphin, which is also a sea-mammal, side by side with the picture of a shark, and if you were to place above these a picture of the extinct fossil Ichthyosaurus, they at first glance appear so much alike in general characteristics of shape and form, that you would say, if unacquainted with the anatomical features of these three creatures, that all three are different kinds of fish. Yet the shark is a fish, and the Ichthyosaurus of the Mesozoic or Secondary Period of geology was a reptile, while the whale or the dolphin is a mammal.

Fish, reptile, and mammal; three widely different stocks which have approached each other in general shape and habit through the influence of environment. That influence in these three illustrative cases has been so strong, though reacting against the inner urge or inner vital drive of the evolving entity in each of these three forms, that it has been prepotent in producing the fish-like body and habit. Though radically different anatomically and derivatively, they yet have the superficial likenesses of the marine fish-stock. But strip away the flesh in all these three cases and examine the skeleton of each of these three animals, and the three different stocks to which they respectively belong, become immediately discernible.

We speak of evolution; and we have frequently set forth in these lectures the sense in which we use that term. We mean by it the unfolding or rolling out of potentialities or potencies or latent capacities inwrap in the creature itself; and when the environment permits an outflowing or unwrapping of these latent powers, they immediately flow forth into manifestation, or assert themselves, the resultant being a change in some one or more respects in the physical vehicle or body.

Please recollect in addition that the Theosophist teaches an evolution along three lines, coincident, contemporaneous, and fully connected in all ways, these three being a spiritual evolution of the spiritual nature of the developing creature taking place on spiritual planes; an evolution or unfolding of the intermediate nature of the creature which in man is

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

the psycho-mental part of his constitution; and a vital-astral-physical evolution, resulting in a body or vehicle increasingly fit for the expression of the powers appearing or unfolding in the intermediate and spiritual parts of the developing entity.

Hence, the Theosophist, in speaking of evolution, of necessity considers the destiny and evolution of the inner parts of the being as by far the most important, because the evolution or perfecting of the physical body has no other purpose, object, or end, than to provide a vehicle, progressively more fit, to express adequately the powers of the inner nature.

Man, the evolving Monad, the inner, spiritual entity, acts upon Nature, acts upon environment, upon surroundings and circumstances, which automatically react, strongly or weakly as the case may be. Environment, in a sense, is an evolutionary stimulus, allowing the expression, as far as its influences can reach, of the latent powers of the entity within the physical body; and herein we find the true secret of evolution, which secret lies not entirely in 'natural selection,' which phrase by the way I do not really fully understand: I have spent thirty-five years in trying to understand what Darwin's 'Natural Selection' really is, and I have not fully succeeded yet; but I do know what environment is and what the influence of environment may be: and in a future study, perhaps on next Sunday, I shall have to go more fully into the question of the real cause of evolution as regards man and the lower creatures.

Meanwhile, please remember — and I repeat this — that when we say that man is the most primitive mammalian stock and always has been so in past evolutionary history — Man being in fact a store-house, a repertory, a magazine, throwing forth many various types, which, in taking different evolutionary directions, have eventuated in the present lower stocks, the stocks beneath man — we do not mean that man of that primitive period was as he is now, or that he had the same physical appearance as he now has.

Although possessing the same general type and physical structure that he now has, he actually was ape-like in appearance, but he never was an ape; I repeat, he actually was somewhat 'ape-like' in appearance; but please mark this and mark it strongly: *at no time was man ever an ape*, for the simple reason that the ape appeared in geologic time far later than did physical man, being, in fact, in part, an offspring of an early human stock.

In far past ages man actually did somewhat resemble the ape in appearance. Yet, as just said, the apes are a later stock than man, and took their origin in part from him in a far distant age.

THEOSOPHY AND MODERN SCIENCE

The apes have the appearance that they have, that is to say, they are humanoid or somewhat human-like, because in that far past time they sprang in part from the human stock. Hence, it is the ape that in some degree even today resembles in physical appearance his human half-parent of that distant time.

It should be remembered that the apes, being of half-animal and half-human origin, are far more beast-like in appearance than man ever was, even in those early ages. Therefore, when we say that man, in early geological periods, was 'ape-like' in appearance, we merely mean that the evolving human monad passed through human bodies which at one stage of their evolution had what now would be called certain modified yet ape-like looks; but these, as time passed, became more and more refined and human in appearance until they are what they are now.

Finally, let me read to you a quotation from Professor Wood-Jones of London University:

"We may say that not only is he [Man] more primitive than the monkeys and apes, having become differentiated specifically in an extremely remote past, but also that he has been a creature which walked upright on his two feet for an astonishingly long period."

So far as the question of man's supposed derivation from the monkeys is concerned, or from the anthropoid apes, I also want to read a quotation from Professor Boule, of Paris, who concludes, from a close study of the skeleton-fossil of the individual discovered in 1908 at La Chapelle-aux-Saints, that man had "been derived neither from the anthropoid stem, nor from any other known group, but from a very ancient Primate stock that separated from the main line even before the giving off of the Lemuroids."

Yes, provided that we add that that 'very ancient primate stock' was man himself — not man as we now know him, but the man of that geologic period, which period Theosophy states to have been in the Secondary times; more definitely in the Jurassic Age, early. Nor did the human stock 'separate from the main line,' because man was himself that 'main line.'

In conclusion, let me repeat what I have said before, that man is, and has been, and will be, as the foremost of the hierarchy of evolving entities on our earth, the foremost in evolutionary development; and as the leading stock, he therefore is the repertory, the store-house, the magazine, of all future types, even as he has been of all past types. He throws off these types as he evolves through the ages; each of these types becomes in its turn a new stock, and follows its own individual line of evolutionary development.

But here let me enter a caveat: I do not mean that these types

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

were or are the bodies in which man once lived, or will live; not at all, but in another manner, in a manner fascinating and mysterious simply because not yet fully understood, and which we shall attempt at a future time more completely to explain.

But the following observations may perhaps give the key to the idea. In a cell, or in the atoms of which a cell is composed, there are uncounted and actually almost innumerable possibilities of development, that is to say locked up or latent potentialities, all seeking expression, and many having to bide their time for ages before that opportunity comes, if their opportunities ever do come; and if and when these potentialities find in their environment an open door for expression, out they go, a rushing tide of life.

Therefore, the cells that man once threw off, even as he now is throwing them off, resulted in these lower creatures, who are not at all degenerated men, as might be supposed, but actually lower types, beginning their evolutionary course towards higher things, springing from man, the repertory or magazine of all types beneath him.

Man is, as Theosophy declares, a microcosm of Nature the Macrocosm, an epitome of Nature. In and above his human physical form, man contains the inspiring Divine Monad, expressing and manifesting itself along three main lines: that is to say, in a spiritual evolution, a mental-psychical evolution, and a vital-astral-physical evolution.

“ERE YET MY BODY BORN”

H. T. EDGE, M. A.



HERE and what was I before I was born? People have innumerable ideas about the states after death, but very little is said about this equally important question. It is inevitable that, if we are immortal at one end, we must be immortal at the other. The immortal Soul, leaving or shedding this body, must at one time have entered it or created it. The poets and other writers teem with references to an existence before birth: see *Reincarnation*, by Walker, for a long list of quotations. Their ideas were mostly based on their own feelings and intuitions, but some have argued the point on logical grounds.

There is something about our Self which forbids us to suppose that its existence can be limited by the atom of time which we call a lifetime. Hence it must have existed before — if it is right to apply

“ERE YET MY BODY BORN”

such words as ‘before’ and ‘after’ to such a case at all, when we are dealing with something that stands apart from what we know as ‘time.’

Death would seem to be like the death of a plant, when it discards its flowers and foliage, but only to create new ones in the spring. We shed the temporary things that we have created in this life, and which are not durable; we cannot take them with us where we are going. But, by shedding them, we do not grow smaller but greater, as a light grows brighter when the veils that hid it are removed. At death we pass from one state into another; we die down to the root, as it were. But that root is the immortal spiritual part, and its life is far richer than the life we know while in the condition of earth-life.

The path which man treads in the course of his manifold experiences has often been described as a process of purification or revelation. It has been called the Finding of the Self. In a bad dream we may have a false self, and wake with a sigh of relief to find it was a delusion and to resume our normal waking self. It has been said that ‘Life is a dream.’ Then who is the dreamer?

I doubt very much that we shall pass from mortality to immortality all of a jump, or take a single bound out of complete delusion into total enlightenment. It is so much more likely that we shall do it gradually, step by step. In a true sense we may be said to be dying all the time — another thought that has often been poetically expressed; as has also the idea that, every time we thus die, we are reborn livelier than before. What we call our self seems like a light shining through various screens or lantern-slides, and making various pictures; but what is the essential quality which links all these moods and fancies into one thing which we call ‘I’? This essence defies analysis. Stripping self of all its accidents or variable ingredients, there is nothing left to define it by.

The greatest of all illusions to which the self is subject is said to be the delusion of separateness, a delusion which causes it to think that the personality is the real self. In reality we are not thus separate from one another. Is it not a great mystery that I should be shut up in my own mind, and know nothing whatever of your mind; and you, on your part, are equally shut out from me and from others? Does it not seem inevitable that there must be some connecting link, some common ground, some unity which resolves all this separateness?

This is a time of enlarging views in all things: science, religion, social polity, what not. We need to enlarge our conception of human nature, of ourselves. The old conceptions are too narrow to fit our expanding modern needs. The mere personality has loomed too large in our ideas; but it bulks small in the cosmic scheme. Great writers have

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

been unable to make any sense out of it, in their interpretation of the human drama; they have depicted man as the sport of a pitiless ironic power, whereas it is only man's foolish way of looking at things that is to blame. We have to try and find out who we are and what we are doing here; instead of remaining content to play a stage-part. We must understand that our real Self existed before birth and cannot at death cease to exist.

And here is where the Theosophical teachings about the Seven Principles of Man come to our aid by supplying a simple and luminous interpretation of the facts of experience. These teachings show what Man really is, what is his true Self, what is his personal self, and how he came to acquire the latter. The ancient and universal story of the Christ, which is to be found in religion prior to Christianity, has two meanings. It may refer to special men, advanced beyond the average level of their times, who have acquired Self-knowledge, realized their divinity, and come forth publicly to teach a body of disciples and to infuse a new era of spirituality among people at large. Such have been the founders of religions and great religio-philosophical cults.

Or it may refer to what is possible for *all* men. For all men are potential Christs. That is, they have a Higher Self, which is not a product of animal evolution, but is derived from the universal fountain of Godhead, the great *anima mundi* or World-Soul; and this Higher Self has sacrificed itself by entering the flesh; or, as the symbology goes, it has been 'crucified,' fastened to the Cross, which is an emblem of Matter.

Thus man is the matrix of a divine birth, and is destined to a resurrection. The Higher Self hovers over him, inspiring him to unselfish aspirations and protecting him in all his goings; but it is not fully self-conscious in him. It needs his willing co-operation in order to effect the mystic union between mind and Soul, whereby man will become conscious of his divinity and triumphant over delusion.

