

## CHAPTER IV.

# THE FALL

"Whoever associateth *any other* with God is like that which falleth from heaven \* \* \* \* This is so."—Al Qur'an, Chapter XXII.

As is evident from the heading of the present chapter, we are transporting the reader to the little-explored dark continent of mythology, where he must prepare himself for a fight with the Dragon of Superstition, whose very touch reduces all that lives to dust. This is the land of strange spectacles, of unlikely events and impossible relationships, the region where people seldom hesitate to pronounce, on little or no provocation, the most deadly and dreadful of curses which are also immediately effective on those with whom they are displeased ; it is the realm of un-human men, of un-womanish women, of un-goddish gods,—in short, of all that has its *raison d'être* in a sense of delight at the discomfiture and breaking down of poor, normal common-sense. In this quaint and uncanny region is distilled the terrible vintage of unreasoning, fanatical faith a few drops of which suffice to produce a life-long insensibility of wits, its sense-stealing properties not being the result of any physical processes of fermentation, but of the magnetism of the magic personality of its Brewer, the High Priest of Superstition and Myth. He who would free his soul from the effects of the

poisonous fumes of this harmful draught must, therefore, first of all overpower this arch enemy of mankind.

The stronghold of the monster is an interminable maze of winding passages, like the Cretan labyrinth where Minos of old kept his fearsome Minotaur ; and the conditions of the combat are also not unlike those which Theseus had to accept at the time, except that there is no Minos' daughter to furnish us the ball of clue and the magic sword wherewith to destroy the fiend. We must, however, make the best of our opportunity, and bowing to the Great Sarasvati, the Goddess of Wisdom, accept the ball of clue of Cause and Effect and the sword of Discrimination which intellect places in our hands at Her bidding. Thus armed, we run no risk of being lost in the winding turns and blind alleys of the indiscriminate jumble of fiction and fact into which we are about to plunge ourselves, and shall also be spared the unholy dread of the residents of this strange land of Fantasy that constitutes the Foe.

For, as we hope to make it clear by and by, mythology is mind's underground rendezvous for all those whose inability to bear the strong rays of the midday Sun of intellectualism forces them to wear the tinted glasses of poesy. They resemble the suppositional prisoners of Plato, who, securely tied to their seats in a cave, with their backs towards its entrance, have to rely, for their knowledge of the world, upon the shadows cast on the wall in their front by all that pass by their prison. Occasionally they also overhear what those in light say when passing the cave, and amuse themselves by robing the unadorned, matter-of-fact

conceptions of truth, thus obtained, in the richest raiment of charming allegory from Fancy's flowery stores, creating, at the same time, the most picturesque scenery and realistic atmosphere for the progeny of their exuberant thought.

No doubt, the modern man, conscious of his incalculable 'book-loads' of learning, smiles in a superior way when confronted with ancient myth and legend; and certainly modern learning can never hope to find a less resentful object as a butt for its contemptuous ridicule than the 'crude' religion of the B. C. days, and especially 'heathen Pantheism.' But we shall see that the man who is the first to laugh is not always the one to laugh the longest. For us mythology does not mean the record of humanity's childhood's thought when man may be said to be still groping his way in the dark, soon after his emergence from the monkey race, but the expression, in poetry's garb, of some of the most sober and valuable pronouncements of the only science which can raise a human being to the status and dignity of Gods. Here and there one might possibly encounter a legend or two which fall short of this estimate; but they might be due to modification through incompetent hands. The thing to be especially guarded against is the stuff of the type of nursery tales which can be picked out almost always at a glance, on account of its not having the true ring of the genuine Aryan coinage. As regards the confusion which is likely to be caused in modern historical notions in certain respects, from our thesis, well, they must be altered if found to be incorrect. Our notions of the origin

of species, the migrations of nations and the like are not founded on a general or special revelation which cannot be altered or interfered with ; they are the outcome of human speculation, hastily formed, and must yield to truth whenever good reason ordains it thus.

As for the interpretation of these myths, some of them are too plain to need elucidation ; others may be solved with a little thought ; there be others still that seem to defy the unravelling skill, but are sure to yield to perseverance and study.

