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NOTES OF THE MONTH

I PUBLISHED a letter in last month's issue of the Occult Review, criticizing certain statements made by me in the Notes of the preceding month. This at the time I was unable to reply to, owing to lack of space, and I am therefore giving it my first attention in the current number. The letter, which certainly bears evidence of a very considerable knowledge of the subjects treated of, took me to task principally under three heads. Miss Dallas (the writer) took exception to my statements (a) that "Jesus would not have recognized His gospel as taught by Paul"; (b) that St. Paul was a "wolf in sheep's clothing to St. Peter"; (c) that the speech attributed to Christ in St. Luke xi. 49-51 was invented by his biographer.

Now I will take the last of these criticisms first, as the point at issue is narrower in scope than either (a) or (b). The point raised refers to the following verse, which I will quote in full. In the passage in Luke above referred to, Jesus is represented as saying:—

I will send unto you prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall kill and persecute, that the blood of all the prophets which was shed since the foundation of the world may be required of this generation, from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary.
This passage in Luke is supported by a parallel passage in Matthew, in which the said Zacharias is described as the son of Barachias. Now I took the view (and must admit put my opinion very strongly) that this Zacharias, son of Barachias, was the Jewish leader to whom Josephus refers as having incurred the hostility of that section of the Jews who were most violently opposed to the Roman authority, and who were agitating for a revolution, with a view to securing the independence of the country. In order to get rid of one who was an obstacle to their plans, says Josephus, they “fell upon Zacharias in the middle of the temple and slew him.” I drew attention to the fact that this was an obvious anachronism, as Jesus at the time had been dead some thirty or forty years, and deduced the inference that the speech was invented for his benefit by a late compiler of records. Miss Dallas retorts that this in fact was not the Zacharias alluded to at all. The Zacharias intended was, she argues, Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, whose murder is recorded in 2 Chronicles xxiv. 20–22. Miss Dallas states, “This book [of Chronicles] stood last in the Jewish canon.” What Jesus intended to do, she contends, was “to remind Israel of its history of bloodshed, and to cite the first and last murders of righteous men recorded in their Scriptures.” She adds, in support of her argument, that in an ancient Gospel freely quoted by Jerome, the name Jehoiada stands instead of that of Barachiah in the allusion to the incident made by Jesus.

Now, my first criticism of this theory is that Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, had been dead some 800 years at the period of Jesus Christ’s ministry. I take the view that this fact alone is quite sufficient to put this Zacharias out of court. Let us consider for a moment what the point was that Jesus Christ was supposed to be attempting to make, on the assumption that the passage is genuine. He was practically turning to the Jews and saying to them: “You have murdered all the prophets that have been sent to you from the earliest days of which we have any record up to the present time,” and very appositely, on the supposition that he had lived fifty years later, he is made to cite an instance that would be fresh in the minds of all of them. But supposing this Zacharias had been the son of Jehoiada alluded to by Miss Dallas, what possible sense could there be in the passage? I think that the manner in which we can throw the clearest light on the point in question will be by taking a parallel from more recent times. Suppose a Frenchman, coming over to England, in the
days of Cromwell, were to have turned to an English acquaintance and said, *à propos* of the execution of Charles I, "You English have constantly murdered your kings, from the time of Edmund Ironside up to the time of Edward II." Would not this have sounded supremely foolish? The distance, however, between the date of Edward II and the date of Charles I was fully 300 years less than the distance between the time of Jesus Christ and the time of Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada. If, in the imaginary instance cited, the criticism of the supposed Frenchman is pure nonsense, how much more absurd would the remark of Jesus Christ have appeared to the Pharisees of his day!

As regards the Gospel referred to by Miss Dallas, in which the name Jehoiada is used, all those who have made a study of ancient MSS. must be perfectly well aware of the way in which such glosses creep in. Some copyist, we will suppose, gets hold of the Gospel of St. Matthew, approximately as it stands in our version, and comes across the phrase put into the mouth of Jesus, alluding to Zacharias, son of Barachias. Being a well-read person, better read than the editor of St. Matthew, whoever this may have been, it at once strikes him that the said editor has made Jesus Christ guilty of an anachronism, recollecting that Jesus had already been dead before the incident occurred. He accordingly says to himself, "This will not do at all. There must be some error in this passage." He proceeds to insert as a marginal note, "Query Zacharias, son of Jehoiada?" Subsequently the gloss in the margin creeps into the original text of one of the Gospels. This is the manner in which the large bulk of the erroneous readings have crept into MSS. all the world over.

I will take a parallel instance, also from the Bible. In the Book of Proverbs, attributed to King Solomon, that worthy is made to give two diametrically opposite pieces of advice to those who are liable to be troubled by the persistent importunities of fools. In one passage he is made to say, "Answer not a fool according to his folly." In the other passage he advises to the contrary. "Answer," he says, "a fool according to his folly." The writer in all probability gave the latter of these two pieces of advice. When, however, the copyist came along, who was on this occasion a rather dull person, he said to himself, "'Answer a fool according to his folly!" Oh, this will never do; Solomon could never
have said such a thing as this!" He accordingly jumps to the
conclusion that the negative has been omitted, and puts in a
marginal note to this effect. Eventually both pieces of advice
are incorporated in the Authorized Version.

A similar instance in which two contradictory statements
have been incorporated in our present version of the Bible is
to be found in Exodus xxx. 6, where the authorized version
reads:—

And thou shalt put it [i.e. the altar for incense] before the vail that
is by the ark of the testimony, before the mercy seat that is over the
testimony, where I will meet with thee.

Now here we get two contradictory readings, both absorbed
into the same verse. The Septuagint, or Greek version, which
is the translation of an earlier Hebrew MS., reads simply: "Be­
fore the veil that is upon the ark (or casket) of the testimony,"
omitting the second part of the verse altogether. The point is
that the direction intended was to make this further altar for
incense, but to set it outside the veil. A copyist took it into
his head that this altar should be, not outside, but inside, the
veil, and suggested, doubtless as a marginal note, that the word
"paroketh" (meaning "veil") should really read "kapporeth,"
i.e. "the place of atonement, or mercy seat." This, it will
clearly appear, is another example of the incorporation of a
gloss in the margin into the original text which has already
been noted in the case of Solomon's saw, and in the case of the
insertion of the name of Jehoiada as the putative father of
Zachariah. I have given these two instances to show how
errors of this kind come about. It would, of course,
be possible to quote innumerable similar passages.
I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that
this is the explanation of the appearance of the
name Jehoiada in one solitary gospel. We have,
however, a further confirmation of the interpretation
I put upon the passage in question, in the fact that it is pretty
clear from other passages in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts,
that the editor or compiler of these books was in the habit of
"cribbing" freely from Josephus. Here, for example, is a glar­
ing instance of the same kind (and it is an instance all the more
noteworthy as it is an obvious case of a speech invented by the
compiler). I refer to the speech supposed to have been made
by Gamaliel and cited in Acts v. 36–38. It runs as follows:—
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For before these days rose up Theudas, boasting himself to be somebody; to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves: who was slain; and all, as many as obeyed him, were scattered, and brought to nought. After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him. He also perished; and all, even as many as obeyed him, were dispersed.

The narrative of the events alluded to in this supposed speech of Gamaliel's is to be found in the Antiquities of Josephus, XX., 5, 1, 2, as follows:—

Now it came to pass that while Fadus was procurator of Judea, a certain magician, whose name was Theudas, persuaded a large number of people to take their effects with them, and follow him to the River Jordan; for he told them he was a prophet, and that he would, by his command, divide the river, and afford them an easy passage over it; and many were deluded by his words. However, Fadus did not permit them to gain any advantage by this wild attempt, but sent out a troop of horsemen against them, who, falling upon them unexpectedly, slew many of them, and took many alive. They also took Theudas alive, and cut off his head and carried it to Jerusalem. . . . Under this procuratorship occurred that great famine in Judea, in which Queen Helena bought corn in Egypt at a great expense, and distributed to those in want, as I have related already; and besides this the sons of Judas of Galilee were now slain; I mean of that Judas who caused the people to revolt when Quirinius came to take account of the estates of the Jews, as shown in a foregoing book.

Now it is pretty clear that this passage was the compiler's authority for the incident in question, but that owing to carelessness and inaccuracy he misread his authority. The Judas of Galilee there referred to headed a revolt as a protest against the enforced registration under Quirinius in A.D. 6, while the address of Gamaliel must have been delivered about the years A.D. 35 to 40 at latest. This registration under Quirinius is the one alluded to by the compiler of Luke in connexion with the birth of Jesus Christ, Quirinius being called by the Greek form "Cyrenius" in the Authorized Version. The object, no doubt, of introducing it in this connexion is to explain the birth of Christ at Bethlehem instead of at Nazareth, the older and better accredited story. Now as a matter of fact the reader of the passage in Josephus will see that the insurrection of Theudas actually took place after that of Judas. To be exact it occurred during the procuratorship of Cuspius Fadus, who was appointed by the Emperor Claudius in the year A.D. 44. Gamaliel, therefore, is made not only to invert the order of the two events, the former of which (according
to his supposed speech), actually took place some thirty-eight years after what he treats as the later event of the two, but worse than this, he is made to allude to an insurrection (that of Theudas) which actually took place at the very lowest estimate some four or five years after the date of his speech. We see, therefore, that the compiler of Luke and Acts has made Gamaliel guilty of an anachronism very similar to that which he attributes to Jesus Christ. I have not space here to give further instances of this evidence of carelessness and " cribbing." I would, however, refer those interested to a book entitled, *The First Christian Generation,* by James Thomas,* to which I have already alluded. It will be seen from this that the two instances above given are by no means the only cases of the kind that can be cited.

I come now to the second point of Miss Dallas’s criticism, taking these points in the inverse order. "The theory," says Miss Dallas, "that Paul was a wolf in sheep’s clothing to St. Peter, or that there was any prolonged opposition between them, seems to me entirely non-proven." She adds, "The theory of the irreconcilable opposition between St. Peter and St. Paul appears to rest on a single passage in one of St. Paul’s Epistles" (*Galatians,* chap. ii.). In order to make my own attitude clear, I think the best thing I can do is to quote what space will allow of this passage, premising first that the occasion alluded to was the second on which Paul went to Jerusalem, the first occasion being three years after his conversion, and the present one after a further interval of fourteen years.†

It runs as follows:—

Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain. But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out your

---

† I ignore here an account in Acts of a further visit to Jerusalem which Paul is said to have made in the narrative of Acts, as this visit is obviously another error of that grossly careless compiler, being, in fact, contrary to Paul’s own statements.
‡ The negative here appears to be an error.
liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you. But of these who seemed to be somewhat (whosoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me: But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of circumcision was unto Peter; (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:) And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do. But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from Jerusalem, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.

It is clear from this passage that there was and had been very serious friction between the Apostle to the Gentiles and the leaders of the Jewish church. The matter was, however, compromised by giving Paul a free field with regard to the Gentiles, on the distinct understanding that he should collect money for the benefit of the Christians at Jerusalem. The compromise thus arrived at was doubtless in the interest of both parties. It is plain, however, from a statement in Galatians i. 6 (and following) that although Paul came to terms with their leaders, he was unable to prevent missionaries from Jerusalem attempting to undermine his position among his own converts, a fact which is not to be wondered at in view of the great divergence of opinion in matters essential between himself and the other apostles. In the passage alluded to Paul exclaims:—

I marvel that ye are so quickly shifting from him who called you by the grace of Christ unto another gospel, which is not another, but there be some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

Paul, it is clear, stood resolutely to his guns, and he does not mince matters when alluding to the emissaries of the Jerusalem congregation. The idea that there was no deep-seated quarrel or cause of dispute between Peter and Paul really rests on the misrepresentations of the writer of Acts, which are frequently
so glaring that they amount to absolute absurdity. Peter there is actually made to state that he has been appointed apostle to the Gentiles, and voices the identical opinions held by Paul, and to which he was notoriously antagonistic. Not only this, but Paul himself goes through various ceremonies to curry favour with the Jewish proselytes, such as head shaving and formal temple observances, which we may feel quite sure he would never have undergone. In order further to make good his case, this remarkable compiler has invented the story of Cornelius, in which Peter is made to have a vision which reconciles him to Paul’s standpoint. It is clear, however, that this vision does not have the desired effect upon the apostle, and Paul, judging by his own letters, has no knowledge of any such occurrence. It may be mentioned in passing that the existence of such a Roman officer as Cornelius, with strong Judaizing tendencies, in a place like Cæsarea, where the feeling between Jew and Gentile was exceedingly bitter and shortly afterwards broke out into open strife, is, to say the least of it, most unlikely. It may be noted in this connexion that a good many of the accepted traditions with regard to Paul are based, not upon his own statements, but upon the very questionable narrative of the Acts. Thus the Apostle to the Gentiles never says himself that he was brought up under Gamaliel, or even at Jerusalem. He does not state that he was present at Stephen’s stoning, nor that he had a commission to bring men bound from Damascus, nor, indeed, that his conversion took place on the road to Damascus, nor, indeed, that he was a Roman citizen. As regards the roving commission given to Paul to carry off heretics and offenders against the Jewish religion from under the jurisdiction of an alien government, on the authority of the Sanhedrin, the whole story is manifestly absurd, and never could have been narrated by any one who had any knowledge of the political conditions of the time. The Sanhedrin would not have possessed the authority in question if it involved matters of life and death within their own territory, and to go further and suggest that they poached on the preserves of a ruler, Aretas, who was at the time in open hostility with Herod Antipas, is a statement too ridiculous for serious consideration. This is, however, a pretty fair gauge of the value of the evidence of the compiler of Acts when he is “on his own.” When we come to another narrative evidently embedded in this record, and identified by the use of the pronoun “we,” we must gauge the
value of the statements given by quite another standard of evidence.