Yes. Where and who was I before I was born? Not what I believe myself to be now. For this personality — has it not been gradually built up during the years from infancy onwards? Theosophy distinguishes between individuality and personality, using the former for the real Self. Death does not merge us indistinguishably into the ocean of life; it leaves our Individuality, but discards the personality. The difference between the two, though thus defined, can hardly be realized until men have larger powers of conception than the average man has now. Nor is it likely that anyone having the knowledge would be able to impart it to anyone not similarly endowed.

When we look towards the future and speculate what may be-

THEOSOPHY AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

come of humanity, things may seem hopeless so long as we consider man to be a collection of little isolated personalities, having no concern with anything beyond the brief term of their separate lives. But think what radical changes might occur, if man should give up that belittling notion of himself and learn to know himself as an infinite and eternal Soul!

THEOSOPHY AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

H. A. FUSSELL

INQUIRY, investigation, and research are among the most marked characteristics of the modern mind; and as old and time-honored opinions and beliefs are being fearlessly criticized with a view to acquiring a broader and truer conception of life's problems and meaning, it may prove profitable to consider the beginnings of Christianity and the manner in which the Church began to formulate its dogmas, some of which, in the opinion of many earnest thinkers, religious as well as skeptical, do not represent the teachings of its founder.

As Katherine Tingley has said, "we have a repetition in some respects of the conditions that existed at that time." The unrest, the questionings, the confusion of thought about spiritual things and the resulting divergences of opinion and belief, that are prevalent now, were prevalent then, though probably not in such an acute form as today, for man has progressed in knowledge and the problems confronting him have become more complex and difficult; but the essential features are the same. Even the phenomena of spiritualism were common. Talking-tables, dancing furniture, levitation, and telepathy are referred to by Tertullian and Augustine, as well as by 'Pagan' writers. There was much curiosity about the state after death, and Augustine tells us he received many letters, mostly from women, some of whom belonged to the highest ranks of Roman society, inquiring whether they would be able to recognise their loved ones.

The Mediterranean countries, in which the shaping of Christian belief took place, form, we must remember, but a small part of the great world of thought and aspiration and endeavor known to us today, and the fault of many critics and apologists of Christianity is that they do not take sufficiently into account the religious and philosophical systems anterior to it, and which profoundly influenced the thought of the time. Above all they ignore the teachings of Theosophy, which cast a

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

flood of light upon the questionings of that age of transition, so like our own in the dissatisfaction with received forms of belief and in the search for more satisfying ones. Theosophy, as we shall see, furnishes the keys to an understanding of the traditions and allegories which form so large a part of the exoteric religions of mankind.

As a result of quite recent historical criticism and research much more is now known than formerly of Christianity's indebtedness, not only to Judaism and Greek thought, but also to the Mystery-Religions and to the Gnostics both Pagan and Christian. According to modern scholars the Gnostics borrowed largely from the ancient religions of Babylon, Persia, and Egypt; but, as we shall see in the course of this article, we shall have to go much farther into the past to find the real source of their doctrines.

Many of the rites,— and sometimes the very words in which these rites are formulated,— that are deemed of Christian origin, formed an essential part of the Mystery-Religions, and are anterior to Christianity. This was known to the early Church Fathers, who, however, affirmed that if they were found in other systems they were the work of the devil, whereas in Christianity they were divinely revealed and instituted, as, for instance, in regard to the Christian and Mithraic eucharistic ceremonies, which are almost identical: *vide* Justin Martyr and Tertullian.

Christianity is a word that lends itself to the most diverse interpretations. The multitudinous sects calling themselves by that name differ in many respects from one another; yet each claims to represent the original teachings of its founder. Its dogmatic development can be traced from the earliest times, and the history of religious dogma is largely one of anathematizing and persecution, yet Jesus rebuked his disciples for wishing to 'bid fire to come down from heaven to consume those who would not receive him.'— *Luke*, ix, 54-55

The earliest Christians had no creeds and little ritual; their sole endeavor was to live according to the precepts of their Master; they believed moreover that 'God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.' That Christianity was not first and foremost a system of belief, but a rule of life, is evident from the fact that its earliest designation was the *Way*.— *Acts*, xviii, 25; xix, 9, 23; xxii, 4; xxiv, 14, 22

Jesus taught universal Love and Compassion. He preached the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. In his description of the Last Judgment he lays emphasis on what men have done, rather than on what they have believed. He never condemned the erring, but bade them "go and sin no more," giving them the strength to do so. He never

THEOSOPHY AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

taught that man was naturally evil — ‘born in sin.’ In his intercourse with men he showed that he possessed the divine gift of calling into action whatever of good there was in them, even if they themselves were ignorant of it.

“Evil,” says Origen (A. D. 185-254), in agreement with the great Gnostic teacher, Basilides, “comes from precedent evil, and therefore this life must be regarded as a continuation of one that has gone before.” And he held that, with very few exceptions, one earth-life was not sufficient for a man’s redemption. Sinners, he taught,—“among whom I count myself,”—are purged with fire, and this fire is kindled by the sinner himself in his own heart. Suffering, not punishment, is the natural result of evil-doing, and will continue until the sinner is restored to moral health. Some souls are hard to save, owing to their obduracy, yet the purifying fire will finally burn the dross away, though not perhaps till after many lives. Origen could not bring himself to believe that any soul would be ultimately lost, for otherwise God would not ‘be all in all.’

The belief in the final restitution of all things was shared by Christians and Gnostics alike, and the Neo-Platonist philosopher, Plotinus, held that ‘lost souls’ might reascend and even surpass their original condition. This nobler and truer conception of the nature of the Deity’s relations to man is finding again zealous advocates in the Churches. To mention only one of them, a prominent English clergyman, H. R. L. Sheppard, lately Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, writes:

“The doctrine of an enduring hell is a negation of the Fatherhood of God, for it is unthinkable that any lover of men could consent to punish eternally a single one of his children, however gross and grave had been his moral failure.”— *The Impatience of a Parson*

All the Gnostic teachers discuss the problem of evil, and all agree that evil does not originate in the Supreme Being, but in man himself and in the animal passions which come to birth in him in consequence of the fall of spirit into matter, views which are completely in harmony with what *The Secret Doctrine* teaches. As H. P. Blavatsky says:

“Esoteric philosophy admits neither good nor evil *per se*, as existing independently in nature. The cause for both is found . . . with respect to man, in his human nature, his ignorance and passions. There is no *devil* or the utterly depraved, as there are no Angels absolutely perfect, though there may be spirits of Light and of Darkness; thus LUCIFER — the spirit of Intellectual Enlightenment and Freedom of Thought — is metaphorically the guiding beacon, which helps man to find his way through the rocks and sand-banks of Life, for Lucifer is the LOGOS in his highest, and the ‘Adversary’ in his lowest aspect — both of which are reflected in our *Ego*. . . .”

“The Demon of Pride, Lust, Rebellion, and Hatred has never had *any being before* the appearance of physical conscious man. It is man who has begotten, nurtured, and allowed the fiend to develop in his heart; he, again, who has contaminated the indwelling god in himself, by linking the pure spirit with the impure demon of matter.”

— *The Secret Doctrine*, II, p. 162; p. 274

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

For Origen, as for Paul, sin was the result of the conflict between the higher and lower nature in man. As the latter says: "The good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do." And yet he delights "in the law of God after *the inward man*." "O wretched man that I am!" he exclaims, "who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Paul himself answers, "the Christ." But, as Theosophy teaches:

"Christ — the true esoteric SAVIOR — *is no man*, but the DIVINE PRINCIPLE in every human being. He who strives to resurrect the Spirit *crucified in him by his own terrestrial passions*, and buried deep in the 'sepulcher' of his sinful flesh, . . . he *has the risen Christ in him*."

This 'indwelling' is presented in Paul's *Epistles* under two complementary aspects: "Christ *in us* the hope of glory"; and "if any man be *in Christ* he is a new creature." It is because we are *in Christ* and because *Christ is in us* that we can show forth the God in us, and so help others to find the God that is in them.

The Christos-Spirit, then, was not incarnate in Jesus alone. He was not the only 'Savior.' All races and ages have had their Saviors. And this must have been known to the early Christians, for Origen expressly declares that "many sinless or nearly sinless beings have assumed flesh to aid in our redemption." After the death of Clement of Alexandria he became head of the famous Catechetical School in that cosmopolitan city, which provided instruction for those who wished to enter the Christian Church, but, just as in any ordinary college, science and philosophy were also discussed, and where "he breathed his own spirit into his numerous pupils."

We have only to consider *what incarnation really means* to see how impossible it is to attribute anything exceptional to the incarnation of the Divine that was in Jesus, "as though," to quote H. P. Blavatsky again, "the Boundless and the Infinite can ever be limited and conditioned to one manifestation individualized in one man."

In *The Wine of Life*, pages 145 and 165, Katherine Tingley says:

"According to the teachings of Jesus himself we are ALL 'sons of God' — we are all essentially divine; we are immortal; we are a part of God, and God is in us and we are in God. And the only difference between Christ and many of those around him was that he recognised his own inner divinity. . . ."

"He was an Initiate; he had made splendid use of his many lives; and it was the refining process of self-discipline and self-directed evolution that had brought him to the condition of being a great spiritual Teacher. . . ."

"Human as we are, and because he was divine as we are, . . . he was one of the noblest, one of the grandest, one of the most inspiring examples of the true man. . . ."

The great truth of the essential divinity of man was known to

THEOSOPHY AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

Pagan thinkers. Cicero writes: "Know, then, that thou art a God, and inferior in no whit to the celestials save in immortality." Epictetus addresses these words to the erring: "You bear a God about with you, though you know it not. It is within yourself that you carry him, and you do not perceive that it is he whom you profane by impure thoughts and unworthy actions." In *Greek Ideals of Righteousness*, page 67, Mrs. Adams says that the dominant idea of Greek religious thought is the essential unity of man and God.

There never was a time when the true religion — the ancient Wisdom-Religion, of which Theosophy is the latest presentation — was without its witnesses in the world. Especially at the end of a cycle and the beginning of a new one, as was the case at the commencement of the Christian era, efforts are made to direct aright the changes that then take place in human thought. If, therefore, we would understand the conditions that favored the acceptance of Christ's teachings — and he came to restate old forgotten truths — we must go farther afield than Roman, Greek, and Jewish thought, which Christian apologists consider as having paved the way for Christianity.

In 327 B. C., Alexander set out on his campaign in India, which lasted about two years and three months. Conquering the Persian Empire, he penetrated as far as the Hyphasis, or the river Beas, which formed the northwestern border of the nations inhabiting the region watered by the Ganges and the Jumna. Here his soldiers, much to his sorrow, refused to go any farther, and he was forced to turn back. Alexander has been credited with wishing to bring about 'the marriage of East and West,' and though his Indian campaign was little more than a military expedition, it opened the way for an exchange of philosophic thought and religious ideals.

After Alexander's death, Seleucus Nicator, who succeeded to the sovereignty of Babylon and Syria, established political relations with Chandragupta, the powerful king of the Mauryas on the Indus, which continued through Aśoka's reign, who extended his rule over practically the whole of India. Ambassadors from Egypt, as well as from the Babylonian and Syrian Empire, resided at the court of these kings, and close relations were thus maintained between India and the West. Several of these ambassadors wrote accounts of their stay in India, but their works have been lost.

Aśoka did all he could to spread the teachings of Buddhism, and Buddhist monks were to be met with in Persia, in the Levant, and in Egypt, for at that time Buddhism was essentially a missionary religion.

Alexandria — founded by Alexander the Great in 331 B. C.— had

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

become the 'clearing-house' for the thought of the then known world. There Ammonius Saccas, one of the most renowned teachers of the Alexandrian Syncretistic School, lectured on the religions and philosophies of the world and attempted to reconcile them on a common ethical basis.

About a hundred years later, Mâni, the founder of Manichaeism, one of the most widely spread so-called heresies of Christianity, in the same sentence, names Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus, "messengers sent by God." References to Brâhmans and Buddhists are also to be found in Pagan and in early Christian writers and controversialists.

Modern scholars have been loth to admit any direct influence of Hindû thought on Greek philosophy. This attitude is, however, weakening. Renan was one of the first to admit that a knowledge of Buddhism had penetrated as far West as Greece. In his preface to *The Message of Plato*, published only a few years ago, Edward J. Urwick says he has "reluctantly omitted a long inquiry into the channels by which Indian thought penetrated Greece in the fifth and sixth centuries B. C.," and states that he "certainly assumes a fairly direct contact between India and Greece," and that "the influence was profoundly felt by Plato."

If we now turn to the Gnostics and their teachings, we shall find still further evidence of this influence. Unfortunately almost all we know about them comes to us through their bitter and prejudiced opponents, who not only distorted their doctrines, but destroyed their writings wherever possible. Some precious fragments remain, however, and these enable us to form a fairly correct idea of the lofty spiritual nature of the original teachings. What we do know fully supports H. P. Blavatsky's assertion that the Gnostic doctrines, "before they were mutilated by the Christian Fathers, contained the ancient esoteric teaching."

Recent historical criticism has done much to put the Gnostics in a more favorable light, and has shown that they contributed much that is of permanent value to Christianity. They taught, for example, that the soul is a spark from the Divine, that has forgotten its origin and lost its way in a world where fleshly desires and passions prevail. Redemption consists in the soul finding its way back to its original source, the Deity, and is only possible through knowledge (*gnosis*). Christ is the bringer of this gnosis, and he occupies the center of their systems.

They also taught that the heavenly Father of Jesus was not Jehovah, the jealous, repenting, vengeful, and punishing God of the Israelites, for the Father that Jesus speaks of "loved the world and sent his Son to redeem it." Redemption, according to them, included not only man, but all creatures and things in the manifested universe, for

THEOSOPHY AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

Spirit was the cause of them all. In the Sabazian Mysteries the evolution of the various races of mankind was depicted, just as it is taught in *The Secret Doctrine*.

What we know of the Gnostic sect of the Ophites comes almost entirely from Christian sources. They repudiated the Jehovah of the Old Testament, relegating him to the position of an inferior God, as all the other Gnostics did. They honored the Serpent because he taught primeval man the Mysteries, and was commissioned to enlighten and save mankind. This was a most pernicious heresy in the eyes of the Christian Fathers, who knew nothing of the real meaning of the Dragon and the Serpent, whom they identified with the principle of evil.

It is interesting to note in this connexion that one of the greatest of modern philosophers, Hegel, considered that the 'Fall,' which, according to the Bible, resulted from the temptation of the Serpent in the Garden of Eden, was a necessary step to spirituality. In his *Philosophy of Religion*, Hegel writes:

"The fall was really a rise. . . . The serpent says that Adam will become like God . . . and that it is knowledge which constitutes likeness to God. . . . And God says to himself, Adam has become like one of us. The serpent had thus not lied, for God confirms what he said."

H. P. Blavatsky wrote:

"Surely Jesus of Nazareth would have hardly advised his apostles to show themselves as *wise* as the serpent, had the latter been a symbol of the *Evil one*; nor would the Ophites, the learned Egyptian Gnostics of the 'Brotherhood of the Serpent,' have revered a living snake in their ceremonies as the emblem of *WISDOM*, the divine *Sophia* (and a type of the all-good, not the all-bad), were that reptile so closely connected with Satan."

— *The Secret Doctrine*, II, 386

And elsewhere in the same work, H. P. Blavatsky declares that the nature of the prototype of that which became in time the Christian Devil was 'Knowledge and Love,' for he "wanted man to become his own creator and an immortal god."

The serpent, symbolizing intelligence and wisdom, the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and the tree of life, were essential parts of the religious teachings of ancient India and China. Their true significance was taught in the Jewish Kabala, and it was only in exoteric Christianity that the original lofty teaching was misunderstood, owing to a too literal reading of the Old Testament. Moreover, as Theosophy teaches, the angels who fell, did not fall morally, but "were simply carrying out their mission and function in the Cosmos." The Gnostics, too, regarded their fall as a necessity.

"Satan, or the Red *Fiery* Dragon, . . . and *Lucifer*, or 'Light-Bearer,' is in us: it is our *Mind* — our tempter and our 'Redeemer,' our intelligent liberator and Savior from pure

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

animalism. Without this principle — the emanation of the very essence of the pure divine principle *Mahal* (Intelligence), which radiates direct from the *Divine mind* — we would be surely no better than animals.”— *The Secret Doctrine*, II, 513

To mention only one other example, among many others which might be adduced, of the conformity between the teaching of the Gnostics and the ancient Wisdom-Religion, they taught “that a certain company of *seven* angels formed the first men, who were gigantic shadowy forms, but mindless.”

If we would have an explanation of these ‘coincidences’ we must remember that H. P. Blavatsky says that the founders of the different Gnostic sects were Initiates, and that “the *Upanishads* have passed entirely into Gnostic literature, and a *Brâhman* needs only to read *Pistis Sophia* to recognise his forefathers’ property, even to the phraseology and the similes used.”

According to Gibbon and other writers, the Gnostics were the most cultured and learned people of the time. Clement of Alexandria calls Basilides “the philosopher devoted to the contemplation of divine things.” According to Eusebius, the twenty-four volumes of Basilides’ work, *Interpretations of the Gospel*, were burnt by order of the Church. They were heretical, but then the Church would allow of no other interpretation of Christ’s teaching than her own.

Clement, Origen, Synesius, and other broad-minded men of authority in the early Christian Church, upheld the value of Pagan learning and philosophy for the development of the Christian faith. They believed with Paul that a Christian ought “to be ready to give a reason for the faith that is in him.” In his *Epistle to the Philippians* the latter wrote these memorable words:

“Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.”— iv, 8

These were wise counsels, but they were not followed. A little more than a hundred years later Tertullian could write:

“What have the philosopher and the Christian in common? The disciple of Greece and the disciple of heaven? What have Athens and Jerusalem, the Church and the Academy, heretics and Christians, in common? There is no more curiosity for us, now that Christ has come, nor any occasion for further investigation, since we have the Gospel.”

H. P. Blavatsky might well speak of “the long centuries of dreary ignorance, after the lamp of knowledge in the heathen and highly philosophical systems had ceased to shed its light on the ages of intolerance and bigotry during early Christianity.”

But though the light burned dim it was kept aflame and even

shone brightly in the minds of solitary thinkers, such as John Scotus Erigena, Nicolas of Cusa, Giordano Bruno, Pico della Mirandola, Reuchlin, and others whom we might mention. Every advance in moral power, in spiritual knowledge, has been the result of a rediscovery of the ancient truths taught in the earliest ages by 'the Divine Instructors of Humanity,' and preserved through the eras of darkness and indifference to spiritual things, through which mankind has passed.

These truths have been made known again in our own time, at least in part, by H. P. Blavatsky and her successors, William Q. Judge, and Katherine Tingley, who have shown men how to live up to the possibilities of their inherent Divinity. By proving the unity of all life, and the solidarity of the least and meanest with the greatest and noblest, they have shown that Brotherhood is indeed a fact in nature, an inescapable fact, which nations as well as individuals ignore to their peril.

The practice of Universal Brotherhood and a love of Truth, so profound that it can see Truth wherever it may be found, can alone put an end to the dissensions, religious as well as social, which still divide mankind. Theosophy is the reconciler of all religions, for it sees the essential truth that they contain, despite their seeming differences; and teaches us that if we would live a truly spiritual life we must "ascend from earth to heaven and then descend again," in order to help to realize there the vision of truth and beauty it has been ours to see.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

THEOSOPHY IN DAILY LIFE

P. A. MALPAS (ENGLAND)

IN speaking of Theosophy it is always well to remember what it is. The word means, 'Wisdom about God,' or rather 'Wisdom about Divine Things,'—Divine Wisdom. Theosophy in daily life is Wisdom applied to daily life.

We live in a country where there is an official religion. This has been stereotyped down through the centuries. In the process, sight has been lost of what it was in its original form and doctrine. If we retain some of that original religion, it is a fact upon which to congratulate ourselves. For, originally, Christianity was Theosophy. It was expressed in terms different from the terms of other religions which in their origin were also pure Theosophy. If one can speak of such things at all, there *must* be words and terms, but there is no necessity always to use the same formula, even if the thing itself is the same, or a phase of it. Christianity was no new thing, but a restatement of very old facts — and those facts were Theosophy, but not all of it.

It is very difficult to obtain a clear view of Christianity in its real beginnings, but it can be done. If one has time and inclination, much may be read in H. P. Blavatsky's books, bearing on the subject. She quotes much, because she seemed disinclined to claim her own authority so long as she could point with profit to what others had said.

How would that original Christianity — which was Theosophy — apply to the ordinary man in daily life? Would it mean learned disquisitions and subtil arguments on original sin, and infallibility, and

THEOSOPHY IN DAILY LIFE

heresies, and orthodoxies, and atonements, and faith, and works, and repentances, and the rest of the machinery of organized Occidental religions? I think not.

You do not have to read the weighty tomes of the early Church-Fathers in order to learn that the first Christians were simply a secret society banded together for the cultivation, or rather recognition, of the soul. Or, more precisely still, for the cultivation and purification of the imperfect part of the soul, and the recognition of the perfect part. The process is expressed by one of them in the words: "Raise the divine within you to the first-born divine" (Synesius). It is practically a quotation from the *Bhagavad-Gîtâ*: "Raise the self by the *Self*." It was the kernel of all real and original religions at all times and everywhere.

There were powerful reasons why the deeper secrets of the soul-life had to be kept sacred, and that is why the primitive Christians were a secret society. When their secrets were spread to unworthy persons, the whole world cried out against the perversions which were made of the original teachings. Into the net of the violent many, were swept the decent few, and *they* were the martyrs. If the very first Christianity was Theosophy, or rather a portion of it, we can hardly expect anything different today, since human nature is the same; and the many grotesque perversions of so-called Theosophy are an abomination, just as were the perversions of earliest Christianity.

The whole of religion is *within* each man. This is one of the great secrets. One perversion was in making of the god within an *outside* god. No great harm, you would think? Well, that is what all the revealers of secrets thought, in their shortsightedness. Look at the result! Soon you had an outside god who can be ignored when convenient. After a while you felt that you could act as you liked without regard to consequences. Of course, it was not so crudely viewed as that. But that is the naked truth about the way in which many lived then and millions live today.