With regard to the first of the statements that Miss Dallas takes exception to, that Jesus would not have recognized His Gospel as taught by Paul: this is a matter upon which I have already trenched to some considerable extent. Miss Dallas admits that it is too long to enter into in a brief letter, and I feel that in my present Notes I should hardly be justified in writing a number of further pages on the subject. It appears to me, however, that it was precisely on account of this great divergence that the other apostles took up so unfriendly an attitude towards Paul. They of course felt that whereas they had known Jesus Christ in his lifetime and had heard his preaching, Paul had had no such advantage. Paul himself indeed boasts that it was through revelation pure and simple that he arrived at his version of the Christian faith. He states in Galatians:

I make known unto you brethren as touching the gospel which has been preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man nor was I taught it except by way of revelation on the part of Jesus Christ.

It would, I think, surprise a good many who are not Bible students to learn what a very large portion of the teaching of orthodox Christianity is deduced from Paul, and from Paul only. It is from him that we obtain the teaching of the Atonement, the idea of Justification by Faith, and various other doctrines regarded as essentially Christian. But most important of all, it is from Paul, and from no other source, that we gain our idea of Jesus Christ as a divine figure who died and rose again, and will return once more as the judge of the whole world. Paul rendered Christianity capable of becoming a world-religion. The ideas of the other apostles and indeed of Jesus Christ himself were limited to Judæa. For them he was at best the Jewish Messiah, and according to their ideas all who had to enter into the fold of Christianity must do so through the narrow gate of Judaism. Here, in a nutshell, was the point at issue between Pauline and Petrine Christianity. It is too often forgotten that Jesus himself stated and emphasized the fact that he was "not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Paul was well advised when he said that he no longer knew Christ after the flesh. It was his beatific vision that beckoned him on to found a creed which knew no distinction.
of race and which should implant the idea of universal brother­
hood taught by Jesus, with limitations, it is true, which Jesus never
recognized, but still on a scale which the Founder of Christianity,
owing to the conditions of his birth and life, naturally could
not have conceived. Paul's was the wider outlook, and the
success of his efforts was due to the fact that he, like Cecil Rhodes,
"thought in continents."

I propose to try a new experiment by making the next number
of the Occult Review a double number, and publishing it at
A NEW
one shilling net (28 cents.). It has been said on
DEPARTURE.
various occasions (and I view the criticism rather in
the light of a compliment), that the Occult Review
is too small. It is, however, obvious that for the price at
which it is published there are limits to the matter which can
be supplied. It will be quite possible, if the new experiment is
successful, to repeat it on a future occasion. I contemplate the
possibility of bringing out several shilling numbers in the course
of the year if the scheme meets with encouragement. If I did
this, it would be necessary to raise the price of the subscription.
At present, however, I propose no increase, nor should I con­sider it if the double numbers were limited to one a year.
Future developments in this direction must guide my course of
action. In the meantime, if any of my readers have observations
to make, or suggestions to offer, I shall be very pleased to give
them my very careful consideration.

While I am on the subject of the magazine itself, there is a
further observation which I think I might do well to make. It
is a point with regard to which I should also be glad to have the
views of my readers. The question at issue is the title of the
magazine. I have never felt altogether happy with the title I
have adopted. In the opinion of the world at large it hardly, I
think, covers the subject matter of the magazine. This issue has
been particularly raised recently by some comments of Mr. W. T.
Stead in his Review of Reviews, on the subject of my Notes of
the Month. He says that though these in themselves are very
interesting, they are hardly what the reader would look for in a
review bearing the title of "occult." With regard to
SUGGESTED
change of
TITLE.
this, I should like to say that nothing in the columns
of the magazine has ever appeared more directly in
line with the aims and objects which I had in view in
founding it, than these same Notes dealing with the origins of
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Christianity. It does not follow from this that Mr. Stead's criticism is unjust. It merely follows that the point on which his criticism falls is the title rather than the contents of the *Re*view. The difficulty is of finding a suitable title if the present one is discarded. Personally, I rather incline to some non-committal title. The magazine is now so well-known that I hesitate to make too drastic a change. I have sometimes thought it would simplify matters if I merely called it by my own name. I have no very strong convictions on the matter except a definite feeling that the word "occult" keeps out certain readers who would otherwise buy the *Re*view, and that this is a great pity, and further, that whatever change is made should be one that would lead to as little dislocation as possible.

Mr. E. Dawson Rogers, whose decease occurred on September 28, had a remarkable career in connexion both with journalism and with Spiritualism. In his own county-town of Norwich he raised an almost defunct newspaper to a leading position, and established around it other papers, all of which he ultimately made highly successful. This was also the case with the National Press Agency, which he established in London and managed for twenty years.

The same qualities of clear-sightedness, determination, and persistence stood Mr. Rogers in good stead in his psychic investigations. Having learned something of hypnotism and healing magnetism, he had some remarkable experiences of the clairvoyant powers of an invalid lady whom he took under his treatment. He was introduced to Mr. and Mrs. Everitt, with whom he formed a close and lifelong friendship, and witnessed many of the striking phenomena which occurred, often spontaneously, in Mrs. Everitt's presence, as described in Mr. E. T. Bennett's book on *Direct Writing*. He also became convinced, after careful investigation, of the genuineness of the mediumship of Mr. Eglinton and other physical mediums, including the Rev. W. Stainton Moses, with whom also he was in close personal connexion.

His public activities in the occult movement included the starting of a central or national association of Spiritualists, which ultimately led to the formation of the London Spiritualist Alliance; of this latter body he was President for the last eighteen years of his life. He established *Light* as the official organ of the Alliance, under his own management, and after the death of the
Rev. Stainton Moses, who was for some years its editor, he took
the editorship into his own hands, and retained it until his last
illness. He also promoted an international congress of Spiritualists, which was held in London some years ago.

Holding such a prominent position in the Spiritualist world,
there was scarcely a person of distinction in psychical research,
at home or abroad, with whom Mr. Rogers was not acquainted.
While Professor Barrett, F.R.S., of Dublin, was staying at his
house, he suggested that men of reputation in the scientific world
should be invited to form a society for the close and authoritative
investigation of psychic phenomena, and the result was that
Professor Barrett convened a meeting at which it was decided to
establish the Society for Psychical Research, and for some time
Mr. Rogers and other leading investigators of Spiritualism had
seats on the Council of the Society.

In all his investigations Mr. Rogers showed himself practical,
clear-headed, and determined to get at the truth of whatever was
advanced or asserted; theoretical surmises had little attraction
for him, he required to see the proofs and test them himself.
The result was that he stood for a sane and sensible Spiritualism,
as a factor in human knowledge and as a practical outlook on life
here and hereafter.

By a singularly unhappy concatenation the contributor of
the above obituary notice, Mr. J. B. Shipley, has himself followed
on the heels of his chief, having died suddenly on October 14,
aged 52 years. Mr. J. B. Shipley was Assistant

MR. J. B. SHIPLEY.
Editor of Light. He was a classical scholar of some
merit and an accomplished writer. On the evening
of the 13th he attended a conversazione in connexion with the
London Spiritualist Alliance. He had not been in good health
for some time, but then reported himself as feeling better. On
the following morning, however, he was found dead in his bed.
Our readers will have appreciated his work in connexion with the
Occult Review as the writer of the Periodical Literature reviews.
I am able to include the following very striking portrait of Mr.
Dawson Rogers, by kind permission of the Editor of Light.
A SPIRITUAL AMAZON

BY SCRUTATOR

Among the most romantic and certainly the most mysterious of the many singular characters France has produced we may confidently name the Maid of Orleans, or as her parents named her, Jeanne d’Arc; the Bashful, the Beautiful, the Brave, the Patriot, as she was variously known to her companions. “Since the writing of human history began,” said Louis Kossuth, “Joan of Arc is the only person, of either sex, who has ever held supreme command of the military forces of a nation at the age of seventeen.” This is a fact so unique and imposing as to rivet the attention on the instant.

What can we learn of this remarkable personality? There is very little to learn which could not be rightfully applied to hundreds of her sex at that or any other period in French history. Jeanne d’Arc was quite transparent. But what of the Individual, the Soul behind the person, the mysterious and illusive character whom none of her time ever fully comprehended, and concerning whose transcendent merits even the Church of Rome, so conspicuous in its treatment of acknowledged virtue, has made but tardy and quite recent acknowledgment? Perhaps we do not rightly estimate the status of a soul when regarded in association with the commonplace of life, and perhaps, too, we have been blinded to the real nature of her mission by the fact that it appeared to be compassed by the saving of France and the restoration to power of that man of doubtful merit, the Dauphin, albeit he was declared by the Maid and on the authority of the “Voices” to be the lawful heir to the throne of France. Doubtless the religious and political condition of the country at that time played an important part in the evocation of the special powers with which this girl was naturally gifted; but in the estimate of the Maid and her work we must not overestimate those conditions, remarkable though they were, to the detriment of the character which made so perfect a use of them. We may agree with Renan that the condition of things in the religious world of Judea at the time of the Nativity certainly had need of and called for a Reformer, but we should err in supposing that those conditions produced the Christ. Similarly in the case of Joan of Arc, who, above all women, deserves to stand
for the incarnation of the Divine Feminine. Her character
and her mission were adapted to the need of the hour, but they
were not produced by it.

The Siege of Orleans.

It is from this most mysterious psychological and spiritual
side of her life that Joan of Arc will for ever continue to command
the attention of the thinking world and make particular appeal
to the student of human nature. It may be conceded that
effective genius is that which satisfies and expresses the spirit
of the age. If it be argued that the Maid lived for her King and
to save him from the effects of his own weakness and vacillation,
as well as from the machinations of his scheming courtesans,
it may be said at once that she lived in vain; and if to save
France despite its King and Ministry, she was altogether successful, so far as the temper of France at that time would allow.*

But it may be that neither the King nor France formed any part of the spiritual equation which she illustrated and worked out in her life. Joan of Arc may have existed at that time for higher ends and purposes than were comprehended in the welfare of any single country or people. Even so, any estimate of character, apart from the circumstances in which it is developed, is sure to be faulty.

Joan of Arc, according to the testimony of Sieur Louis de Conte, was born at Domremy on the eve of the Epiphany, January 6, in the year 1412. The family all told numbered seven. There was Jacques and his wife, Isabel Romée, their three sons, Jacques, Pierre and Jean, and the two daughters, Joan and her little sister Catherine. Joan was born a child of the Tree, as all were called who were born within hail of the Fairy Tree of Bourlemont, about which they played in their infancy while their parents toiled and spun, and the youth of France wasted itself in the wars. There is a song about this tree which has a particular charm, since Joan herself sang it. The second verse runs:

And what has built you up so strong,
Arbre Fée de Bourlemont?
The Children's love! They've loved you long,
Ten hundred years, in sooth,
They've nourished you with praise and song,
And warmed your heart and kept it young—
A thousand years of youth! †

Everybody has read of Joan's call to the great and distinctive career which she carried through with such courage, endurance, and magnanimity. If we look into the psychology of the case, we shall find the same peculiarity dominating it as has universally been associated with every instance of prophetic inspiration as well as with many cases of undoubted insanity. I mean the peculiar faculty of clairaudience, the subjective hearing of voices. Joan was wont to refer to her revelators as "the Voices." But she also had visions of a terrific character, and on her own testimony at the Examination at the Castle of Rouen, February 22, 1430, she took oath and said: "I have done nothing except by revelation." And after this she said: "I was thirteen when I heard a Voice from God for my help and guidance. The first

time that I heard this Voice I was very much afraid; it was midday in the summer in my father's garden. I had not fasted the day before. I heard this Voice to my right towards the Church. Rarely do I hear it without its being accompanied also by a light. This light comes from the same side as the Voice. Generally it is a great light."

At first she was afraid; it was a new experience. But the third time she heard it she "recognized that it was the Voice of an Angel." Now, although the Voice was externalized, the recognition of its origin was interior, intuitive.