Against this we have the soul-truth that 'the kingdom of heaven is within,' and the kingdom of hell, too. The secret was half-revealed, half-concealed. 'Know Thy Self' was one expression of such half-revealed, half-concealed, truths. To the ordinary intellectual man it is rather a pleasant and clever saying. To the soul-student it has a world of meaning in it. In its ultimate essence it is an assertion of the Divinity within us all, and the injunction to identify ourselves with that divinity, by killing out the personality, the lower mask. But only the man whose mind is awake would instantly and usefully see that. To such a man the whole of the purpose of existence is contained in the formula.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

The real SELF is the Christ. It is *within*. Within each of us! Theosophy in daily life, which is identical with the Christianity of the very first times, so far as the latter went, is nothing more than an endeavor to follow the dictates of the God, the Christ, within each of us; that and no more.

How are we to know those dictates? If it is difficult, it is only because we have allowed them to be overwhelmed with rubbish and have let our brains swamp our intuitions. And often enough the worst of that rubbish is learned speculation. The world needs life and light. Those dictates, then, are the voice of conscience. It is the real voice of the god within. Give it a chance and it will speak ever more clearly. But it must be acted up to and there must be no self-deception or putting off.

Supposing this 'Theosophy' were the mainspring in man's daily life. He might be a down-and-, I was going to say 'out,' but such a man is never out, though he may be down. He might be wondering where to look for his next meal. His body might suffer. His mind might suffer. *He himself*, the soul, does not suffer at all. He would know that these were only necessary lessons and experiences or adjustments of nature. Even if he starved to death, knowing that he had lived up to the best in him, he would know that there are other lives in which to learn other lessons as his part in the world's progress. This is an extreme case, but it is used here in order to show the idea more clearly.

Theosophy expressed in terms of daily life, means doing the best one can to live in harmony with the god within. It is not 'a' god, but is like the sea as compared to a drop. Every soul in the world is a drop in this ocean and one who helps humanity unselfishly in the smallest act, helps himself, and vice versa. One who helps himself in the truest sense, helps humanity. There is no such thing as separateness, and brotherhood is not a sentiment, but a fact everywhere, except on the plane of stupid, sentimental, selfish illusion.

Take the other extreme, a rich man. His lesson is often more severe, because with him the soul often suffers without the brain-mind knowing how that soul is crucified. The lesson and the opportunity are lost because the brain does not know. Or, at least, the lesson largely fails of its purpose, for no lesson is ever really lost.

What are thousands of our poor people today but a portion of those who in previous lives failed to utilize worldly possessions properly, thinking that they were 'their very own,' as the saying is. They did not learn the lesson in one class, so they are having it in another. But, of course, many poor people have put themselves in such a position for the sake of helping others. Their brains may not know that they deliberately

THEOSOPHY IN DAILY LIFE

chose the place where they could do most good in the world, but *they*, the souls within them, do. Hence the shining lights we find among the poor, of every religion and no religion at all. If all the world's a stage, it is a school as well, and more so. These are only two explanations of poverty out of many.

So Theosophy in daily life has nothing to do with what the world calls good and bad fortune. A Theosophist is fortunate only in so far as he is using his present opportunities to push forward the world's progress, and the growth of the soul by experience. If he does his duty, whether it be street-sweeping, or adding figures in an office, or filling the air with instrumental harmony, it is all the same to the soul, so long as the lesson is learnt. It is the motive and the way in which a thing is done that count, more than what is done. But we must be honest with ourselves and be under no deception as to our motives.

Theosophy in daily life is a putting into action of the laws of conscience. If followed faithfully they will become more and more clear, and the sum of the world's misery will automatically grow less. Never mind about other people doing it first or at the same time. We can each be leaders of the world by thinking aright and doing our own work at the right time and place. Thought is real, and the right attitude to circumstances, good and bad, is a lead to the world. Someday our thought will strike another mind in a position to act more powerfully on the outer plane than we can. Sometimes our thought, if sufficiently pure, may sway a whole nation. Then the world is benefited, though it may never know that we were the cause. What does that matter? We have done our part, and that is enough. If we desire to see results we often ground the current, and our purpose is weakened. We can be sure there will be results for every cause we set in motion.

In short, Theosophy in daily life is doing our duty with the larger view of the good of the whole rather than that of ourselves only. Whatever answers to the divine part within each of us, *is* the good of the whole, because humanity is One, and Brotherhood is a Fact in nature.



“Now understand me well — it is provided in the essence of things that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary.”— *Walt Whitman*

SOME IRISH IMPRESSIONS

JAMES H. GRAHAM, F. R. P. S.



W HETHER in Donegal, where the poor inhabitant spades over the scanty soil which lies between the boulders near his hut, or in the east, where the fair ground will grow anything, there is on Irish land an enticement that tugs at the heart-strings of both native and stranger.

In this isle, beautiful, yet sad, as though the skies would weep for its trials, more is growing than the land produces. A nation is finding itself.

In the northwest there are bays and creeks, the valleys between the mountains, and sometimes the tide runs into the land, miles away from the open sea. The country is bare. Centuries ago the ancient forests were destroyed by the invader, and peat-bogs have supplanted them. At evening time householders may be seen driving their wee carts, with a patient donkey between the shafts, taking home a load of firing which has been dug from the peat-bog and dried for a few months. The donkeys are happy and strong. Loose animals will cheerfully take a noonday nap in the middle of the highway. Discretion is needed in driving a car; if there is no donkey just round a bend there may be a flock of geese, or children trudging with unwilling feet to school.

Southwards there is a land of faery. There are the hills whence the gods would come and the lakes and caves where the 'little folk' dwell. All is covered with remembrance of the past and hope of the future, when the time shall come for the lost mysteries to be recalled to life.

The south is more fertile and freely wooded. White cottages are on the hills, high above the ordinary levels. The cottagers live by ranging their sheep on the hillsides. They are a thrifty folk, and can live where others would fail to subsist. The sheep are sold to lowland farmers who fatten them for the market. Many the tale that is told of the wilfulness of the little ragamuffins; if they can, they will be up on the hillsides again at the first chance. They prefer mountain grass and freedom to soft pastures and fences.

The east is a fair country of cattle and pasture-land, of lush grass heavy with dew. The folk here are prosperous. It is said that they do not care to take the risks of growing grain, since the demand for Irish dairy-produce is always good.

Dublin is a great city. It is famous among English people for the

UNDERSTANDING

beautiful speech of its inhabitants. It was the home of William Q. Judge.

Traveling through the land, one feels that this ancient country will once more come into its own. Unemployment there certainly is, and emigration has been called the chief industry. But there are vast natural resources, almost untouched. They await the day when the Irish can use that which the gods have provided for his welfare.



SELF-GRATULATION

“SELF-GRATULATION, O Disciple, is like unto a lofty tower, up which a haughty fool has climbed. Thereon he sits in prideful solitude and unperceived by any but himself.” — *The Voice of the Silence*; translation by H. P. BLAVATSKY from the ‘Book of the Golden Precepts’



UNDERSTANDING

M. G. GOWSELL

ALTHOUGH no longer eye to eye, the age
When men saw thus but waits to be returned.
It waits. And understandings, long inurned,
Bide too, their time, until mankind, more sage,
Re-reads Life's dim palimpsests page by page.
Meanwhile, Man's peace-wise councils are adjourned,
And strife yet thrives from germs of concord spurned,
While newborn needs seem no one's to assuage.

Misunderstandings are but seeds of fear;
They bear the fruit of hate, not wide assent
To forge new brother-bonds for nations rent.
This earth might be as heaven within a year,
The Promised Land, long pictured as afar,
Were trust the mutual bond and guiding star.

*International Theosophical Headquarters,
Point Loma, California*



DEITY AND KARMAN

QUESTION: I would like to ask where and what is the place of God in the Theosophical scheme of things. Also, is not the behavior of man and the entities beneath him totally ruled by what Theosophists call Karman? My motive in asking is the obtaining of authentic information.

ANSWER: This question has often been asked. In order properly to answer it, let us choose the Socratic method, and ask the questioner a question. How can this querent expect to obtain a clear answer to his question until the question itself has more definiteness to it, and a more perfect outline?

In the first place, what is meant by 'God'? Is it the God of the Christians which is meant, or the God of the Hebrews? Is it the God of the Brâhmans? Is it the God of the native American Indian? Is it the God of the Eskimo? Is it the God of the Druid, or is it the Zeus of the Greek, or the Jupiter of the Roman, and so forth? You ask a question, and tacitly suppose that 'God' conveys an idea sufficiently clear and definite to all men, whereas history shows us that there never was a question on which men differ so greatly as upon the

answers they might give as regards the nature of the Divine.

We may briefly say first, that for such national or theoretical gods as those above alluded to, be they one or be they many, and which are the offspring of man's religious imagination, the Theosophical philosophy has absolutely no place. Theosophy deals with realities, and not with men's mere beliefs or imaginings about infinites or supposed infinites.

The very heart of the Theosophical Religion-Philosophy-Science, is the Divine, as we call it, because we must call it by some name in order to let others know what we are talking about. Concerning the thing itself, the Theosophical philosophy is likewise extremely precise, definite, and runs straight to the point.

Our conception of the Divine is an impersonal and absolutely limitless Life — for we must give it some name that our human brains can understand. This Universal Life is the source and origin of everything, of all beings, and of all worlds; the best qualification of it that perhaps could be given to it would be comprised in the one word 'Space.' Space comprises everything, because it is everything.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

There is nothing outside of it, therefore it is the ALL.

Space, as Theosophists use the word, does not mean mere extension of matter. It means everything that ever was, that is, or that ever will be, visible and invisible, small and great, on all planes, because all these are comprised in the abstract meaning which we give to the word Space. It is not mere limitless extension; nor is the Divine a stock or a stone; but all these are in the Divine, so to say, and partakers of the Universal Life, which it is. Can you think of anything which is outside of Space? Of course not.

But our God is not a personal God, obviously not. It never was not and it never will cease to be. It neither thinks, nor feels, nor acts, because all these actions are predicates of *finite* entities such as men. The Zeus of the ancient Greeks, or the Jehovah of the ancient Hebrews, who thundered and lightened, are in either case a conception of the Divine which, in our majestic Theosophical philosophy, seems not merely grotesque to us, but downright blasphemous.

May we not say, therefore, that the Divine, Universal Life, Space, is neither conscious nor unconscious, neither active nor inactive? A long string of such hypothetical contraries might be enumerated, all of them expressing human emotional or mental actions; but what good would it do? Assuredly these cannot be ascribed to the Divine, to

That which is at once limitless and endlessly enduring. All such contraries are but descriptions of human imaginings, taking their root and rise in our own limited human consciousness.

We are conscious, and in our egoism, we imagine that the stock or the stone is unconscious. Theosophy teaches us better. All entities and things are offsprings of the Universal Life, and each, in its way and manner, and to the fullest extent of its capacity, contains all that we do as enlightened human beings — in other words, each contains all in germ.

These differences among entities arise out of the various stages of evolution which they have respectively attained. Some things are more advanced than others, and manifest thereby the more fully the inner potencies, faculties, powers, call them what you like, which are at the heart or core of every human being, and of every other entity or being or thing.

Hence, answering the question more directly, in view of the foregoing necessary explanation, it may be said with perfect truth, and said emphatically, that the Theosophical philosophy has no 'God,' *as that word is commonly understood by people who do not think*, and who therefore imagine that ideas which have become popularized by time, and which throw one's intuitions of the Divine into a chaos of contradictions, must contain some essence of reality, some essential truth.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

Not so very long ago men thought that the sun moved around the earth, and that the stars in the splendid, dark-blue vault of midnight were sparkling light-points placed there by a personal God in order to proclaim his own greatness to his erring and sinning children on earth. We know better now. No, such a God, or a God of any such kind, has no place in our Doctrine of Truth.

Nevertheless, no one can equal the Theosophist in the unspeakably profound reverence which fills his heart as he endeavors to raise his spirit in awe in contemplation of the Divine. It is our Source whence we came and whither we are journeying on our return pilgrimage to it; we issued forth from the 'Bosom of the Divine'—if we may use easily understood terms—as unselfconscious God-sparks, and shall return to it as fully selfconscious gods, thereafter to take a god-like part in the great Cosmic Labor. We are even now co-operating instruments, or rather co-operating agencies, in the fulfillment of the great Cosmic Work, to the extent of our capacity.

Turning now to the second part of the question: with regard to "the behavior of men and things—is it not wholly ruled by Karman?" To this we answer most emphatically, Yes, with a minor exception to be noted in an instant; but when Karman is understood, it will then be immediately seen that it is not Fate, as the form of the

question might suggest. The Theosophist rejects Fate as emphatically as he does Cosmical Anarchy.

Karman is what we ourselves have brought about; Karman is a Sanskrit word meaning Action and Consequence. Karman is what we do, and the consequences that flow back upon us from that doing. We learn the lessons of life through Karman which we ourselves sowed in action. No God outside sets Karman upon us. Karman is an intrinsic factor of Universal Nature. It can be called a Law, if you like to use popular human phraseology; and to that we have no objection, provided Karman be understood to be simply the teaching of act and consequence. If you put your finger in the flame it will be burned. God did not put your finger there; you did it. You put yourself under the operation of the forces and workings of Nature itself, and suffer the consequences.

When you say that "men and things are ruled by Karman," I object only to the word 'ruled.' A king rules, or a government rules; but Karman is neither a king nor a government. It is no person; it is an impersonal operation of the universe, inseparable from its working because it is that working itself. Theosophists would rather say that men arouse the operation of the natural laws, in other words of Karman, by their acts, and suffer the consequences.

No, there is no place in the Theosophical philosophy for a personal

THEOSOPHICAL FORUM

entity, which is at the same time infinite and eternal, nor for the theory that such an entity has created men and things, and rules them as does a king. If the Theosophical philosophy did not reject these fables, how could it explain, as it indeed does explain very beautifully, the manifest evils and imperfections and sufferings and miseries and horrors which exist in the world? As the action of this purely theoretical and supposititious Deity? If so, then such a Deity is a very dreadful God, and no man with a heart in his breast could accept it for a moment, once he has understood the situation.

If such a God be all-good, and the creator of all, then how account for these evils? How account for sin and suffering and weaknesses and evil desires, and for such things as natural catastrophes — earthquakes and cyclones and tidal waves — killing their tens of thousands on occasion, with no more apparent compunction than follows the sweeping away of the flotsam and jetsam of the seashore?

Does God, supposed by some to be all-good, all-powerful, therefore create imperfection and evil, and send the latter upon the poor helpless creatures whom he created? Such a God Theosophy cannot accept, for the majestic and inflexible logic of the Theosophical philosophy, as well as the sense of justice abiding in the human heart, to say nothing of the instinctive reverence which the Theosophist learns to

know for the Divine, all combine to render such a conception of the Divine impossible.

It might be said in passing, in explanation, that these imperfections and so forth, which have just been spoken of, are not 'God's work,' whether they be great or small, but are of the very nature of the Cosmos itself, which is a vast body of evolving entities and things in a practically infinite scale of differentiated evolution. This accounts for the imperfections and for the contrarities and so forth.

But when the Theosophist turns in contemplation to the Invisible, to the vast realms of the Unseen, and realizes that there is not an atom anywhere, not a point in space anywhere, which is outside of the sweep and action of the Universal Life: when he realizes that the Universe is infilled, and full-filled, with unselfconscious, and partly selfconscious, and, lastly, godlike, fully selfconscious entities, extending in endless hierarchies, high and low, in all directions so to say, then his heart is filled with that unspeakable reverence for the Divine of which mention has been made.

Yes, as Katherine Tingley so often has said, the Theosophist no more rejects the Divine, or the Divine throughout the Cosmos, than he rejects the sunlight; but the Theosophist does not accept any infinite, eternal, personal God, which things are to him a flagrant contradiction, not merely in terms

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

but in facts. All this is unreasonable.

A personal, creative, infinite God of any kind therefore, the Theosophist does not accept nor teach, because, outside of other reasons, such a God would be responsible for the imperfections and evil in the world. If not, then he would not be omnipotent or all-powerful. Together with the an-

cient, the Theosophist holds that only a perfect work could emanate from Infinite Perfection; yet none more than the Theosophist withal senses a greater spiritual elevation of soul when his whole inner being is raised in reverential aspiration in the ineffable intuition of the Divine which our philosophy teaches us of.

—G. DE P.

WHAT THEOSOPHY IS NOT AND DOES NOT TEACH

THEOSOPHY is NOT Atheism; nor does it teach a *personal* God, as the infinite and absolute Deity.

Theosophy is NOT Buddhism, not Hindûism, not Christianity, nor any one of the religions of the world.

Theosophy is NOT Christian Science, Faith Healing, Spiritualism, Psychism, nor Clairvoyance.

Theosophy does NOT teach or endorse hypnotism or any psychic practices.

WHAT THEOSOPHY IS AND DOES TEACH

THEOSOPHY is Divine Wisdom; it teaches belief in the Supreme, that at the Root of all is Divinity 'in whom we live and move and have our being,' transcending all limitations of thought or comprehension, immeasurable, Infinite, hence Impersonal,— the Unknowable, Absolute.

Yet Theosophy is Religion Itself; it is the very Essence of Wisdom-Religion. Literally translated, 'Theosophy' is 'Divine Wisdom,' from which all the great World-Religions have sprung, the Parent-Stem of which they are the branches.

Yet it gives the explanation of these, explains their rationale and their danger.

On the contrary, Theosophy protests against these, explaining them, and it points out the terrible dangers attending them. It asserts most emphatically that they do not lead to true knowledge, nor to a true understanding of life.

THEOSOPHICAL FORUM

Theosophy does NOT offer spiritual instruction for money.

Theosophy does NOT teach transmigration of the human soul into animal or lower forms. William Q. Judge, the second Leader of the Theosophical Movement, and H. P. Blavatsky's successor, says: "Reincarnation does not mean that we go into animal forms after death, as is erroneously supposed by some. 'Once a man always a man' is a saying of the great sages."

Theosophy is NOT fatalism.

Theosophy does NOT teach the doctrine of 'original sin,' but on the contrary:

"Theosophy teaches that the higher knowledge and true spiritual development can be gained in no other way than by the greatest purity of life and conduct."

Theosophy teaches Reincarnation, that man lives many lives on earth, but always in human form, returning again and again to take up the thread of experience to reap what he has sown in the past, and thus to enjoy to the full all the possibilities and attain that perfection of evolution that earth-life affords.

Theosophy teaches that all life is under the governance of law, that 'whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' Hence Theosophy is the gospel of hope and encouragement, for while today we are reaping the harvest of past thought and action, we can also today sow new seed which shall bear a new harvest in the future. Theosophy teaches that for all there is another chance, another life and other lives, in which to achieve his high destiny, and that the Divine broods over us and leads us to our own.

Theosophy teaches that man is divine in essence and therefore that no man is essentially sinful, but that he can rise ultimately above all sin and triumph over all obstacles, and at last win to Freedom,—freedom to live in accord with his highest aspirations, freedom to act and be a co-worker with the Divine.

—J. H. F.

JUSTICE AND GENEROSITY

R. MACHELL

THERE is an adage which warns us to be just before we are generous. This venerable proverb seems to imply that the two are not always compatible. To examine them a little: What is the essential idea in justice? Is it not well expressed in the old saying, "To every man his due"? This simple formula seems to express the entire scope and purpose of justice.

But if everyone received his due, what need would then remain for generosity? Would it be right to give to any man more than his due? Clearly the warning in the proverb is directed against a popular conception that justice alone is not sufficient without the aid of generosity. To some minds no doubt the two are widely different if not actually opposed to one another. It is probable indeed that both the words have been interpreted in ways incongruous with their original significance.

Have we not heard it said that "Justice must be tempered with Mercy"? If justice needs tempering it is not what its name implies. It cannot be the giving to every man his due. Or if it is, what need is there of mercy? Can it be mercy's function to pervert justice? If not, then it must be supposed that justice is not adequate. To some minds justice may seem too cold and passionless, something austere, inhuman, pitiless, but mercy has sympathy for human weaknesses. Mercy forgives where justice has condemned.

Can justice then be more or less than just? The weak man shrinks from justice fearing judgment and condemnation; but are these the only attributes of justice? In *human* courts of law it may be so, for though justice itself is absolute there is no certainty of full justice in the decrees of any human court. The court can but investigate the evidence, and endeavor to establish some foundation upon which a judgment may be based. The human court is liable to error while its whole scheme of penalties and punishments is arbitrary and not founded upon natural principles.

Nature does not hold court in order to decide what consequence shall follow such an antecedent cause. With her there is no blame nor condemnation: she does not need to pity or forgive. All her decrees are natural, inevitable, and just. For her the consequence is actually inherent in the cause; the cause involves the consequence.

The courts of law devised by men are but a parody of Nature's

JUSTICE AND GENEROSITY

plan of justice. The penalties that man decrees are arbitrary expedients, not the inevitable consequences of proved and unquestionable causes. The idea of punishment pervading all the judgments of the court is but the spirit of revenge disguised in robes of justice. This spirit of revenge, coupled with a desire to inspire the criminal with fear of the law, reacts upon the court and makes it pitiless. No wonder then that men have said, "Let justice be tempered with mercy." The brand of justice they refer to is the human kind based on the ancient code of vengeance: "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

But in the first proverb quoted, the injunction is to temper generosity with justice. It seems to say, 'Be just!' 'Be just even as nature is, without thought of vengeance'; then there will be no need of generosity, so far, at least, as the recipient is concerned; for the effects of mercy and generosity are all included in the establishment of perfect justice. But such is not the generally accepted understanding of the words.

Mercy and generosity are looked upon as qualities of the heart, entirely beneficent, and universally attractive. But justice is looked on coldly; it seems too impersonal: it stirs no violent emotion: in some minds it excites awe and reverence, in others fear, but rarely love. To the ordinary mind it will seem unattractive as compared with either mercy or generosity.

Mercy is tender and pitiful; she is loved by all, and feared by none. And generosity is well beloved; for she is lavish in gifts, reckless of consequences, uncalculating, in a word emotional. The adage recognises this and sounds a warning against the danger of mistaking an emotion for a virtue, when it says, "Be just before you are generous."