"She stood in the mystic beauty and pathos of her tender years. Like the child David she occupied herself tending her father's sheep and was chosen by Heaven. Like the child Samuel, she possessed the open ear and the receptive mind. In her innocent consciousness there were fair spaces where she might receive her dear brothers and sisters, the happy saints of Paradise! These were silences so deep and exquisite that in them she might hear the sweet voices of the everlastingly blest." *

Her alarm was that of a mortal soul who had been given a task greater than she believed herself able to sustain, as when the maid of Nazareth heard the voice of an angel "she was troubled and said: How shall this be?" And in each case, with the annunciation there came also the power to recognize and accept the word. "Behold the handmaid of the Lord!"

The telepathic vision was not uncommon with Joan, as we see from what she said to Captain Robert de Baudricourt, when he tarried about bringing her to the presence of the King. On February 12 Joan went to him and said: "In God's name you keep me here (in Lorraine) too long: for this very day near Orleans a great disaster has befallen the gentle Dauphin, and he shall have worse fortune still unless you send me to him." It was on that day that the French suffered defeat at Rouvray, near Orleans.

Joan also gave evidence of possessing the "discerning spirit," which is the psychometric sense in one of its many functions, when at length she was brought into the presence of the Dauphin. Being met by the Council, she refused to deliver her message save to the King alone, and the Council left her in great wrath at her obstinacy. But she excused herself to her comrades, saying: "If one would have a message go sound and ungarbled, does one choose traitors and tricksters to send it by? . . . Be patient, the Dauphin will hear me presently, have no fear." And at length it was accorded her to see the

* Joan of Arc. Grace James, p. 53.
king in the great Audience Hall. At the end of a long free space, flanked by the guards in their shining armour and the masses of colour lighted by hundreds of flaming torches, a crowned and sceptred figure sat upon a throne, royally canopied and blazing with jewels. Joan was announced by the herald, and a blast of trumpets was sounded. Every eye was upon the Maid; every one stood motionless; all lips were parted. Joan made no obeisance, but stood looking at him who sat upon the throne. Then she turned her head slowly and her eyes wandered along the lines of courtiers till they fell upon a young man who was quietly dressed. Then her face lighted joyously, and she ran and threw herself at his feet and clasped his knees, exclaiming: "God of His grace give you long life, O dear and gentle Dauphin!"

Then happened a dastard thing. The King denied his identity and pointed to the man who sat on the throne. "No, gracious..."
liege, you are he, and none other," Joan persisted, and then it was seen that she knew. But it was a miracle to the minds of those who in that day had no knowledge of thought-waves, magnetic currents, and the extension of the sensory field as illustrated by the phenomena of telepathy and psychometry. But also it may have been that the Maid had already received some vision in which the person of the King was made familiar to her. It behoves us not to be too wise on occasions of this sort. The new wine of modern psychology may be capable of exploding the old bottles of an effete theology; but also there is the danger that we ourselves may be intoxicated by it, if we do not observe moderation.

A marvellous personality is that of Joan of Arc, from whatever point of view we regard her, and one that all authors have confessed themselves unable to comprehend. He, perhaps, sounded the right note, who in horrible contrition returned from the burning to his home, groaning: "We are all lost; we have burned a saint."

The martyrdom took place on the 30th May, 1431. Joan's father died of a broken heart, and her mother was granted a pension from Orleans and lived to a good age. She lived to see her daughter's rehabilitation, concerning which, for twenty-three years, the King of France had been indifferent. Even then it was not gratitude which moved him to action, but the comment which was gaining ground that his crown had been set upon his head by a heretic, an apostate, an idolater, and one who was convicted of having been in league with the Devil.

The horoscope of Joan of Arc which I have here included will doubtless prove of interest to students of Astrology, who may find therein some singular indications of this remarkable destiny. The positions of the planets are taken by their mean periods, and with the exception of the Moon and Venus, will hardly vary from the true longitudes by a single degree.

The illustration of the Siege of Orleans from Mark Twain's fascinating work on Joan of Arc, which embodies the original testimony of Sieur L. de Conte, Joan's playmate and comrade-in-arms, is here reproduced by kind permission of Messrs. Chatto & Windus.
I MUST inform all and sundry that I am not a spiritualist, and that I know nothing whatever about spiritualism. I have been informed by several people that I am what is termed a "sensitive."

I have never attended a séance or any meeting or gathering of the kind, nor had I ever read any literature dealing with such subjects as spiritualism or mysticism or occultism or anything of kindred nature until quite recently, when my attention was called to the Occult Review, which I found intensely interesting and illuminating.

As a journalist, and a very busy one, I am, as a rule, so tired when I go to bed—invariably in the small hours—that I fall asleep almost immediately and sleep for hours without ever a break. On a never-to-be-forgotten night I was in my usual state of health, I was untroubled and without a vestige of care. I had had my usual supper. I had been in bed a short time and was in that blissful condition of mind when one is just dozing off. The room was in total darkness, as I had switched off the electric light and drawn thick, heavy curtains over the holland blinds that covered the two large windows. My pet cat invariably sleeps on my bed, and was in its customary place, curled up on the quilt, fast asleep.

As I lay there, with half-shut eyes, there suddenly appeared at the top of the wall on the right (the side to which I had turned), a long shaft of light, of the most beautiful shade of light bright blue. It moved and quivered along in the direction of the right window, and I watched it with fascinated gaze.

"How extraordinary!" I thought, "I never saw the moonlight come in in this fashion when those thick curtains were drawn right across, and it is a different blue from moonlight blue, too, and moves about so oddly . . . what can it be? . . . but of course it must be moonlight, and perhaps there are clouds passing over the moon?"

The light—a heavenly forget-me-not sort of blue—the counterpart of which, however, I have never seen, either before or since, still wavered and drifted across the room in the same part, near the ceiling, and I stupidly looked at the top of the door.
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(over which hung a heavy crimson plush portière) as if a light could have been cast through a solid brick wall!

At last I jumped out of bed, pulled curtains and blind aside and looked out of the window. Nothing but impenetrable darkness met my astonished gaze. No moon, not a star, not a ray of light to be seen! Intense blackness and gloom—nothing more. I could not distinguish the road, or the opposite trees, or, in short, anything at all. The street lights are put out early in the country, and the night was of inky blackness.

"Could it have been some one with a lantern, or a searchlight?" I pondered, still marvelling over the occurrence, as I returned to bed. I was not in the least alarmed, and it had not even occurred to me that there was anything at all supernatural in connexion with the affair.

As I went on puzzling, or rather, trying to puzzle it out, the cat suddenly jumped up on the bed, his fur bristling all over his body, his eyes glaring, and with one bound he leaped to the door; and as he tore frantically at the plush portière, he emitted the most awful howl or scream that I ever heard from an animal—in fact, I did not think such a horrid, blood-curdling sound could have been given. I think my hair stood on end then, but even after this I did not entertain the least idea of anything at all supernatural. My idea was that the cat had suddenly gone mad! As for the blue light, this new and startling development had quite driven it out of my mind.

Hydrophobia or no hydrophobia, I was so distressed at seeing the poor animal's agony of fear, that I took it up in my arms and tried to soothe it. Trembling all over as if with ague, it cowered against me, hiding its head, and giving evidence of the most fearful state of terror and distress. I soothed and petted it, and gradually it grew calmer; but to my astonishment it peered over the side of the bed, glaring fearfully, its eyes blazing as if on fire, and its fur bristling again as at first. I saw nothing, but that the cat saw something I am absolutely convinced, and nothing could shake that conviction.

Feeling safe in my arms, now that the first shock of the horrid sight—whatever it may have been—was over, poor Fluff craned his neck eagerly and looked down on the carpet, watching the movements of the (by me) unseen enemy, as it apparently travelled along the bedside and rounded the end of the bed in front of the dressing-table. The "thing"—whatever it may have been—was on the floor, and made no attempt to get on the bed. Had it approached us, I am certain that Fluff would have expired at
once; but, from the safe shelter of my arms, he watched the nocturnal visitor, following it with his eyes along the side of the room, between the bed and a huge mahogany chest of drawers, and round the end of the bedstead to the left. It seemed so strange to see the cat craning its head and following with its gaze some object undiscoverable by myself that I got up, and, leaning over the brass rail at the end of the bedstead, looked anxiously and intently in the direction indicated by the cat. All I saw was the carpet!

But it must be remembered that I saw the blue light when the cat was asleep. It might be suggested that my fear of the light was communicated to the cat, but then I had no fear of it, for I deemed it an ordinary (though perhaps unusually beautiful) shaft of moonlight until I found that there was no moon, and the night was as dark as Erebus.

One friend suggested that perhaps it was all a dream! Well, I know, and am prepared to swear, that it was not. If I had been asleep, the mere fact of getting out of bed, going to the window, drawing the curtains, and switching on the electric light, would have been sufficient to rouse me; and, again, I am not, and never have been, subject to delusions of any sort. As the editor of the Occult Review knows, I am on the staff of a well-known London weekly paper, of large circulation, and my pen-
name is known all over the world. I am practical, business-like, and logical—not a dreamer, or a visionary. I may say, too, that my house is a new one. There has never been the slightest suggestion that it was haunted. There have been no other manifestations in it either before or since.

Recent studies of the effects of light upon living things have brought many new and surprising theories to the front. It is said that we are bathed in light, visible and invisible, for there is a radiation which has been termed "black light" which cannot be seen by our eyes, but which may be visible to eyes differently organized. Professor Jerviss declares that it is possible that these ghostly sheaths of ours are perceived by certain animals possessing the power to see in the dark.

Some time after my own remarkable experience my attention was drawn by a friend (to whom I had confided the whole matter) to an almost identical experience related by Mr. Maurice Hewlett to Miss Constance Smedley. There was the same blue light, wavering and flickering; there was a pet animal—a dog, not a cat, in this particular instance—sleeping on the bed; there was the fearful terror of the animal, its whining and moaning and whimpering, and, finally, there were ghostly hands seen passing over the dog, as if stroking it. At length, the whimpers slackened, and, ere long, ceased. The dog was dead. . . . In the event of any one scoffing at my own honestly set down experience, I would ask these questions: Whence came this mysterious light, and how could the cat's extraordinary terror be accounted for? Suppose, for instance, that my mind might for once have been subject to such an extraordinary hallucination, or that my eyes might, for once, have played me false—for we know that there are such things as optical illusions—it is difficult to believe that the cat should at the same moment suddenly have experienced the same hallucination, delusion, or illusion—call it what you will. Then, too, the cat was obviously terrified to the farthest limit of its endurance —had I not soothed it, and covered its head, I think it would have died from its fright—but I was not alarmed in the least. Puzzled I was, most assuredly, but not alarmed.

Perhaps it was a "cat" phantom, or a "dog" phantom that my poor "Fluff" saw—the ghost of some former pet of mine that haunted its erstwhile owner, and was suddenly seized with an access of jealousy and rage. It must have been a horrid object, anyway, for Fluff is the quietest, gentlest cat I have ever known. For a long time we fancied he was dumb, for by day or by night no sound was ever heard from his "voice-box." He was fearfully
scalded on one occasion, but even then only gave two small piteous "mious." On another occasion he was trapped in a door, in a gale of wind, and gave a small and almost human cry at the moment he was released, but the howl he emitted when he saw the ghost—or whatever it was that he did see—was so loud and so horrible that I shall never forget it, nor the sight he presented after I had got a light and I saw him tearing at the plush portière in frantic efforts to escape.

If any one can offer a solution, or even make an attempt at a solution, I should be both interested and gratified. I have no theories of my own on the subject, though I have exhausted every possible field of speculation.

VOICES IN THE SILENCE

There are voices in the silence,
There are faces in the void,
There are touches in the twilight,
There are strange things there deployed,
And I see you stealing towards me
With the fateful look of yore,
And I feel that I must follow,
While you glide there on before.

* * * *

There are dim sweet eyes upon me,
Though their face I may not find,
There is sombre music near me,
There is sighing in the wind.
White hands beckon me to follow;
They refuse to let me stay.
And with force I cannot baffle,
They are bearing me away.

From the forthcoming book of poems by Constance Sutcliffe (Mrs. Fitzgerald Marriott), entitled If Thou Wert Blind and other Poems. Published by Simpkin Marshall & Co., Ltd. Price 6d.
ONE of the greatest occultists, philosophers and physicians during the middle ages was Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Bombast of Hohenheim, better known by the name of Theophrastus Paracelsus. He was born on November 26, in the year 1493, at Maria Ensisiedeln, in Switzerland, and died on September 24, 1541, at Salzburg, in Austria, where his monument, a beautiful pyramid of white marble, containing in its interior a part of his skull, may still be seen at the church of St. Sebastian. It has the following inscription:

Philippi Theophrasti Paracelsi qui tantam orbis famam esse au ro chymico adeptus est effigies et ossa donec sursus circumdebitur pelle sua.—fou. cap. xix.

Paracelsus obtained a world-wide reputation on account of the wonderful cures he performed by means of his spiritual power and his knowledge of nature; he has been very properly called the father of modern medicine, because he refuted the medical quackery of his times and introduced a rational system of curing diseases. He was a great alchemist and philosopher, conscious of his powers, and his device was

"Alius non sit qui suus esse potest."
"Omne donum perfectum a Deo, imperfectum a diabolo."

No one ought to belong to another, if he can be his own. Every perfect gift comes from God, that which is imperfect from the devil.

We will not occupy ourselves at present with a description of the life and travels of Paracelsus; this has been done on a previous occasion; but will attempt to give some extracts of his writings, consisting of over one hundred books and manuscripts on cosmology, ethnography, pneumatology, medicine, alchemy, philosophy, theosophy, magic and sorcery.*

Magic, according to Paracelsus, is not sorcery. Sorcery is

the misuse of spiritual powers, such as are hidden within the constitution of man and generally only little developed and

known; magic is the employment of such powers for some holy and beneficent purpose.

"There is as much difference between magic and sorcery as there is between light and darkness. Therefore the use of magical powers for a good purpose is called practising 'white magic,' and their perverted use 'black magic,' witchcraft and sorcery. The former is a divine, the latter a devilish art."
These powers belong to the inner man, the "soul," and become manifested through the external, physical man. To form a conception of the nature of these powers we must know the sevenfold constitution of man, which, according to Paracelsus, is as follows:

1. The elementary body (the physical, visible form).
2. Archaeus (the life principle).
3. The sidereal (and ethereal) body.
4. The mumia (animal soul and its "magnetism").
5. The flesh of Adam (the rational soul).
6. The man of the New Olympus (the spiritual body and soul).

In other words; there is the spiritual, the intellectual, the animal man, the spiritual, astral and physical body. They apparently all form the unity called "man," nevertheless they differ from each other, each having its own qualities and state of development, while they are all pervaded by the one life principle, which has its origin in the Logos, the "Word."* But the psychic powers belonging to the soul and the magical powers of the spirit are in the great majority of mankind still only little developed and known. They are often exercised unconsciously so that the greatest sorcerer does not himself know by what means his feats are performed; because it is the inner man and not the external personality which uses these powers; the external man only gives his consent. The sorcerer is so to say possessed by a devil, this devil being actually his own inner self, acting through the outer man in conformity to his will. Moreover, it is a known law of nature, that like associates with like, and if an evil will becomes active, it attracts to itself corresponding evil influences from the invisible realm, which go to assist the sorcerer in his nefarious work.

Paracelsus says:

"Men have two spirits in them, an animal and a human. A man who identifies himself with his animal spirit is in his soul-life an animal with animal instincts and desires. If the animal spirit alone in him is active, he resembles an animal and may act like a wolf, a dog, a tiger, a snake, etc. The human spirit raises him above the animal state; but if he employs this higher principle for the purpose of serving the lower, he endows his animal soul with human intelligence and becomes an intellectual beast or what is called a devil."†

The powers which are called into action by the practice of magic are the will and the imagination. These may be aided by the use of ceremonies and prayers (ceremonial magic) and

* John i. 1.
† De Lunaticis.
by the employment of the "mumia," that is to say by some particular magnetism, inherent in some physical substance.

Imagination is the power which creates forms, the will endows them with life; ceremonies are used to give external expression to an internal action and substances, as vehicles for certain influences or vibrations are used for the purpose of transmitting the same. A benevolent imagination creates angelic forms of mental matter; an evil imagination causes the formation of monsters, of various kinds. Here it may be remarked that it is not necessary that a man should himself imagine such forms; because the imagination of nature itself does the work. Good thoughts produce beautiful, evil thoughts evil forms; every thought creates a form corresponding to the character of the thought. Such forms are visible to the clairvoyant sight and may become temporarily "materialized" by means of ceremonial magic and magnetic attraction (mumia), so that they will be visible and tangible on the physical plane.

Such thought forms being infused with life through the power of the will become for the time being apparently independent beings with an intelligence of their own and the power of individual action, by means of which they execute the commands of the sorcerer; but there is also a class of beings in the supersensual realm incapable of judgment and unreasoning. These beings may be subjected to one's will by threats and conjurations: but they have no intelligence of their own.

All magical or spiritual power, whether it acts for good or for evil, has its origin in the spirit. It is through the power of the spiritual will that magic feats are performed. This power is called "faith." The "will" of unspiritual man is only a wish or desire, a product of the intellectual action of his brain; the true will power comes from the heart.

Faith and imagination are the two pillars supporting the arch of the temple of magic. They act powerfully when they are one. Man has a visible and an invisible workshop; the visible one is his body, the invisible one his mind. His will is the creative power and his imagination the soil where forms germinate and become developed. His imagination may be compared to the sunlight, which causes vegetation to grow. Visible and tangible forms come into existence from the invisible elements contained within air, water and earth, and likewise ethereal images and forms grow from the invisible elements of the ether by the power of man's thought and imagination. The great world, wherein we live, is a product of the magic power.
of the universal mind, our own subjective world with its thought forms which fill its sphere, is the product of the magic power of the same mind acting within our own constitution and being subjected to our own individual will. In most people the light of imagination is only feeble and the forms created by it are like shadows; but if the imagination becomes exalted to a high degree by the power of faith, it becomes like the sun or a fire, lighting up the deepest recesses of our interior world and the forms created by it become real and living creatures.*

To Paracelsus that which is to-day called "hypnotism" and "suggestion" was well known, as well as other acquisitions of modern science, such as thought-transference (telepathy) and other practices of magic, which were for centuries after him looked upon as superstitions. He says:

"Spirits speak with each other by spiritual means and not by audible speech. While the body of a person is sleeping, his (astral) soul may go to a distant place and act there in an intelligent way. One man may communicate his thoughts to another person, with whom he is in sympathy, at any distance, no matter how far away, or he may act upon the spirit of another while that person is asleep in such a way as to make him perform orders communicated to him during that sleep after he awakens. In this way a great deal of injury may be done to a person and upon this law of nature is based the possibility of witchcraft and sorcery. However, we shall not act like the heathen of whom it is said that if they cannot persuade a man to do their bidding, they conjure him while his body is asleep and cause him to act against his own will and his own nature. Woe to all who use such contemptible means; their doings will rest heavily upon their souls at the ultimate end and fill them with misery and despair."  

Nothing can be accomplished without that internal conviction of success, which is called "faith." If a loaf of bread were laid on a table before a hungry man, and the man did not believe that he could take it, he would starve to death in spite of the loaf. It is the faith which gives power. Through the power of faith we realize that we are spirits ourselves and become able to use spiritual power. Faith renders the spirit strong, doubt hinders or destroys the work. Faith requires no proof; it is spiritual knowledge, and that which we recognize and know to be true, does not need to be proved. He who asks for proofs departs from faith. The good as well as the evilly disposed can only be strong through faith; it is a power which may be used for good or for evil purposes.§ Faith is not a mere belief or

* De virtute imaginativa.  
† Philosophia occulta.  
‡ Ibid, De conjurationibus.  
§ De morbis invisib.
credence; it is a spiritual power, and like any other power or force cannot be known unless a man is himself conscious of its possession. No one can know what love, justice, modesty are, if he does not possess them.

Faith is the power by which one may cure diseases even at a distance, and it is also the cause of witchcraft and sorcery, by means of which one person may injure another without running much risk of discovery; because he may kill or injure his enemy without going near him and that person cannot defend himself as he might, if he were attacked by a visible foe.

"Thus it has often happened that nails, hair, needles, bristles, pieces of glass, and many other things (even living snakes) have been cut or pulled out of different parts of the bodies of patients from under the skin and were followed by other things of a similar character, and such a state of affairs has continued for months, while the physicians stood there unable to help and not knowing what to do, because they knew nothing about the magic power of witchcraft and sorcery. Nevertheless there is nothing supernatural about it. We may put our hand holding a stone into a basin of water. We deposit the stone in the water and take our hand out. There will be no hole left in the water and nevertheless the stone is within. In a similar way some evil spirit may pass some material object through solid matter or put rags, nails or other objects into a man's body, without making a hole in his skin."

A strong will subdues a weaker one and therefore weak-minded persons can easily be influenced by others having more self-reliance and a stronger will, and thus they can be made to do things against their own reason. These are cases of obsession, whether the obsessing influence comes from a living person or from an inhabitant of the astral plane; they constitute feats of black magic and are very injurious to the subject and even more so to the performer in the end. Such obsessions may also take place while a person is asleep, so that after awakening he will perform actions which he has been ordered to perform during his sleep, and which he would not have performed if left in possession of his own free will.

"You have a visible and material body; but there is another man with an invisible, ethereal (astral) body within you and that inner man is yourself too. Each act performed by your external body is performed and caused by the invisible man; the one acts in a visible, the other in

* De Sagis et earum operibus. Phenomena of this kind seem to occur only rarely at present; but they happened very often during the middle ages and even as late as 1850. Gœres, in his Christlike Mystic, and Ch. Bloomhardt give many well authenticated accounts of such cases.
an invisible manner. If an injury is inflicted upon the invisible man, it will be reproduced on his visible body." *

In the same way as thoughts can be transmitted from one person to another one at a distance, so also the magic power of the imagination may be made to act upon an absent person, be it for good or for evil, and the imagination may be aided and rendered more powerful by using certain external means, such as pictures or images of the person upon whom it is desired to act. Thus, for instance, the witches and sorcerers use images of clay or wax of the persons whom they wish to injure, and the evil thoughts directed upon these images take effect upon the persons represented thereby, provided the imagination of the sorcerer is strong enough and the receiver a weak-minded person.†

In regard to ceremonies and ceremonial magic Paracelsus says:

"Our faith ought to be put in God and not in ceremonies and images or prayers; because all power comes only from God and not from the image or prayer, or from the person through whom the divine power may act. If you believe that St. James or St. Peter can cure you, your belief is a mere superstition. Nevertheless your faith may cure you; but it is neither St. James nor St. Peter, but your own faith which cured you, and if you had put your faith in God you would have been cured just the same and received the Kingdom of God in addition. Everything returns to its first origin, from which it was born; if you put your faith in a perishable object, it will perish with it. If your prayer is blessed by God, it will be your blessing; if not, it will be a merely superstitious action, if not a blasphemy; for even the Paternoster is poison in the heart of the evil doer and his eternal death, while within the heart of the just it leads to eternal life. All real strength comes from God. If a soldier’s courage in battle has not this origin, he will be the first one to run away.‡ No matter how saintly a person may be, he can accomplish nothing by his own power, because all spiritual power comes from God."

"It is said that pictures, ceremonies and religious plays are made in memory of the New Testament, but the New Testament is not a dead thing of the past, but still living. Such things may be amusing, but the

---

* This explains why, for instance, a hypnotized person, having his skin touched by a cold piece of wood, may have a burn produced upon his body if he is made to believe that he is touched by a hot iron. His imagination produces a burn upon his astral body and this becomes reproduced on the physical form.

† Nowadays photographs might be found more convenient; but fortunately there are not many people having the necessary powerful imagination.

‡ This means that his courage must come from God through his own higher impersonal consciousness, be it called patriotism, sense of duty or otherwise.
Holy Ghost is not in them; He does not enter into man through the
worship of sensual things but through the heart, and we must seek and
approach him by means of the true spirit of prayer, by faith and contem­
plation."

"All things were in the beginning made by God and consecrated by
Him, and therefore all things are holy and need not be consecrated by
man. Such consecrations of localities, cross-roads, circles for conjura­
tions, swords, clothes, candles, water, oil, fumigations, writings, books,
pentacles, crowns, belts, rings, etc., and whatever the necromancers
make and use for protection against the spirits, as if they could not
be overcome otherwise, may well be dispensed with; because our power
rests in our faith in God, and not in ceremonies and conjurations; but
the consecration of the sacraments, especially of baptism, marriage and
of the body and blood of Christ upon the altar, ought to be held in high
esteem until the day when we all shall be perfectly sanctified and clothed
with a celestial body."†

"Although by means of conjurations of spirits certain things may be
accomplished, nevertheless nothing good can be obtained thereby; they
are against divine law and ought to be prohibited."‡

There is no difficulty in causing evil spirits to come; they
answer our thoughts and come without being called. Far more
important it is to protect ourselves against their intrusion, and
this may be done by the power of faith, which surrounds the
faithful like an impenetrable coat of mail.

"There are, however, certain words and signs in use for the purpose
of affording protection against evil spirits and of such signs one is the
double interlaced triangle and another, still more powerful, one is the
pentagon with the five syllables of the holy name of God Tetragrammaton
inscribed within the five corners. By the use of these signs a person
obessed by an evil spirit or bewitched in some way may have the
evil influence expelled and be cured. The sign may also be made upon
a piece of bread or cake and given to the obsessed person to eat. All
evil spirits and also those who live in the four elements are in fear of these
signs, which are exceedingly powerful and useful during diseases caused
by magical spells; but they ought never to be misused."§

"There are many ills, having their origin in the misuse of magic power,
and which can only be cured by corresponding magical means. It may
for instance, happen that upon a man's body boils, stripes and blue spots
appear, as if he had been beaten all over with a stick, and if such things
have not been due to some physical cause, they may be supposed to have
been caused by some person using black magic.|| And there are also
diseases caused as a punishment from God,¶ which no physician can cure.