The gratification of a generous emotion may be an act of merest self-indulgence far removed from virtue. Who has not met with people who are always ready to relieve distress by gifts of money, which they will not part with to an honest creditor however grave his need may be. Such generosity is hardly admirable. Surely justice would say 'first pay your debts.' When that is done it will be time to think of generosity.

So justice may seem cold and hard, stern and implacable: but generosity wins every heart. A generous rascal will often seem more lovable than a more honest man. It may be that his generosity is actually more precious than the other's honesty: it may be that it springs from some divine impulse, love, or compassion, and not from any false emotion or desire for gratitude.

We must remember the duality of human nature, and not condemn a weak, unbalanced, well-intentioned person as a hypocrite. His vice is perhaps weakness rather than hypocrisy. So also justice, which in one case may be inspired by fear of consequences, may, in another instance,

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

have its origin in spiritual wisdom, which includes all virtues, justice as well as generosity.

Proverbs are sign-posts and danger-signals on the path that leads to Wisdom. They have their uses; but when wisdom's light is seen the sign-posts on the path can be neglected: that beacon-light is all the pilgrim needs. It has been well said that "the wise man does good as naturally as he breathes." Therefore, 'BE WISE!'

"Be wise! 'tis a marvel of words, and a mock for the fool and the blind,
But I saw it writ in the heavens, and its fashioning there did I find.

Be Wise; and thy budding wisdom shall grow as the great oak grows
From the seed that falls in the forest, when the sorrow-full north wind blows.
Be Wise as the Sun in his shining, who heeds not the heat of his rays,
But shines with the glory of wisdom, to lighten the dangerous ways,
Where men in their ignorance wander like shepherdless sheep in the night,
Nor hear not the voice of their leader, nor see not the life-giving light."

RECENT DISCOVERIES, ACTIVITIES, AND PROBLEMS IN SCIENCE

C. J. RYAN



THE planet Mars, by reason of its general resemblance to our own world and the advantages it offers for convenient observation at comparatively frequent intervals, has long been an object of intensive study. Quite lately, some very interesting new information about the planet has been gained by Dr. Trumpler and Mr. H. H. Wright at the Lick Observatory and announced by the University of California.

It seems that the mysterious network of lines—the so-called 'canals'—have an actual existence, though no evidence of their being waterways of artificial formation has been found. They appear to be lines of vegetation marking valleys, but there is no satisfactory explanation of their regular linear structure. It is satisfactory, however, to learn that the distinguished astronomers who have fought so hard for the objective existence of the 'canals,' in face of bitter and prejudiced opposition, were right. Let us hope we have heard the last of that controversy which, to an impartial observer, has always seemed to lack dignity on the part of the critics of Schiaparelli, the discoverer of the lines.

That the dark markings are caused by vegetation seems undeniable because the effect of the change of seasons is plainly visible. Of course we cannot expect to see animal life or artificial structures, if

PROBLEMS IN SCIENCE

such exist, yet the presence of vegetation makes it extremely probable that animals of some kind live in the forests, if any.

In connexion with the possibility of animal or human life on Mars, the latest discoveries about the atmosphere of the planet are of special interest, because they make it quite reasonable to suppose that beings not unlike ourselves may flourish there, even if under rather different conditions.

Till recently the atmosphere of Mars was supposed to be very shallow and rare, and the temperature very cold. Dr. Trumpler's intensive studies of the planet at its recent near approaches, aided by 1700 photographs, have reversed this notion, for he finds that the atmosphere of Mars closely compares with that of the earth in depth, being about 52 miles deep; the earth's atmosphere extends to about 68 miles from the ground. No doubt the temperature of Mars is rather colder than ours, but, with a reasonably thick atmosphere such as Dr. Trumpler finds, the heat collected during the day would not be immediately dissipated at nightfall as would be the case if the atmosphere were as rare as formerly thought.

The discovery that a larger proportion of the visible disk of Mars than was supposed is due to the atmosphere, carries the need of revising our estimate of the solid globe, and Dr. Trumpler finds that the equatorial diameter has to be reduced to 4133 miles and the polar to 4087, with a possible error of no more than ten miles.

Mars has far less cloud than the earth, though fogs are common. Mr. Wright, one of the Lick observers, states that there are two distinct cloud-levels on Mars, the upper clouds being blue while the lower ones are white. The white clouds are seemingly rain-clouds like ours, but the nature of the upper ones is yet unknown.

This new information has nearly all been obtained by means of color-photography which has only lately been applied to the study of the planets. Ultra-red light easily penetrates a great depth of atmosphere, hence plates taken through screens which only allow those rays to pass, show the body of the planet without interference by the atmosphere. On the other hand, plates taken through screens permitting the passage of ultra-violet rays only, which penetrate the atmosphere feebly and are mostly reflected by it, reveal the extent of the atmosphere above the surface. By comparing the two kinds of plates the difference in diameter between the solid and gaseous parts of Mars can easily be measured.

Venus comes nearer to the earth than Mars, but there are so many observational difficulties that astronomers know little or nothing of the conditions of its surface. There has even been nothing known about the inclination of its axis or the length of its day. Quite recently, how-

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

ever, it has been announced that the inclination of the axis has been determined. The difficulty lies in the rareness and faintness of the vague shadings on Venus. As the planet is covered to a great depth by clouds, it is probable that we never see the solid surface.

The problem of the inclination of the axis is, of course, entangled with that of the length of the day. For many years the generally accepted theory was that the axis was fairly upright, and that the planet rotated only once during its annual journey around the sun; therefore it would always present the same face to the sun, just as our moon always presents the same face to the earth. This arrangement necessarily implies no alternations of day and night, and would appear to render life as we know it impossible.

The new discovery, which is the result of many years intensive observation by Professor W. H. Pickering, confirmed by two eminent English astronomers, Dr. Steavenson and Mr. McEwen, completely upsets the popular theory and is of special interest to students of the Eastern Wisdom as brought to the West by H. P. Blavatsky in her great work, *The Secret Doctrine*.

By a careful study of the faint markings sometimes visible on Venus, the observers mentioned have ascertained that the direction of rotation is the same as that of the earth and most of the planets, but the *axis is nearly horizontal*, being tipped over at a great angle. The poles, therefore, are each in turn directed towards the sun and away from it. Conditions of life would be very curious for us, but probably not un-supportable. As Venus is shrouded in dense cloud stratum for at least twenty-five miles above the surface, the intense solar heat must be greatly modified. The severe cold which might be expected to prevail for several months in certain regions would also be reduced from the same cause. The length of the day on Venus has not been definitely ascertained yet; Professor Pickering favors a period of about three of our days. It is certainly a short period.

In relation to this interesting discovery and the claim that H. P. Blavatsky had access to definite information on many facts of nature unknown to science when she wrote *The Secret Doctrine*, the following quotation from that work will be seen to be very significant:

“Another allegory, in *Harivansa*, is that Śakra [the ‘Regent’ or informing ruling deity of the planet Venus] went to Śiva asking him to protect his pupils, the Daityas and Asuras, from the fighting gods; and to further his object he performed a Yoga-rite ‘imbibing the *smoke* of chaff with his *head downwards* for 1000 years.’ This refers to the great inclination of the axis of Venus (amounting to 50 degrees), and to its being enveloped in eternal clouds.”— *The Secret Doctrine*, II, 32

It will be seen by this that H. P. Blavatsky was not only able to penetrate behind the thick veil of allegory in which the ancient scriptures

PROBLEMS IN SCIENCE

are written, but knew that the axis of Venus was greatly inclined to the plane of its orbit, a fact which no Western astronomer suspected till lately.

In referring to the unusual knowledge of natural phenomena displayed at times by H. P. Blavatsky when it was necessary to illustrate some special argument, we must not infer that she attached undue importance to the accumulation of a great mass of facts about the material world and the reaching of conclusions by the modern process of induction. Rather the contrary, for she favored the process of reasoning from the general to the particular. But as her Teachers possess a comprehensive knowledge of Nature, including planes of forces and causative intelligences that western physical science has not even glimpsed, it was found desirable, in order to demonstrate this, to give an occasional proof of superior knowledge in support of the authoritative position taken in regard to their acquaintance with the nature, origin, and destiny of man. The cold facts of science are in themselves of little importance in view of the higher matters of the soul-life, though of course they have their full place.

In this connexion it is deeply interesting to find that certain broad-minded scientists are abandoning the notion that intensive study of external Nature — intellectual knowledge of material phenomena — can be a substitute for concentration upon the development of the spiritual in man, or what may properly be called Religion. Science has a rightly honored place in the intellectual development of man, but it is not the only pathway to the heavens, and it can, and often is, prostituted to the lowest aims — warfare, greed, and unbrotherliness in every form. A recent and widely published article by Dr. Garrett P. Serviss contains an excellent exposition of this position; it might have been written by a member of the staff of this Theosophical magazine.

Dr. Serviss, in speaking of the attempt to exalt science above religion, forcibly repudiates the efforts being made to sweep away the spiritual dykes which protect the world against the increasing flood of criminality, selfishness, and immorality. In language not too common in the mouth of a trained scientist, he says that the true and proper work of science is entirely related to the material world and the mental side of man's nature, and very largely in connexion with the improvement of physical conditions of living. Even the study of the mind is not beyond its scope, though that cannot be carried on with the exactness of mathematical analysis. But Dr. Serviss boldly declares the limit beyond which modern science cannot go:

"to assert that science can supply the place of that meditation upon one's inner self and its destiny which constitutes the essence of religion, is nonsense on the one hand and a snare on the other."

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

Reason does not carry us beyond the possibilities of physical nature, he says; beyond the illusions of matter, as a student of the Eastern Wisdom would express it. It is refreshing to find a scientist who understands and respects the 'scientific method' showing that he fully realizes its limits, and placing it in due fraternity with 'meditation upon the inner self' which according to Theosophy is the 'door which opens inward only' and leads to wisdom and the immortal life.

Another interesting report comes from the Lick Observatory which may be a valuable hint toward the interpretation of certain Eastern teachings given by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Secret Doctrine*. Dr. Stebbins has been comparing the brightness of Jupiter's four large moons with certain unvarying stars with the object of testing the variations in the light of our sun. Jupiter's moons have no light of their own but simply reflect that received from the sun, and any changes of radiation *on all four moons* at the same time would, of course, be caused by fluctuations of the sun's emission of light.

The observer failed to get what he desired, but made an unexpected discovery. The four moons were found not to vary in brightness at the same time, but each one independently of the others. The entire change of illumination of each satellite exactly coincides with the time it takes to travel round Jupiter which, of course, differs in the four cases. By careful study of the variations of light, which are due to permanent markings — dark and light — on the satellites, Professor Stebbins ascertained that each moon turns the same face toward Jupiter throughout its complete revolution or month, thereby behaving exactly as our moon does in relation to the earth.

The strange coincidence of rotation with revolution observed in our moon and Jupiter's four, leads one to suppose that some important law of nature is concerned with this peculiarity, something more than tidal action, and it would be profitable to learn if all the other satellites in our system are affected similarly. Students of Theosophy who are looking for hints on this subject will find in *The Secret Doctrine* statements which, when considered together and related to the new discovery about Jupiter's satellites, are significant. See Vol. I, pp. 179, 180, 155, 156.