* De Suggestitionibus. † De consecrationibus.
‡ De conjurationibus. § De characteribus.
|| Philosophia occulta. Of the misuse of magic.
¶ The law of Karma. Diseases incurred by, caused, created in some
preceding incarnation.
There are certain things which a physician ought to know not taught in the high schools, but nevertheless true.

Sorcerers and witches use for their nefarious practices the "Mumia," which means the "magnetic" or "odic" influences, inhering in certain substances or emanating from living persons or animals, or from dead bodies. These etheric emanations contain some of the life principle and character of the things from which they come, as may be seen by a "mesmerizer" transferring some of his vitality to his subject. These emanations are invisible, but nevertheless something substantial and semi-material, and vehicles for forces which may produce good or evil effects. Paracelsus writes:

"In the Mumia is contained great power and great cures have been performed by its use, although they are little understood by the vulgar; because they are the results of the action of invisible things, and that which is invisible is beyond the comprehension of such ignorant persons. As the odour of a lily emanates from the flower and fills the surrounding air, so the vital force emanates from the invisible (astral) body through the visible form. The Mumia, being the vehicle of vitality is invisible; nevertheless it is an ethereal substance, containing the essence of life and its currents can be guided by the will and thought of the operator and be made to act upon other forms, to which they impart their own qualities."

"Thus the 'mumia' of the plague carries its contagion and by infection causes epidemic diseases; the sun, the moon and each star has its emanations, those of the sun give life, while those of the moon are injurious and therefore the astral influences of the moon are used by witches for the purpose of practising sorcery. The mumia may be transferred from one person to another, it is the vehicle of vitality and the true elixir of life."

On the magnetic power of the mumia rests the efficacy of charms, sympathetic cures, the occult influences of precious stones, plants, relics, etc. Thus, for instance, metals and stones may be used for vehicles and accumulators of astrological influences. There is one law of universal harmony, according to which there is a relationship existing between spiritual, ethereal and physical substances; like associates with like, and the higher vibrations acting upon the lower ones, strengthen and increase their activity.

Man is a little world in which all the essences and powers of the universe are represented. His physical body is his "earth," composed of the four elements, his sidereal body is his ethereal realm, his mind is his heaven, his spirit from God, and all the powers existing within the universe correspond with, nourish

* De origine morb. invisib.
and act upon the principles contained within man's little world. His body receives his nutriment from the products of the material plane; his sidereal body is formed and developed by the influence of the stars, his mind receives its nutriment from the realm of ideas, his spirit obtains its divine life from God, the origin of all power and life, and if we learn to know all the virtues contained within the great storehouse of nature, we shall be enabled to make use of them for our welfare.

"But whatever virtues suns and planets, stones, plants or any other thing may manifest, all these powers come from God; the planets, stones and herbs are only the vehicles of the one essentially divine life in the universe called into existence by the divine Word of God (the universal soul), the cause of all life and all power. Nature creates nothing herself; she is only the workshop in which the power of the one life-principle becomes manifested according to the conditions existing within her productions. Principles and virtues are eternal and uncreated, and if man possesses any virtue or power, it cannot be said that he has created it, but that it has become developed and manifested in him." *

"There is only one divine wisdom, and as all the millions of human beings are only parts of the one universal humanity, likewise human wisdom is only one, but it manifests itself in mankind in many different ways, giving rise to different sciences and arts according to the capacity of the instrument for its manifestation. Therefore we find two different degrees of wisdom in man, the wisdom belonging to the man of this world, 'the son of man,' whose wisdom is imperfect, and the divine wisdom and light of God, manifested in the truly wise, who by this spiritual illumination has become a 'son of God,' and obtained the conscious realization of his divine state and immortal being. The kingdoms of this world perish, the laws made by man are not enduring, men hate and fight each other and bring misery into the world, owing to their non-recognition of eternal truth; but God wills that we should become useful instruments for his divine wisdom. If the will of God were to be done on earth, our earth would be like heaven and we should be like the angels. But how can a fool or a man without knowledge be godlike or live according to the will of God or be like an angel? God has not sent us into the world in order that we should remain stupid or ignorant of his laws and the relation of things in nature; but that we should become wise and intelligent, so that his wisdom may become manifested by us. Man has two kinds of reason, animal and angelic intelligence. The animal mind too is from God, but it is not immortal. The body dies and the animal intellect ceases to act; but not the angelic mind. Only the animal dies, but not that which is eternal. Man has an animal body but he is not of animal origin. He lives in his animal body, but he has an eternal father, and in him his mind and consciousness ought to dwell." †

* De vera influentia rerum.
† De Fundamento Sapientiae.
THREE OF US AND TWO GHOSTS

BY ANON.

LADY C— having asked me to pay her a short visit in Hampshire, it was arranged that her daughter, a mutual friend and myself should drive their Welsh ponies from C— Manor to H— House, a distance of about sixty-eight miles.

We arrived the first day at the village of O—, where we stayed the night, and, starting off early the next morning, drove as far as A—, where we rested the ponies, and then commenced the last stage of our journey in the hope of reaching our destination before nightfall.

I was holding the reins, and was going very quietly so as to save the little animals as much as possible, and I must have stupidly taken the wrong turning as we came to four cross roads facing a desolate common. It was now getting dark, and we pulled up to discuss the situation. There was not a soul to be seen, nor was there any house in sight, and though there was a sign-post, which Miss K— left the carriage to consult, it conveyed little to our minds, as the names on it were quite unfamiliar to us. The ponies were very fidgetty, rearing and plunging, and seeming frightened, so that I was greatly relieved at seeing a young couple walking along the road facing us, and called out to Miss K—: "Jump in, the ponies won't stand. Let's drive after those people and ask them the way."

Miss K— was a little distance from the carriage, and I had time to notice that the girl wore a white gown and a black hat, but what chiefly caught my attention was the way in which she was holding up her skirt, and the swaggering manner in which she walked.

The man had his right arm through hers, and wore a short coat and a cap. We drove after the couple, and I called out, "Please can you tell me the way to ——?" but as they paid no attention I drew nearer to them, repeating the question, when suddenly they vanished, there was no one to answer it—the road lay empty in front of us, the common on either side devoid of bush, tree or shelter of any kind where they could have hidden!

I remarked, "Well!" and then we all re-echoed the word, and sat looking at each other. I must confess that I am not at all brave where ghosts are concerned, so I drove on hastily, follow-
ing the same road for about a mile, when we met two cyclists
who put us in the right direction, and we reached H——-
House safely soon afterwards, to find a hearty welcome and a
good supper awaiting us.

After a pleasant visit we commenced our homeward drive.
Another daughter of Lady C—— had joined us, and she was
much interested when we pointed out the spot where the mysteri­
owus couple had disappeared. We decided to stop at T——, the next
village, for the night, and to put up at the George Hotel. So while
Miss K—— went into the Post Office, the two girls and I went
on to order supper. After waiting some time we were just starting
in search of her when she came in and told us that she was in
the Post Office in the act of stamping her letters, when these
words attracted her attention—

"Don't you tell her nothing at all about it. She's fair
frightened as it is. She told me she saw some one in white
holding up her frock."

Miss K—— said it instantly flashed through her mind what
we had seen on the Common, and she remarked to the post­
mistress :

"Excuse my asking, but who was frightened and who was
seen holding up her dress?"

"Oh," replied the postmistress, "that person was just telling
me, Miss, that a friend of hers was walking home late last night,
and met a woman dressed in white who did not pass her or go
back, but just disappeared."

At Miss K——'s request, the postmistress gave the address
of the woman who had seen the figure, and after supper we all
trooped off to interview her. Mrs. M—— and her husband
were "at home," partaking of a late tea, and she was charmed
to tell us of her adventure, which I give in her own words:

"We was a-comin' home after market, middling late, along
the path that's a short cut here. I was walkin' a bit ahead of
my old man, when I sees comin' along in the middle of the road
a young woman holdin' up her dress, and walkin' as if she be
somebody. I thinks to myself, ' I wonder who you may be,'
and made room like for her to pass. She never turned right nor
left, but seemed to come straight through me. I turned cold
and my legs shook, but I calls out to my old man—

"' Peter, d'ye see that ?'

"' See what ?' calls out he.

"' See that young woman,' says I.

"' I seed no young woman,' says he."
Neither would Peter allow that there was any young woman. "'Cause if there 'ad bin any one there for the missus to see," he remarked, dryly, to us, "wouldn't I have seed her too?"

"Well," retorted his wife, "I've spoke the truth, and tain't like I'm the only one in the village that's seen her. There's plenty who can say the same as I 'ave."

Beyond that she had nothing to tell us, so, thanking her, we went back to the inn, where we made inquiries of the landlady, who assured us she had not heard of any ghostly visitors in the neighbourhood, but that as she and her husband had only been a few days in the place she would ask in the bar if any one knew of any such tales. She returned shortly with the information that a few years ago there had been a shocking murder near to, or on, the Common, the coachman's or gardener's son at —— having killed the girl he was in love with. It appeared that the young woman was in a somewhat higher station in life than himself and her parents objected to the match. The girl was in the habit of walking across the Common to A——, where she took music lessons, and the young man sometimes accompanied her. One night, as she did not return, a search party went out to look for her, and found her body lying on the Common, where she had been foully murdered.

At this point in the story I interrupted to observe, "But we saw two ghosts—a man and a woman."

"Well, you see," replied the landlady, "he did away with himself, too. They found his body lying by the gate on the right-hand of the sign-post that points to A——."

She then added that she understood that the parents of both of the unfortunate couple still lived in the neighbourhood.

We were all entire strangers to the place and knew nothing of the murder on the Common.

One of the girls wisely remarked:

"I never believed in such things as ghosts before. I do now, as three of us have seen them."

[The above narrative comes from an unimpeachable source and is thoroughly authenticated.—Ed.]
THE MYSTICAL IDEAL AS EXPRESSED IN POETRY

BY W. L. WILMSHURST

WHEN mysticism speaks, it speaks in music; the two terms are essentially, as they are etymologically, related. For mystical utterance is the voice of purified emotion; it is the soul, speaking, as nearly as its physical limitations permit, after a spiritual manner. All other speech, the issue of the mind rather than of the soul, is relatively mere mouthing, and although mind and reason must needs be employed to ensure intelligibility and regulate the expression and form of what the soul seeks to express, yet the value of the expression is proportional to its freedom from the warping, clouding influences of ratiocination and the deflective action of intellectual prejudice. Silence we know to be often the best speech, since the greatest things surpass expression; but since humanity, like Nature, is impelled to give expression even to silence and to things which silence would best express, the fact stands that the purest and truest of vocal utterances come ex ore infantium—out of the mouth of babes, of whatever age in point of mortal years, but young and fresh in spirit, whether children, seers or poets.

Thou Primal Love, that grantest wings
And voices unto woodland birds,
Grant me the gift of saying things
Too simple and too sweet for words!

In this quatrain from The Angel in the House, verbally and emotionally so exquisitely simple, yet imaginatively so comprehensive and exalted, one hears as it were the naïve voice of aboriginal, unsophisticated man, but recently ex-paradised, striving to sing the songs of his spirit in a strange land, yet hampered by an inadequate organ of expression and envious of that of orders of life less noble than himself but possessing one commensurate with their ordained status. The logical reason speaks in prose, and prosaically; the native voice of the soul, like that of the world-soul, is rhythmic, poetical, mystical, and the truest poetry is that of the truest mystic.

Poetry is the quest of the Beauty lying beneath the surface of
any given subject-matter. But what is that Beauty? It is itself something mystical, unanalysable; not one but an aggregate of pleasing qualities; an assemblage of perfections brought to a focus; a confluence and synthesis of virtues natural and ultra-natural. Plato, in the *Phaedrus*, anticipating by six centuries the very words of the Christian gospel, affirmed that absolute Beauty, of which all glints of terrene beauty are but iridescent reflexes, exists objectively upon a transcendental plane of life, "shining in company with the celestial forms," and that a man initiated into direct cognition of It will leave all, father and mother, brethren and companions, and despise loss and contumely, to follow It and sleep by Its side as a servant. The ideal of the Hebrew prophet was to "see the King in His beauty." Keats epitomised philosophy in the phrase—

_Beauty is Truth; Truth, Beauty; this is all_  
_Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know._

It is the subject of two of the noble *Four Hymnes* of Spenser. It is the theme of that truest of nursery-myths which tells of a Sleeping Beauty long drowsing in a tangled forest and awaiting but the reviving kiss of a lover bold enough to win a way through to her. But this is but a variant of other cosmic parables telling of a Lost Word waiting to be found; of a ruined Temple needing to be rebuilt; of a removed Graal; of kings and ideal men sore wounded and departed towards the sunset;—all legends of man's fall and loss; parables of his present dream-life amid illusions, until an awakening kiss comes and restores, or sets him upon the path to, his primal rights.

There is no source from which the kiss may not come, for all things conspire to minister to man's awakening. Wordsworth received it in the vocal solitudes of virginal nature, and was caught up out of the sense-world to a recollection of the superb glory of an antecedent life and of "that imperial palace whence he came." But he discerned that that glory was nowise banished even here; but shrouded and occulted rather as by some Merlin-magic; ever ready to "flash upon the inward eye" receptive to its impressions, and ever exercising a beneficent, formative influence upon human life; cloud and tree, storm and star, mountain and rivulet, each contributing its subtle ministry towards man's reintegration and causing "beauty born of murmuring sound" to pass into his face.

To Coventry Patmore the appeal of the ideal Beauty beckoned through the faces of women.
Her beauty was a godly grace;
The mystery of loveliness
Which made an altar of her face
Was not of the flesh, though that was fair,
But a most pure and living light
Without a name, by which the rare
And virtuous spirit flamed to sight;

and this vision of the “veiled virgin” led him on to the deeper truth of the profound sacramentalism of inter-sexual attraction; a phenomenon predicative of the ultimate marriage in consciousness of affinitised souls, and further, of these, when so wedded, with the Divine Soul, which is restless until its segregated rays coalesce in their original unity. He saw the divine in man seeking union, beneath all physical folds and beyond all sensual taint, with the divine in woman, and a prophetic outburst in his *Sponsa Dei*, at a stroke, discloses the fallacy of human separateness, emphasizes the fundamental but as yet unrealized unity of life, and reveals the truth that every inter-flash of love between men and women is a shadow of what, in a fine paradox, he calls “The love that is between Himself.”

Oh, Heart, remember thee
That man is none
Save one,
What if this lady be thy soul, and he
Who claims to enjoy her sacred beauty be
Not thou, but God; and thy sick fire
A reflex heat
Flash’d on thy cheek from His immense desire
Which waits to crown, beyond thy brain’s conceit,
Thy nameless, secret, hopeless longing sweet,
Not by and by, but now?

And to some the initiation comes not from natural sources but through the doctrine and artificial offices of instituted religion. Of such was Francis Thompson, one of the very greatest of mystical poets, who upon the Thames Embankment spent abject and penurious nights that yet rewarded him with the sight of the Beatific Vision “pitched between Heaven and Charing Cross.” A son of the Roman Church it fell to him, as Patmore recorded, to exploit “the inexhaustible and well-nigh wholly unworked mine of catholic philosophy.” To him the universe showed as one vast sanctuary wherein a “Titanian primal liturgy,” of which the temporal reflex is that of the Church, is sung perpetually; the sun an officiating priest, the earth itself a censer slowly being swung by some mighty spirit unknown in
adoration before an unseen high altar. His gorgeous verse is perhaps the greatest justification extant in poetry of the doctrines of renunciation and the cross, by means of which he reconciled the conflicting opposites of the world's pain and joy, and unified ideal Beauty with all that seems at first to negate it and to prevent its manifesting. To his cleansed vision that latent Beauty was everywhere present: it might be seen by us all if we looked, as Wm. Blake used to say, "not with but through the eye" of the senses.

The angels keep their ancient places;
Turn but a stone, and start a wing!
'Tis ye; 'tis your estranged faces
That miss the many-splendoured thing.

Only the splendour of his work and the richness and imminence of his accorded vision, one feels, can justify the price exacted for it in his own life-tragedy. "There goes the man who has been in hell," people whispered as Dante passed; and, to use Thompson's own words, to

Drink the moonless mere of sighs
And tread the places infamous to tell
Where God wipes not the tears from any eyes,
Where through the paths of dreadful greatness are,

seems, as the common history of the greater mystics testifies, to be a prerequisite to the great awakening.

The foregoing sketch of types of mystical poetry, inspired from different sources but disclosing a common term, is intended to prelude a notice of the poetical works of Mr. A. E. Waite.* These stand, and that prominently, in the direct line of succession of highly illuminated utterance. A purely literary appraisement might adjudge his verse, as such merely, below the supreme level of attainment which has secured for the great names already mentioned canonization among the classics. Yet it is always admirable; never otherwise than chaste, ardent and sincere, and lacking perhaps in no other merely literary merit than the power to coin frequent striking phrases—*aurea dicta* that "twinkle like Sirius on a frosty night," haunting the memory and compelling quotation; a capacity, by the way, which the author displays abundantly when employing the medium of prose. But from the mystical standpoint one has no reservation to make; the purely literary deficiency (though I fear that this

word is much too strong) is atoned for by the range and grandeur and many-sidedness of his conceptions. With many poets the moments of authentic inspiration are few. The flame leaps from the altar to touch the heights for an instant, and then relapses to a modest glow; or perhaps some aspect of truth is offered tentatively or apologetically; or in a moment of exaltation some precious glimpse is captured which is truer for the reader than for the instrument who gives it lyrical expression. But Mr. Waite's message is not sporadic, but systematic. He writes always with and from the open vision, and with his feet upon the rock of knowledge and tested, first-hand, spiritual experience. His voice is that of one who has climbed to certain heights above his labouring fellows and shouts down to them an assurance that the path upwards is safe and sure, if severe, and that beyond the wreathing clouds he has seen peaks that will well repay the climb. He is expositor and encourager as well as seer and poet.

There are things of which it has been said, as of that Sleeping Beauty before-mentioned, that the outward eye hath not seen nor ear heard; yet those who have said such things must, by the hypothesis, have entered, as Mr. Waite gives evidence of having done, into conscious relations with them by another process than that of the senses. Heart-hunger to attain to this process is common to us all; but the fact that the hunger exists is also the earnest that the travail of our hearts shall be satisfied, a matter upon which Mr. Waite gives full assurance in some tender, winning verses entitled *A Confidence*:

That which you seek for in your heart of hearts,
That which transcends both Nature and the Arts,
Great beyond conscious grasp of human mind,
But ever as the rest and goal
Acknowledged by your secret soul,—
Brother, I promise, you shall surely find.

And if you ask me—knowing it so great—
The solid ground on which I dare to state
That you shall certainly attain at length;
Learn that beyond the things which seem
I have divined your dream.
And also know your hidden source of strength.

Have courage, therefore: Keep your daily road,
And after your own individual mode
Do that which comes to hand, but well and true;
For failures sometimes made—as such—
Be, not concern'd too much.
Fear not yourself;—I have no fear for you.
And if you wish to know further as to the supreme secret, you will find it here written—by way of restating an ancient doctrine that tells of a passport that "never faileth,"—that the secret is one for those

Whose souls are subtly link'd with things above
By sanctified capacities of love...
Know too the work is love's, and love's the call,
While love is also the material.
And at the end such union comes at length
As to the worker brings another strength
Those heights forsaken once again to dare,
Those realms discover which await him there;
With consciousness of ends beyond them still,—
The holy palace, the eternal hill;

And thus it comes about that with "the glorious company of the apostles" of poetry who have striven to express the mystical Ideal in verse, and from whose evangels have here been collated a few typical and mutually-corroborative testimonies, it may be claimed that Mr. Waite is to be numbered as one who speaks with a confidence, and perhaps with an experience, that is excelled by none, and with a variety of expression and form attained to by few.

Mr. Waite's philosophical base is the catholic thesis that human life is passing at the periphery of a circle whose centre is our true and eventual home. And his one cry is, Who goes home?—home out of strange houses of sleep where the soul drowses under the myriad enchantments that make up what our dull senses persuade us into imagining is life. Nature herself (and here Mr. Waite expands Wordsworth's message) is ever crying to man, "Awake, thou that sleepest!" Everything sub-human offers kisses sacramental of the great awakening one that is supra-human, saying as it were, "I, too, sleep till you awake; I, too, suffer arrested ministry till you are made whole; till the Lost Word is found, till the King returns from the West, and the Graal is restored." Mr. Waite, who elsewhere has interpreted at length the import of these great legends of cosmic loss, brings before the mind with great art the sense of the spiritual Beauty and realities underlying the cortex of physical life and needing but the release of a dormant faculty to ensure their perception. In The King's Rendering, a superb poem, presaging things that shall be, he gives us the vision of the return of the mystic King from Avalon with the Graal; the invisible procession entering London from the west at dawn, and passing through the awakening life.
of the streets to restore the withdrawn hallows to the Minster altar, whilst the dull citizens are gradually startled from their spiritual lethargy by light kindling in the East and by the shouts of a ragged, homeless lad roused to vision and worship by the brushing against his naked leg of the robe of one in the passing cavalcade of angels. This is poetry at its noblest; but Mr. Waite’s implication is that there remains something nobler still—namely, the personal realization of what this vision implies; and the gist of his meaning is lost unless one sees that the city the King must enter is within us; that the altar awaiting the Graal is the sanctuary of the individual soul, and that its restoration is a present possibility.

Nature herself, then, awaits the re-integration of that which is her centre—namely, man. She is inarticulate, save for sacramental whispers, because he is; let him but speak the word of power and she too will be made whole. She is dependent upon him, and the apparent antagonism between him and her is due to her reaction against his neglect to recognize the fact. Here is a passage typical of Mr. Waite’s great sweep of vision, embracing earth, man, and heaven simultaneously:

All things on sea and land
Speak to my soul, and each
Blithe voice I understand
Answers in flowing speech.
Quantities, measures, rhymes,
Harpstring and organ-note
Surround me at all times;
Stars that in ether float,
Sun in his flaming course,
All the world’s lights and all
Darkness and tempest’s force
Thril me with frequent call.
Bear I no tidings true
Which all might hear and learn,
Plain Nature, simple view,
And little child discern?
Soul high-encompassed, tell!
Surely the world can know
How the small fonts as well
As great with mercy flow;
Grace to the humblest field
Of daily life is lent,
For each is sign’d and seal’d
With marks of sacrament.
In Wall Street dare we say
An office God disowns?
Why, angels pass that way
    As by the Masters' thrones.
The keen winds sweeping there
    Do proud hosannas sing.
Yea, even as in the fair
    White City of the King.

From the sacramentalism of Nature, from that of the great myths and legends, from the co-ordination of all these in the instituted rites of official religion, Mr. Waite bids us come up still higher and behold the prototypes behind the sacramental phenomena; to assist in thought at the heavenly Mass; to watch the Holy Sacrifice ever being offered behind all veils; and to perceive the hidden mysteries perpetually operating to secure the return of man to the Centre. Upon this side of his work, Mr. Waite's genius connects with Francis Thompson's. His Poor Brother's Mass Book is an esoteric and interpretative commentary graduated to the external incidents of the Eucharistic Office; a wonderful adjunct to the formal text of the missal, intended to lift the imagination above the bonds of the letter, and one that may serve to elevate the consciousness into places high above all sacramentalism. Such a consummation would surely be the crown of the ministry of poetry; and poetry is itself, for many, a most potent minister in revealing that Beauty which I have said to be the subject of all mystical quests and which all witnesses testify to be everywhere present, but to be sleeping. Exigencies of space, and the quasi-dramatic form of much of Mr. Waite's poetical work, prevent further quotation here, but perhaps enough has been said to send readers to his two volumes, sumptuous alike in form and content, at first hand. I will add only that Mr. Waite's poems earn a title to something more than the poet's conventional bays, and I would fain offer my own obolus of thanksgiving. His work carries with it a claim to that tribute which is due to the servitors and illuminators of humanity; and although, such is the nature of the times, there may be few able to pay it, or who are even conscious of the obligation, there are grounds for believing that the wages do not go unpaid.
PROFESSOR WILLIAM JAMES.

To the Editor of the Occult Review.

Dear Sir,—I am writing away from my library and notes of reference, hence these remarks may be marred by inherent weakness of memory. But the personality of William James was so marked, and the part he took in psychical research so important, that a few words, on broad lines, may be justified.

William James was, definitely, a man of science, and his methods of investigation always scientific. In this lies the importance of the fact that he accepted telepathy as scientifically proved to have been brought within the four corners of human experience.

There is, as yet, no general appreciation of the change which must be made in the treatment of psychology as a science, if the fact of telepathy as a part of human experience be accepted. The fact, I would state boldly, gets rid of the psychological "I": we are driven to the conclusion that each one of us exists as a spiritual or intuitive self, and that the psychological "I" is no more than a pericratic and mediate manifestation in our universe of time and space of the (relatively) noumenal "I." We expand human experience: it covers ground that otherwise is part of the dim, unknown, spiritual.

Now it would appear that William James when investigating psychical phenomena started with an assumption of the existence of this spiritual "I." And he examined all "sorts and conditions" of psychical phenomena: nihil humanum escaped his net and he brought the spiritual into his human net. But how did he examine these phenomena? As a sane man of science.

It is most interesting to compare the sane method of William James with the equally sane method of Frank Podmore. The latter was always influenced by the dominant idea that man exists and exists only as the psychological "I," and, therefore, his reasoning led to a conclusion that there is no proof in human
experience of the spiritual in man. The former was influenced by reasoning which led him to assume the spiritual in man. But he did not therefore accept all the evidence offered. He examined it scientifically, rejected much and treated that which he accepted merely as evidence towards proof of the spiritual in man. He was always scientific in method, and herein lies the extreme value of his work.