Correspondents to the *Observer* (London), have lately discussed the question of the influence of the moon on vegetation, a subject which science has not frankly faced yet, apparently in fear of admitting that one more of the 'superstitions' of the ancients is no superstition, and Mr. W. A. Littell, writing from Valencia, Venezuelà, gave such interesting testimony that an excerpt from his letter is worth quoting:

"In Spain I was connected with a railway and we purchased all our sleepers from Portugal. One of the conditions in connexion therewith was that they should only be cut in

PROBLEMS IN SCIENCE

the *menguente* (*i. e.*, when the moon was on the wane). If by any chance the supplier, in bad faith, supplied us with sleepers cut in the *cresciente* (when the moon was rising [waxing?]) the heart of the wood rotted within a year, whereas wood cut at the proper time lasted seven or eight years. This is an accepted and proved fact out here in the tropics, and we never accept wood cut in *cresciente*, and in cases where we have done so the wood has rotted within a few months, whereas beams cut under supervision at the proper time are still in our station roof as sound as the day they were put in forty years ago.

“It is supposed that this phenomenon is due to the action of the sap, which is rising during the growing of the moon, and there seems to me to be every reason to believe that there is truth in the theory, when one considers the influence of the moon over tides, lunatics, etc. . . .

Puerto Cabello and Valencia Railway Company, Ltd., Valencia, Venezuela, S.A.”

Mr. Littell writes as a railroad man who has to face economical necessities, and is not to be put off by superstitious fancies. Another correspondent points out that the explanation probably lies in the great activity of destructive bacilli during the increasing moon when the sap is rising most vigorously. We hear more of the effect of the moon on vegetation in the tropics than elsewhere, and it seems reasonable that in the tropics where there are no great changes of temperature during the year the influence of the moon should be more noticeable than in higher latitudes where heat and cold are dominating factors in plant growth.

As we have pointed out in these columns before, there is a steady increase of recorded evidence in favor of unexplained lunar forces which influence in some unknown way vegetable and animal life, and at times even affect human beings. Recent researches in this line, including Dr. Munro Fox's discoveries of undeniable lunar influence on the reproduction of Sea-Urchins in the Red Sea, were fully discussed from the Theosophical standpoint in the August, 1926, number of THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH. How little we know of the finer and more obscure forces of nature is made plain when such matters as these lunar influences, or the Millikan Rays, come as complete surprise.

In regard to obscure forces, the problem of the temperature of the planets opens a curious line of thought relative to possibilities for mankind not worked out by Western science but familiar to the deep thinkers of the East.

We have recently learned that the photo-electric cell, that exquisitely sensitive heat-measurer, shows that Jupiter and Saturn are extremely cold, their recorded temperatures being far below zero, a great contrast to the cheerful warmth of Mars. We do not know whether the interior of the two giant planets is warmer than the mass of dense vapors in which they are enveloped, and it is difficult to understand how such vast quantities of vapor, much of it moving at enormous speed, can exist in the presence of a temperature of about a hundred degrees below zero. Such conditions would be impossible on our earth, but of course

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

we know absolutely nothing of the chemical, physical, or magnetic condition of the solid parts of Jupiter or Saturn.

The discovery of the supposed frigid state of these planets has again aroused the gratuitous assertion that they cannot be the abodes of highly organized or intelligent life. This assumes, of course, that bodies like ours are essential for the manifestation of such life. Certainly, if there is no oxygen, no carbon, no water, etc., *we* could not exist there, but that proves nothing against the possibility of entirely different lines of evolution leading to physical vehicles of mind suitable to the conditions of other planets.

But if the conditions were not so very different from ours, if a low temperature, for instance, were the chief difference, it is not impossible that the human body might develop unexpected powers of resistance to cold. To a degree, the Eskimo have adapted themselves to arctic temperatures, but they require warm houses and furs; there is, however, evidence that the human body can be trained by special processes to endure intense cold without feeling the least chill or inconvenience. Little as the hidden potentialities of man are yet known in the West, Eastern philosophers have searched for and discovered psycho-physiological powers which make our studies seem very elementary indeed. Many accounts have appeared from Eastern lands of yogis who live comfortably under conditions of extreme cold; H. P. Blavatsky, when living in India, endorsed them, and she had unusually favorable opportunities of learning the truth.

A striking confirmation has just appeared in Madame Alexandra David-Néel's *My Journey to Lhasa*. This author is well qualified by her scientific training, long residence in Tibet, and thorough knowledge of the language, to understand what she saw. She is a profound student of Tibetan Buddhism and has translated Tibetan books. A reviewer in the *Times Literary Supplement* (London) says:

"The author, whose high qualifications have already been mentioned, has succeeded in imparting a considerable measure of useful and trustworthy information."

In regard to the Tibetan Buddhistic claim that heat can be generated in the human body by certain mental training, Madame David-Néel makes this remarkable statement, which certainly ought to arouse profound interest in scientific, philosophical, and religious circles:

"I had studied under two Tibetan *gompchens* (hermits) the strange art of increasing the internal heat. For long I had been puzzled by the stories I had heard and read on the subject, and as I am of a somewhat scientific turn of mind I wanted to make the experiment myself. With great difficulty, showing an extreme perseverance in my desire to be initiated into the secret, and after a number of ordeals, I succeeded in reaching my aim.

"I saw some hermits seated night after night motionless on the snow, entirely naked,

THE SPIRIT OF BEAUTY AND REPOSE

sunk in meditation, while the terrible winter blizzard whirled and hissed around them! I saw under the bright full moon the test given to their disciples who, on the shore of a lake or a river in the heart of the winter, dried on their bodies, as on a stove, a number of sheets dipped in the icy water. And I learned the means of performing these feats.

"I had inured myself, during five months of the cold season, to wearing the single thin cotton garment of the students at a 13,000 ft. level. But the experience once over, I felt that a further training would have been a waste of time for me, who, as a rule, could choose my dwelling in less severe climates or provide myself with heating-apparatus."

It would seem, therefore, that we need not assume that planets far colder than the earth would necessarily be uninhabitable by man.

THE SPIRIT OF BEAUTY AND REPOSE

GRACE KNOCHE

"Shakespeare brought back to us the spirit of ancient beauty. He was a true Theosophist." — KATHERINE TINGLEY in *Theosophy: the Path of the Mystic*, p. 182

"Here is one more proof of the cyclic evolution of our Theosophical ideas."

— H. P. BLAVATSKY in *Lucifer*, March, 1890 (Editorial)



HE Greek ideals were four: clarity, simplicity, balance, and repose. The result was Beauty. Not exterior loveliness alone, such as that of her

"Whose fatal beauty launched a thousand ships
And burnt the topless towers of Ilium"*

but spiritual beauty, as that of the soul in lofty womanhood, in the Iphigenia, the Alcestis, the Antigone, the Pallas Athena, of Greek dramatic art.

When Katherine Tingley designed and then erected the Aryan Memorial Temple in Lomaland (now the Temple of Peace); when she built that 'jewel on the brow of beauty,' the first open-air Greek Theater in America; and when, still earlier, she turned an angular 'hotel and sanitarium' into the lovely Râja-Yoga Academy, an architectural triumph, she set the architectural keynote of her new International City. And that keynote was Beauty and Repose.

Nor did she stop with the designs, leaving the practical carrying-out of them to others. Until the structures were completed to the last splash of gold-leaf on the flaming tip of the domes, their designer was here, there, and everywhere, superintending, directing, sometimes changing, always improving, every detail subject to her keen supervision, her

*In the archaic mysteries of which Laomedon, father of Priam, was the reputed founder, H. P. Blavatsky tells us that "the earth-bound material soul (the fourth principle), was personified in Menelaus' faithless wife (the fair Helen). . . ."— *The Secret Doctrine*, II, 796

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

scrutinizing care. There were those who wondered why she would not leave more to the mere builders, and save her strength and time. But they ceased to wonder as the plans took shape. Then it was clear that she was needed.

That was more than twenty-seven years ago, and tens of thousands of visitors have poured through Lomaland-gates since then. In numberless cases they have declared that they were first attracted by the strange and mystic beauty of the architecture, the lofty, glass-domed Temple and School, rising above the envioning shrubbery and trees, gleaming like opals in the sunlight, visible for miles around. Nothing elsewhere could approach them in beauty of silhouette and modeling, (nor can today, we aver) whether seen against sunset or sunrise-sky or at high noon. They were eloquent of the Spirit of the Past (and so are eloquent today).

Ability, power, simplicity, clarity, balance, and repose — there were the ideals all. As proof of the permanency of these ideals we have the fact that today, a generation later, increasing numbers are attracted to them, drawn by their sheer beauty. Architects come here, even from Europe, to study them. Architecturally they follow none of the world's set seven styles; nor could they be said to form an eighth, in a limited meaning of the term. Rather, they are the sublimated evolution of all, rising into a spiritual rather than material loveliness, and because of that to the dignity of pure style.

And no wonder. The underlying motive was apart. While they were building Katherine Tingley said one day (in substance) to a little group of students of whom the writer was one: "These will be our Theosophical messengers. They have their silent message and people will feel it and receive it. It is the message of Antiquity, which stood for beauty and repose."

The beneficent influence of such an effort in a commercial age need not be stressed, and as we see this spirit of repose and beauty flaming and singing out in the newer architectural efforts here and there throughout the world (as it does, in slow but sure *crescendo*) we ask: Did this early effort loose some new and splendid psychology to do its work on the hungry souls of men? — new, and yet not new, for in reality it is immeasurably old. It would seem so.

Recently, despatches from England announce the judges' decision in the matter of designs for the new Shakespeare Memorial Theater at Stratford-on-Avon, and it is significant that they stress the very qualities so emphasized by Katherine Tingley when the Lomaland Temple and School were building towards thirty years ago. They state that the winning design was chosen from a list of seventy-two submitted, and

THE SPIRIT OF BEAUTY AND REPOSE

that the judges were unanimous in their decision because of the

“(1) great ability and power of composition; (2) largeness and simplicity of handling, unequaled by any other design; (3) suitability for the site on the Avon banks, and picturesqueness in silhouette and modeling; and (4) conformity with the traditions of Stratford.”

Power, largeness, simplicity, suitability, conformity with the traditions of the place, picturesqueness — in a word, *design*. What of the future when these golden, ancient principles and ideals, so forgotten during the craze for building with one eye on the main chance of profit, are active and honored in a significant public work?

The successful competitor, Miss Elizabeth Scott, has (to borrow the doctor's phrase) an architectural heredity. Sir George Gilbert-Scott, R. A., the great Victorian architect, and Sir George Bodley, R. A., of the same period and considered equally great, were her great-uncles. Sir Giles Scott, a second cousin, won in his early days in open competition for a design for the Liverpool Cathedral. The despatches seem to stress these facts. But we submit that there may be other causes quite as fundamental as 'heredity' to produce a result in which the spirit of beauty and repose were the real objective. Miss Scott tells us that she worked out in her mind the design in the course of long walks in the country — a very hilly country. The mere work of reducing it to form on paper occupied but six weeks. Of it she says (as reported in *Public Opinion* for January 15, 1928):

“In my Memorial Theater design I have aimed at creating an atmosphere of space and ease, in addition to the ordinary structural necessity; there will be ample foyers, which will help in impressing the public that they have come to a place of ease and comfort, where they can for a time forget the outside world. . . .