Spiritualists and mystics have their part in the advance of humanity. But real and lasting evolution in human thought, all which forms a sound foundation for advance, must be based on scientific methods. And the work now to our hands is to gain admittance for telepathy as a fact in human experience into the Kingdom of Science.

Many marked men of Science are now engaged in this work: William James takes his place with them as one of the foremost. When the time comes for the science of Psychology to be rebuilt on its wider and deeper foundations, then will full honour be paid to the memory of the man who has left us.

Those of us who know not the man but know his works must recognize the courage and love of truth of William James. For courage and love of truth are revealed in all he wrote.

William James, by common admission, was a marked man of science. But, though a man of science, he took deep interest in psychical phenomena. It must be, then, of interest to consider what was his attitude of mind in relation to psychical research.

I think we have none of us as yet fully appreciated the great change in human thought which has taken place during the last fifty years or so. William James was and still is one of a large and distinguished body of scientific men who have effected a new departure for humanity: they have gone far to prove that psychical phenomena cannot now be treated as outside the field of science; they demonstrate that these phenomena have so much in them of reality that they can be the subjects of scientific investigation. If science still refuses to give free entry to psychical research within its portals, it has at least begun to consider the advisability of taking down its notices against spiritual trespass.

William James was one of the presidents of the S.P.R., so we may well consider his presidential address in trying to find out what was his attitude of mind in relation to psychical research. This address is reported in the Proceedings of the S.P.R., vol. xii, pp. 2 et seq.
As to science itself, he says:—

"The rigorously scientific mind may, in truth, easily overreach itself. Science means, first of all, a certain dispassionate method. To suppose that it means a certain set of results that one should pin one's faith upon and hug for ever, is sadly to mistake its genius and degrade the scientific body to the status of a sect" (p. 6). 

Hume's well known argument that "there is an antecedent improbability in miracles which no amount of human evidence can overcome" is based on the assumption that we have exhaustive knowledge of the laws of nature, even of nature itself. This William James would appear to deny; holding, on the contrary, that the true scientific method is to dissect all evidence offered without dogmatic assumption that the laws of nature are fully known to us.

It was open to him, therefore, to consider telepathy scientifically, whereas many men of science refuse to consider it at all, because they assume they know all the laws of nature and telepathy cannot be brought within the category of known laws.

In considering telepathy William James refers to the important fact (following Gurney) that—

"Our evidence for telepathy, weak and strong, taken just as it comes, forms a faggot and not a chain. No one item cites the contents of another item as part of its own proof. But, taken together, the items have a certain general consistency; there is a method in their madness, so to speak. So each of them adds value to the lot; and cumulatively, as no candid mind can fail to see, they subtract presumptive force from the orthodox belief that there can be nothing in one's intellect that has not come in through ordinary experience of sense." . . . "If you wish to upset the law that all crows are black, you mustn't seek to show that no crows are; it is enough if you prove one single crow to be white."

This being his attitude of mind towards scientific consideration of telepathy, what conclusion did he arrive at as to telepathy itself? He holds it proved scientifically. He says:—

"For me the thunderbolt has fallen, and the orthodox belief has not merely had its presumption weakened, but the truth of the belief is decisively overthrown" (p. 5).

Again, even as to physical mediumship he says:—

"I am not ashamed to say in my own case, although my judgment remains deliberately suspended, my feeling towards the way in which the phenomena of physical mediumship should be approached has received from ghosts and disturbance-stories a distinctly charitable lurch" (p. 7).

(Cf. Dreams of a Spirit Seer, p. 88, where it will be found Kant had expressed somewhat the same opinion.)
That William James’ attitude of mind was always scientific when dealing with psychical phenomena is well shown in his review of Myers’ *Human Personality* (*Proceedings S.P.R.*, Vol. xviii, p. 22) and his report on Mrs. Piper’s Hodgson-control (*Proceedings*, Vol. xxiii, p. 2). In the latter he says:

"I therefore repeat that if ever our growing familiarity with these phenomena should tend more and more to corroborate the hypothesis that ‘spirits’ play some part in their production, I shall be quite ready to undeafen my ears and to revoke the negative conclusions of this limited report. The facts are complicated in the extreme, and we have as yet hardly scratched the surface of them” (p. 29).

Now it was this man, so gifted, so subject to scientific caution, who accepted as definitely proved the fact of telepathy. Herein, I think, lies the importance of his life’s work.

When so many men, like to William James, distinguished in science, accept telepathy as a fact, the community of men of science in general cannot long refuse to keep it at arm’s length. But the strife against acceptance must, for long, continue and be embittered. For, if telepathy be once accepted as a fact of human experience, the very foundations of the existing science of psychology crumble away. Telepathy imports communication from man to man otherwise than through the normal organs of sense, and this could not be if man were no more than a thing of material body and mind. If telepathy be fact, then there must be in man a spiritual, an intuitive self, so that the “psychological I” becomes no more than a partial and mediate manifestation in our universe of an existing spiritual self. Dogmatic men of science will fight to the death before admitting that the very foundations of existing psychology are rotten or that a new standpoint must be taken from which to view psychology as a science.

When the time comes for the science of psychology to be rebuilt on its wider and deeper foundations, then will full honour be paid to the memory of the man who has left us.

Yours faithfully,

F. C. CONSTABLE.

**SWEDENBORO AND REINCARNATION.**

_to the Editor of the Occult Review._

Sir,—Mr. Dudley Wright in his article “Can Reincarnation be Demonstrated?” in the October issue of the Occult Review, mentions Swedenborg (among others) as a believer in Reincarnation.
As a reader of the voluminous writings of the Swedish seer for more than twenty years, I am bound to say (no pun intended) Mr. Wright is wrong, in this respect. Emanuel Swedenborg was by no means a believer in Reincarnation. In fact his teachings are emphatically the other way. Briefly put, what Swedenborg says on the subject of human destiny is as follows:

Every man is a spiritual being, clothed with a material, physical body which is the mere instrument of the man himself.

When the physical body dies, the man within does not die but lives on as a spiritual being, in a spiritual world, and is clothed with a spiritual body adapted to the requirements of the spiritual world. This spiritual body (referred to by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 44) is very similar to but far more perfect than the physical or natural body.

All (men, women and children, good, bad and indifferent) when they leave this world, immediately pass into this World of Spirits, which is neither Heaven nor Hell, but is the Intermediate State between both. The majority of men being neither good enough for Heaven nor bad enough for Hell remain there for a considerable time until their character (determined by their ruling love, and their life while in the world) is fully developed for either good or evil. As like attracts like the separation of the good and the bad takes place automatically. Each makes for where he feels most at home. What is Heaven to one man is Hell to another, and vice versa.

After a time each one finds his own place either in one of the innumerable Societies of which the Heavens are made up, or, if he deliberately chooses evil instead of good, and cultivates a hellish instead of a heavenly nature, he takes the opposite direction.

Swedenborg's Hell is not of the fire and brimstone order, but is rather the state of the soul tormented by its own evil nature (the "worm that dieth not").

Swedenborg states that both the Heavens and the Hells are eternal, and it is characteristic of him that he professes to speak of what he has seen (clairvoyance) and heard (clairaudience), not of what he believes.

Yours truly,

NOTTINGHAM.

ALFRED HAMMERSLEY.

[Several letters have unavoidably been held over through lack of space.—Ed.]
REPLYING in *The Hibbert Journal* to the article by the Rt. Hon. Gerald Balfour in the April number, Professor Hyslop does not believe "that any philosophical theories like Parallelism, Epiphenomenalism and Interactionism in any way condition an answer to the question of survival after death," and thinks that their discussion only confuses the issue. No philosophical system, he says, has any direct relation to the problem except atomic materialism, and only that on the proviso that we do not suppose intelligence in matter. Psychic research does not await the verdict of philosophy, but must itself determine that verdict.

The simple question is whether personal consciousness is a function of the organism or not. . . . We have never proved the non-existence of consciousness when the cerebral functions have disappeared, and it is a tolerably safe statement to say that we never shall. All that we know about the relation is the uniformity of co-existence and sequence between them as a fact, not the necessity of it, and this circumstance excludes all dogmatism about the necessity of the connexion. If we could prove that mental and physical phenomena were identical in kind the case might be very different. . . . The real question is whether there are any facts that dissociate consciousness from the organism altogether.

Dr. Hyslop thinks that the solution of the problem is bound up with the proof of personal identity of the deceased communicator, and that "the crucial evidence is not in any single incident, however valuable, but in a collective mass of incidents having an organic unity that makes any opposing hypothesis applying to the individual incident seem unreasonable."

Another writer describes his experiences of dual consciousness, and, although a Catholic, he thinks that they can be explained on the basis of theosophical teaching as to the seven principles in man. He says that on several occasions when he has been in great danger he has felt that his normal consciousness was superseded by a higher one, which seemed to regard himself and his danger from a detached standpoint, without fear, seeing death, personal pain, and separateness as illusions. He says:—

Without conscious transition "I" was apart from that self that had seemed to be the whole of me, contemplating it with wonder and vague pity. I did not seem to be much interested in the danger or the fate of that self. I seemed to be beyond the reach of emotion. The wonder and the pity that I felt were quite calm, wholly different from those emotions in my normal self. . . . The self that was in danger also awaited the event, watchful and alert. It did not hope, fear, or reason. Instinct, pure and primitive, dominated it. At the instant of action it would
know what to do, and do it. From the civilized complex human being ages of evolution seemed to have slipped away, leaving primeval man.

The Quest, which has now entered upon its second volume, contains, as usual, valuable articles on various points in comparative religion. Dr. Eisler writes learnedly on "The Fishing of Men in Early Christian Literature"; there are notes on Hafiz and on Buddhism; Evelyn Underhill continues her exposition of mysticism, holding that it is practical; that it is final and personal—"an act of love, an act of union, and an act of supreme perfection"; the business and method of mysticism is love; it entails a definite psychological experience. Further:

Mysticism is not an attitude of mind, but a form of organic life; not merely a theory of the intellect or a hunger, however passionate, of the heart, but a definite and peculiar development of the whole Self, conscious and subconscious, a remaking of the whole character in the interests of the transcendental life. The object and end of this development consist in the raising of the powers of the Self to the condition in which conscious union with the Absolute takes place, and man, ascending to the summit of his manhood, enters into that greater Life for which he was made. . . . It is one of the many indirect testimonies to the objective reality of mystical experience that the stages of this road, the psychology of the spiritual ascent, as described by different schools of contemplatives, always present practically the same sequence of states.

The editor, Mr. Mead, writes on "The Sacred Dance of Jesus," and shows that "the idea of a sacred dance—a heavenly carol or chorus—of utmost holiness goes back to the earliest times of Christianity"; that it was in fact an integral part of the Christian Mysteries, but that in course of time, owing to abuses, these sacred dances, together with the love-feasts and the custom of the kiss of peace, were abolished. Mr. Mead confines himself to Christian traditional practices, but hints that the mystery is of far wider extent, and truly "cosmic"; it may be compared with the dance of Siva, which has more than once been referred to in recent issues of the Theosophical Review.

Among other articles are a description of the Sikh religion as one "which has a God and a soul, which presents no mysteries, and which embraces an ethical system such as has never been excelled"; "The Dethroned Gods," and one on "The Life of Jesus Christ in His Mystical Body," by Father R. H. Benson, who, however, refers to the highest form of life on earth as "that of an ideal Society in which human persons are the cells, and of which the immanent and transcendent consciousness is that of the Founder and Centre of the Society." The Rev. R. Roberts also replies to the articles in the Hibbert Supplement, on the question
raised by himself in the Hibbert Journal, and hints that whereas Jesus, Krishna, and Gotama were local, the Christ is universal.

The Open Court for September is largely devoted to the consideration of ecclesiastical subjects, such as the Eucharist, the Seven Sacraments, Beethoven’s Missa Solemnis, and of the religion of Egypt in Greco-Roman times, in the form in which it became a cult in Rome itself; its power of attraction is attributed to the firmness with which it insisted on the necessity for preparation for a higher and purer after-life.

The detailed account of the Elwin March case of "Poltergeist" in the Journal of the American S.P.R. is disappointing; after a long catalogue of mysterious movements of objects in a house at Portland, Oregon, it reduces them all to the tricks of a naughty little boy. Much greater interest attaches to a narrative of numerous psychical experiences, including apparitions and premonitions, in the life of a lady here called Mrs. Maltby.

The Word contains an interesting article on "The Marvels of the Hand," including its use and significance in occult symbolism.

The Health Record quotes from The Hospital an article on "The Royal Touch" as used for healing, which is described as the survival of a rite performed by the priest-physicians of ancient Egypt and Babylonia. Pyrrhus and Vespasian also cured diseases by touch. The practice probably took its rise in the belief that certain individuals were born with powers superior to those of their fellow creatures, and that monarchs had a distinctive excellence imparted to them at their birth by the ruling signs and planets. They were believed to be capable of imparting this influence by a glance or a touch of the hand, or even of their robes. Thus arose the belief in the healing power possessed by the Lord’s anointed. The practice in this country appears to have originated with Edward the Confessor; Queen Elizabeth was said to have been averse to its use, but she touched an immense number of people, making the sign of the cross with her finger on the affected part; a practice which was revived by James II. The Stuart kings appear to have had a special liking for exhibiting the virtue of the royal touch.

The Vedic Magazine regards the Vedas as the primary source of Christianity and of religion in general, and says:—

The Holy Veda will remain the primal focus of all revelation, the central sun in the light of which everything else must be read and estimated. But different parts of the New Testament—when the pruning-knife has been applied to it—will form another Arash Granthavali set like stars round the sun, and the Vedic teaching of Christ will be abundantly used by the Aryan sons of the Occident. . . . Almost every Christian belief, rite
Johnston has written a book dealing with Christian tradition in teaching and practice. He regards this age of facts as affording increased stability in the thinking world, and early draws attention to the facts of the moral realm. He regards Jesus as the greatest specialist in facts relating to human character; and His attitude to the facts of spiritual life strictly scientific. Consequently we have the scientific Faith, the Scientific Belief in God, in Character, in the Bible; and in this latter connexion we are confronted with the original statement that "the Bible is not the revelation of God, but the record of that revelation." We pass to the Scientific Belief in Miracles, which, as involving the knowledge of the Miracle, culminates in the reformation in human character by saving grace. Then we have the Scientific Belief in Christ, in Prayer, in Christianity, and finally the Scientific Outlook and Hope, which, as expressed from the ingenious author's point of view, cannot strictly be associated with Scientific thought as we know it in representative circles. The whole argument rests upon a specialized use of the term "scientific," and I fear that it is a use which will not only be disallowed but even rigidly condemned by those to whom science means the entirety of revelation as cognized by us.

SELF-CONTROL AND HOW TO SECURE IT. By Dr. Paul Dubois. London: Wm. Rider & Son, Ltd., 164, Aldersgate Street, E.C. Price 45. 6d. net.

Convinced from experience that "Man is the only animal who does not know how to live," and that this need never have been so, Dr. Paul Dubois, who will be known to our readers as the author of those valuable essays on "The Psychic Treatment of Nervous Disorders" and "The Influence of the Mind on the Body," has added to his works of instruction this upon Self Control. It is said to be no longer possible to divide humanity into two classes, the ill and the well. Neurasthenia may serve the physician's purpose to define a morbid condition of the nervous system, the corrosion that is due directly to the unnatural strain of our daily lives in modern conditions; but we have need of a new name for that condition of mental debility which characterizes so many people to-day, and need, too, of a better understanding of the cause and cure of this evil. To the former need Dr. Paul Dubois answers with the definition of "psychasthenia," while to the latter need he addresses himself in this excellent work. And we, who feel so confident of our own mental poise and nervous virility, are warned to remember that "no man is a hero to either his doctor or his valet." In seeking to ascribe blame in the right quarter Dr. Dubois attributes it chiefly to defective education, in the broadest sense of the word, to social influence, the contagion of habit, and the moral effects of social life.

We have not been taught how to think or act for ourselves. Our education consists in the absorption of ready-made opinions and the acceptance of already determined standards. We are all able to see with one eye that we are blind in the other. It is the judgment which employs both eyes that has the correct perspective, and this is what Dr. Dubois seeks to enforce as the only remedy for that insidious disease hereafter to be known as psychasthenia. The excellent translation from the French is by Mr. H. Hutcheson Boyd.
REVIEWS

The Influence of the Mind on the Body. By Dr. Paul Dubois.
London: Wm. Rider & Son, Ltd., 164, Aldersgate Street, E.C.
Price 1s. net.

This translation by Mr. L. B. Gallatin of Dr. Paul Dubois' work proves a valuable addition to the series of "Mind and Body Handbooks," published by Messrs. Rider & Son, Ltd. Dr. Dubois' primary object is to show the influence of the mind over the body, but he does not neglect the converse side of the problem, as we see from the single sentence: "The dependence of the soul upon the body commences in the cradle and finishes only in the grave"; and this when considered in regard to heredity and atavism means a very great dependence indeed. What is true of inherited physical qualities is equally true in regard to moral tendency. We are born with definite mental characteristics, from wheresoever we derive them. We have no reason to presume, however, as does Dr. Dubois, that all is inherited. An inherited destiny is something the moral sense jibs at. We are willing to accept our own deserts but not those of others. The saying that "the Soul is an intelligence served by the physical organs" is only a half truth. It is true also that the soul is frequently the servant of those organs. But in the writing of this book Dr. Dubois has a practical end in view, its aim is not to discuss abstruse psychological problems, but to insist upon the need of self-education, self-control and the right use of one's psycho-physical organism. To this end much practical instruction is given, and the Handbook is thereby rendered exceedingly valuable.

Scrutator.

London: Wm. Rider & Son, Ltd., 164, Aldersgate Street, E.C. Price 1s. net.

This little manual, which forms one of the now rapidly growing series of Mind and Body Handbooks, published by Messrs. Rider & Son, Ltd., is a practical application of the principles of the true Mystic Healing of the Ages. In a word, it affirms the mastery of mind over matter and the possibility of curing the body of its ills by means of meditations. It is that faith which, when established by a correct knowledge of the relations of the spiritual and physical worlds, is capable of removing mountains. Where the correct knowledge does not exist, it is instilled and enforced by the twelve meditations into which the author has divided his course. Those who have tried other agents and remedies without success may, after reading this book, be disposed to see what they can do for themselves of their own inherent power.

Scrutator.

The Walter Scott Publishing Co., Ltd. Paper, 1s. net.

A lurid romance of mediaeval diablerie and witchcraft. The exploits of the central figure, Ezelin (who, by the way, considers himself directly overshadowed by the Evil One), with his whimsical fancy for quaint refinements of torture, afford admirable reading of the kind that furnishes a plentiful supply of "thrills." The description of how Ezelin and his mother, Adalhita the witch, compass the removal of his saint-wife, Gisla, who stands in the way of his achieving his ambition to become king of North Italy, by way of an alliance with Selveggia, daughter of the Emperor Frederick, is nothing short of horrifying. Decidedly a romance of the variety denominated "powerful."

H. J. S.
THE OCCULT REVIEW


This occult record will be well known to most of our readers, if only by name, and we are pleased indeed to see this beautiful "romance," which is claimed to be founded on a past life of one of the invisible members of the great White Lodge, re-issued in so attractive a form. The type is large and clear, the paper fine in texture, and the cover carries a handsome design of lotus flowers, whence the story derives its name. It forms a gift-book that reflects credit on printers, binders and publishers alike.

H. J. S.


This synthetic treatise on judicial astrology proposes a method of easy calculation of horoscopes without the use of tables or globes. While extolling Ptolemy for his founding of judicial astrology, and condemning the Arabs for their fantastic embroidery of the subject, the author falls into the common error of attempting too much upon immature experience. Thus in disposing of the metals among the planets, platinum is given to Uranus, and Radium (derived from Uranium) to Neptune; and the "gems" attributed to these are respectively the opal and aerolites. We are told, moreover, that "all aspects formed between the solstitial points are less powerful than those comprised within the equinoxes," and that "aspects from intercepted signs are diminished in strength," while "malefic aspects formed by benefics that are in their dignities may produce benefic effects," all of which belongs to an astrology that has long since been pensioned off. The author also confounds heliocentric and geocentric astronomy when indicating the aphelia of the planets instead of their apogees, stating that "transits over these degrees...are always more powerful in their action." Yet there are many ingenious applications of well-established principles which give considerable value to the work.

SCRUTATOR.

"VITAL FORCES": HOW TO DEVELOP THEM. By Vox. Published by Author, 146, Edgeware Road, London, W. 1s. net.

Scattered throughout this little pamphlet there are some counsels which contain sound advice. "Be at the helm; guide and direct; choose the thought; hold it until you feel new vibration; keep it going strong, especially the last thing at night; sleep on it." It is conformable to sense and experience that to dwell on an invigorating conception the last thing at night before going to sleep will tend to increase the mental power. The author defines psycho-therapeutics as "a re-education of the subconscious mind," and this re-education will have to be accomplished, when the condition has become parlous, by one who can answer in the affirmative the question of Macbeth:

Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased?

B. P. O'N.
REVIEWS


This extremely able and interesting work elaborates with enviable skill and lucidity the methods by which the personality may be improved and refined and set steadily on the road to that perfection which certain higher types of men have always felt the necessity of striving to realize. Though he states that “directive psychology” is at present empirical and not scientific, Mr. Bligh believes and, I think, will convince the reader that its study will become of great value in the future when its results are classified, compared and organized in an enlightened manner. For any one who wishes to correct faults in his own nature and to develop his individuality harmoniously, this book, teeming with observations and suggestions, will serve as a practical guide within this little known and profoundly important region of human inquiry. The writing is so good both from a literary and instructive point of view that there is a positive thrill produced as the first pages are turned over. It is like the sensation of suddenly discovering a fine ruby. The scattered references to great psychologists like Nietzsche, Stendhal and Montaigne are introduced with great point and felicity. The language is so simple, and so much care is taken by the author to make all his statements perfectly clear, that the book is easily comprehensible to all, while the weight of material is handled with such power and ease as to make us conscious throughout that we are reading the work of a master.

B. P. O. N.


Books that are calculated to increase public interest in universal aspects of religion, to widen the horizon of our perceptions and extend our intellectual sympathies, are much to be commended. This book by Mr. Colville is one such. It is well written in the pleasing fluent style of this author’s well-known works, and contains a great deal of honest thought.

If Bibles will not bear examination, then the sooner they are consigned to the limbo of desuetude the better, but if we can find much that is excellent in all of them, but the whole of truth in none, we do well to broaden our human sympathy and compare Book with Book and System with System, to the end that we may at length find a common religious and philosophical denominator.

That is well put surely—a religious and philosophical common denominator is what the world needs more than anything else, and it is what we are all seeking; and the more we extend our knowledge the greater are the number of factors involved and the more difficult is the solution of our problem until we find that many factors are contained in others.

So much general interest is now evinced regarding all that pertains to the psychic side of every subject, and so many curious and conflicting views are still expressed concerning matters designated “occult” and “psychical,” that it seems a highly important duty to do all we can to clear up mysteries and present our ripest and most helpful thought to the inquiring multitude.

This is the correct attitude, and the author has fully maintained it throughout this excellent work, and there is scarcely a single aspect of magic, theurgy, psychism and religious philosophy, which does not receive some degree of elucidation in these pages.

Scrutator.
MENIENCE AND THE CHURCH. Edited by Geoffrey Rhodes. Lon­
don: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., Gerrard
Street, W. Price 6s. net.

This is a series of studies on the relationship between the practice of
medicine and the Church’s ministry to the sick. Among the contributors
who write chapters from their various points of view are Sir Clifford
Allbutt, the Bishop of Bloemfontein, Mr. Stephen Paget, and the Hon.
Sydney Holland. A sympathetic foreword is supplied by the Bishop of
Winchester.

The text from which all the writers take their departure may be said,
roughly speaking, to be “the prayer of faith shall save the sick.” Illness
has been left too much in the hands of materialistic science. Even the
clergy have become affected by materialistic tendencies, and have given
up such practices as anunction and the laying on of hands. It is time to
resume. The modern development of abnormal psychology has demon­
strated the tremendous power, in certain circumstances, of mind over
body; and, this being so, the clergyman may be able to set curative forces
at work better than the doctor. Medicine and religion had a common
origin in pagan temples. They afterwards got divorced—an “ adulterous
divorce,” in Emerson’s phrase—but are now making shy advances towards
a reconciliation. The reluctance is perhaps mainly on the scientific side,
but when an authority like Professor Osler goes so far as to say that “ faith
is the most precious asset in our stock-in-trade,” it seems likely that even
the most conservative and drug-loving practitioner will eventually have
to “range himself”—as the French have it—and to mend his ways.

In the chapter by Dr. Mackenzie there is a timely remark to the effect
that the line between “functional” and “organic” disease is an arbitrary
one. The terms are convenient, but there is danger of their being taken
as corresponding to distinct and essentially different classes. Probably
all disease is organic, for we regard all mental states as having a material
cause or concomitant—the latter term being preferable. A “functional”
disease, then, is only so-called because no organic change is discoverable,
the presumable lesion being too minute even for detection in post­
mortems, as is often the case in epilepsy. And it therefore follows that it
is absurd to limit the possibilities of mind-cure to “merely functional”
troubles; though, on the other hand, there are reasons for doubting its
curative powers when considerable organic change has occurred, as in
cases of cirrhosis of the liver, Bright’s disease, and the like. Dr. Mackenzie
goes fully into the question of treatment by suggestion, and Mr. Paget
offers trenchant criticism of Christian Science, the practitioners of which
are slow to provide adequate proof—in case of cure—that the disease
was what they state it to have been.

The book is very much on the lines of the Rev. Percy Dearmer’s recently
published Body and Soul, and is equally well worth reading, though more
general in scope, and, by reason of composite authorship, less coherent and
unified.

J. ARTHUR HILL.