“The main theory to which I have sought to give expression is that buildings should not conceal the functions which they exist to fulfil. In my ideal city it is possible to read the buildings as you pass them in the street. . . .

“The first aim in designing a building, whatever its nature, should be to express its function clearly in the plan and elevations.”

It is an ancient teaching that Nature is a vast, mystic, invisible storehouse of all Beauty, all Wisdom that ever has been. Here and there comes a mind able to enter this treasury, though only here and there in our shut-in, unreposeful age. But it cannot be done by book-study and nothing more; it cannot be done by any system of picking locks. It can be done only by one sufficiently meditative, sufficiently mystical, to strike a balance between technical skill and knowledge, and the reposeful calm and beauty and largeness and ease and power of Nature herself.

Will the new Shakespeare Memorial Theater thrill the soul, as our Lomaland buildings do, with the ancient, quiet, eternal regard for spiritual and reposeful things? Nothing less than this could be worthy of Shakespeare, or of the old Greek dramatists who will also have their home there.

DUSTING THE MIND

PIET BONTJE

(Stenographic Report of Extemporaneous Address delivered at a meeting conducted by the William Quan Judge Theosophical Club, in the Rotunda of the Râja-Yoga Academy, Point Loma, California, on Sunday evening, November 13, 1927)



ADAME TINGLEY, Mr. Chairman, and Comrades: It has occurred to me that, since the mind 'gathers dust while it reflects,' and since we are supposed to reflect before speaking, we may expect to find a good deal of dust clinging to our words!

Philology is well acquainted with the process by which words gradually deteriorate. Words often lose caste, fall on evil days, and you will find the 'Holy Day' of one century a mere 'holiday' in a later period. A similar process, I find, takes place, or threatens to take place, in the life of every individual. This process becomes a real danger when certain words occur over and over again in the vocabulary of the individual.

We, here in Lomaland, are in such a position. By virtue of our common ideals, and because of the fact that we at all times try to remind ourselves of these ideals, certain words occur in our vocabulary again and again. Words like *Trust*, *Loyalty*, *Devotion*, *Enthusiasm*, *Unselfishness*, *Impersonality*, can be found on almost every page we write, and in practically every serious conversation that takes place on this Hill. The very fact that these words stand for some of the loftiest and most spiritual conceptions known to man, may make their thoughtless use a source of danger.

For these words have their home in the realm of the soul, and every time I use any of them without raising my mind to the plane of the soul, a little dust settles on the word so misused. Once it may have been ringing like a little bell struck — may have had mantramic power, — yet, as the process goes on, and I continue to use it glibly, its ring will become duller and duller, until, at last, the word has lost all power. It is then buried in dust and is no more sacred to me than any other noun.

Conscious of having lost something priceless, I may try to remedy this situation by purely external means: I may marshal my words in such a way as to create definite rhythms; I may hurl them at my audience or my readers with emotional violence; I may add sonorous adjectives, and pile superlative on superlative, pentasyllabic on pentasyllabic — all

DUSTING THE MIND

in the attempt to show how very profound my ideas are, and how very eager I am that others should be benefited by them. But it is of no avail. It is, in fact, a dead give-away. In the very act of trying to express some aspect of the soul-life, I am straining. The soul never strains. In spite of all my efforts — *because* of all my efforts, perhaps — my words will seem artificial and sound hollow.

I believe there is but one remedy for the situation, and that is the remedy suggested by H. P. Blavatsky: “It needs the gentle breezes of Soul-wisdom to brush away the dust of our illusions.” I must raise my mind to the plane of the soul.

It occurred to me this evening that a meeting like this, with so many inspiring aspects, is really an opportunity to raise one’s mind to the level of the soul. We certainly were challenged to do it tonight. Nor need its influence be confined to just this hour here; for I, as a spiritual being, am not only endowed with the faculty of memory, I have been given creative imagination: at will I can revisualize the scene, recreate its atmosphere.

So, if I recreate the atmosphere of this meeting, and think of it quietly and steadily, and then take the word I wish to get a deeper conception of, like *trust*, and hold it in my mind for a few moments — again quietly and steadily — I shall see something very inspiring happen. For ‘the gentle breezes of Soul-wisdom’ will begin ‘to brush away the dust of our illusions,’ the dust that has gathered around the word. Dilemmas prove no dilemmas; difficulties fade away; new aspects swing into view, each of them leading up to other aspects still more beautiful.

Slowly the word regains its power. *Trust* once more becomes like a bell, a gong, struck somewhere within the recesses of the soul. Once more the word glows; once more it floods the mind with light. And I feel like a man who walks on a meadow covered with flowers, beauty wherever he goes, sunshine everywhere, a lark darting up at his feet to soar upwards, ever upwards, until lost in the blue, its exultant song proclaiming still greater beauty, still more inspiring heights to reach. . . .

This thought-process by which I use the atmosphere created by the aspirations of my comrades, and some lofty ethical concept, as stepping-stones to swing right out into the impersonal, is one of the most sacred privileges granted me as thinker — Manas — Man. And we are to be congratulated that we live in a place where such a thought-process can be undertaken, without appreciable danger of reaction.

NEWS FROM THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD

OBSERVER



THE problem of the antiquity of man in America is attracting more attention than ever before, and as new discoveries are made new theories are being devised and discussed. Did the ancestors of the American Indians originate in America, or did they come from abroad? If the latter is the case, were they immigrants from northern Asia, from the western Pacific islands, or from the remains of the lost continent of Atlantis, or perhaps from all three localities? If the source of the American races lies in this continent, demand the ape-ancestry evolutionists, why do we find no relics of anthropoid apes?

A couple of years ago a tooth was discovered which some of the leading biologists declared to be 'humanoid,' *i. e.*, belonging to an ape-like man or man-like ape, and there was great rejoicing in certain Darwinian circles for this support to the theory of American anthropoids as ancestors to American men. But, unfortunately for them, further examination has lately revealed that the tooth belonged to some extinct pig, related to the modern peccary! So the American Indian still remains an orphan with unknown parentage, at least in the opinion of impartial students.

Whatever may be the ancestry of the Indians, there is very strong evidence that man has been in America for an immense period of time, and the theory that this continent was uninhabited by man until a comparatively few thousands of years ago is rapidly losing ground. It does not follow, however, that the present Indians are the unmixed descendants of the human races of fifty or a hundred thousand years ago, the Pleistocene men, or of those who used bone tools in Nebraska perhaps four million years ago, as Dr. Fairfield Osborn believes.

The problem is of great interest, as its solution would clear up many mysteries. According to the teachings of the Eastern Wisdom, colonists reached America from Atlantis, then in its prime, about the time suggested by Dr. Osborn for the Nebraska people. The same teachings speak of immigrations from eastern Asia, and even India, though the latter would be comparatively recent. Dr. Elliot Smith's theory of a great pilgrimage from ancient Egypt is not out of the question, though we may be inclined to place it at a far earlier date than he suggests.

In an attempt to clear up some of the difficulties, the Smithsonian

NEWS FROM THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELD

Institute is sending a research-expedition to Florida with Dr. J. W. Gridley in charge. Remains of man and artifacts have been found in various localities there, associated with bones of extinct Pleistocene animals, indicating that fully-developed man has lived in America for an enormous time. While many authorities have accepted those discoveries as good evidence for Pleistocene man, others imagine that hurricanes or other natural forces buried the remains of far more recent man in the older Pleistocene strata. The Smithsonian expedition will study the complicated problem on the spot with great care, and probably its findings will be conclusive — for the time being, at least!

The question of Pleistocene man in America perhaps one million years ago, was vigorously discussed at the December meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and some interesting points were brought out. Dr. Oliver P. Hay, of the Carnegie Institute at Washington, said that the discovery of arrowheads in Texas and in New Mexico among the bones of extinct animals of the Pleistocene age, indicated the presence of man at that period. He considered that man was then in about the same state as the more uncivilized tribes of today.

Dr. Aleš Hrdlička announced that he had found several features in common among the prehistoric Indians and the Aurignacian or Cro-Magnon people of Western Europe, both in bony structure and in culture. He said:

“While none of these items is decisive, they nevertheless are suggestive, and there is no inherent impossibility in the later Aurignacian influence, both morphological and cultural, reaching the old stock which eventually gave us the Indian.”

Dr. Hrdlička favors the view that a large movement of animals from Asia to America took place in the Pleistocene, and that men followed the animals they were accustomed to hunt.

The problem of the ‘prehistory’ of mankind is filled with tremendous difficulties to the biologist who has to depend on a few damaged skulls and bones and the limited number of tools and utensils, etc., which can withstand the wear and tear of geological ages, to build the story of millions of years of human life. Perhaps a future, more comprehensive, and more spiritual science will employ weapons of research of infinitely greater penetrating power!

The Southwest Museum (Los Angeles), has planned a great year of research, the outstanding feature being an expedition into northern Arizona and southern Utah in order to study the ‘Basket-Makers’ civilization which flourished there as far back as 2000 B. C., and whose art-works

THE THEOSOPHICAL PATH

and utensils are still in good preservation. Comparatively little is known of this early Indian race. Mr. Monroe Amsden, field-director of the Southwest Museum, has been chosen by the Carnegie Institute to lead an expedition into Guatemala to explore Uaxactan, a very ancient city believed to be a pre-Mayan stronghold, where it seems likely that valuable data regarding that earliest high American civilization yet discovered will be found.

Not many months ago an expedition sent out by the Southwest Museum discovered burial-grounds of former Indian races in the heart of the Casa Grande ruins in the lower Gila basin of Arizona. Though these ruins, the greatest valley-pueblo in Arizona, have been known since 1694, no signs of burial-grounds have been found till now, though many expeditions have searched for them. Many burial-urns and other examples of ancient pottery were found, some painted in beautiful and intricate designs, proving that a high degree of culture existed more than a thousand years ago among the builders of the great community-houses. The wealth of information disclosed by the objects unearthed from these cemeteries is confidently expected to clear up problems about the races of the Southwest that have hitherto completely baffled scientists.



Further rumors have lately appeared to the effect that the daring British explorer, Colonel P. H. Fawcett and his two companions, who have been missing in the wilds of Brazil since 1925, are prisoners of the Indians, but the only authentic news is that Commander G. B. Dyott and four enthusiastic friends are on their way to the jungles of Matto Grosso to do their utmost to rescue the Fawcett party. The expedition is well equipped to meet the dangers and discomforts of the adventure, and communication by radio will be kept up unless disaster overtakes it.

The Fawcett expedition set out to determine the truth of persistent reports made by Indians and even Portuguese that a large and magnificent ruined city exists in the wilds, and that there is a building from which a strange light perpetually shines. Colonel Fawcett has explored the South-American jungles for many years, and he claims to have obtained considerable evidence in favor of the contention that a majestic civilization, perhaps older than Egypt, once flourished somewhere in the two million miles of unexplored territory around the Amazon, and that traces of it still remain. We wish the Dyott relief-expedition success.