As an instance of the first kind may be mentioned the story of Echo and Narcissus from the Greek Mythology, in which the personifications are of the plainest possible type, though by no means inelegant in a literary sense. The wood-nymph whose power of speech had been taken away from her 'unless in answer to some other voice,' is as plain a description of the phenomenon of echo, as Narcissus, who, in love with himself, comes to grief in the foolish endeavour to be embraced in the arms of his own reflection in water, is of personal vanity. The Hindu conception of Lakshmi, the wife of Vishnu, is another instance of this type. She represents wealth which is a consort of Wisdom, though, in evil times, so runs the curse of Gayatri, she is 'not to remain stationary in one place and to abide constantly by the vile, the inconstant, the contemptible, the simple, the cruel, the foolish and the barbarian.' It would be superfluous to say that the description is not of a person, much less of a goddess, the wife of one of the greatest divinities of the Hindu Pantheon, but a pure and simple rendering

of our conception of wealth in poetical, metaphorical speech.

The legend of the rivalry between Arachne, the daughter of a famous dyer in purple, and Pallas-Athene, the goddess of Wisdom, is an instance of the second type, and yields its secret on a little reflection.

The legend runs that Arachne was famed for her rare skill in weaving rich and wonderful patterns on her webs, and so high rose her name that even Pallas-Athene, the goddess of such arts, one day came to examine her work. Now, Arachne was very proud of her skill, and denied that the excellence of her work had anything to do with the inspiration of the goddess, though men generally held otherwise. On meeting the goddess face to face, she hurled open defiance at her, on which the goddess, stung to haughty disdain, offered to match her art against her earthly rival's. This challenge was accepted, and arrangements were made for the contest which began forthwith.

"Two looms were set up, at which these eager rivals plied their best craft and cunning, with such swiftness that ere long on each the growing tissues shone in all the hues of the rainbow woven into marvellous devices, and shot with threads of gold. For her design Pallas chose the gods ranged upon the Acropolis at Athens, Jove's awful majesty in the midst, Poseidon smiting the rock with his trident, herself in full panoply among the rest, who was shown calling forth the olive tree that made her best gift to man. About this central group were pictured scenes of impious mortals brought to confusion, rebellious giants turned to mountains, and,

for a hint to her presumptuous rival, prating girls changed to screeching fowl. Round all ran a border of olive foliage, as sign of whose handiwork this was, with which few would dare to vie!

"The irreverent Arachne, for her part, had picked out stories that cast shame or derision upon the gods. Zeus and his brethren were seen wooing mortals in unworthy form, Appollo humbly serving, as a shepherd on earth, Dionysus playing his drunken pranks, nay, scandalous memories of old Cronos himself.....all enclosed by a border of ivy leaves and flowers. But these scenes were worked in with so cunning art, that one could believe to see real animals and real waves standing out before the eye upon that accusing web, the more offensive for its truth. So Pallas-Athene felt when she rose to examine the other's work. With a cry.....she snatched at the too faithfully coloured cloth, tearing it to pieces, and showering blows upon the sly maker of such a masterpiece.

"How might mortal maiden stand before the fair-haired goddess when her eyes blazed with wrath? Thus unfairly beaten, Arachne could not bear her spiteful shame. She stole away to hang herself in despair. Nor even then was the wrath of Pallas glutted. She bid her rival live, yet in what hateful form! For a spell was woven round her bloated body, her human features disappeared, her hair fell off, her limbs shrunk up, and thus poor Arachne hung as a spider, doomed for ever to spin as if mocking the skill that had moved Olympian envy."\*

---

\* The Classic Myth and Legend, by A. R. Hope Moncrieff.

Such is the story of the rivalry between the Goddess of Wisdom and her mortal rival, which, according to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (art. Arachne) "*probably indicates the superiority of Asia over Greece in the textile arts.*"

The *italics* are ours, placed to mark the contrast between the 'scholastic' view and the spiritual interpretation of the legend which we shall now proceed to propound.

The rivals represent the two powers of the soul known as omniscience, which being associated with divinity is personified as the Goddess of Wisdom, and the limited faculty of Intellect appertaining to the human soul in its un-emancipated state. The difference between the two aspects of knowledge, human and divine, is well brought out in the patterns respectively woven by the competitors, one merely representing an impious conception of the world of Life after the most approved and up-to-date manner of the learned, but the other descriptive of the true nature of things, spiritual and material, and of the consequences that flow from impiety and foolish prating. With its 'free-thinking' proclivities, intellect cannot but resent the notion of the excellence of her handiwork being the result of the inspiration of the goddess, though there being only one source of knowledge which is infinite in its capacity and scope, finite thought cannot but derive its oil of existence from the original and, therefore, Olympian 'wells.' Hence, truth is only in accordance with the *vox populi* in this instance. Again, in so far as knowledge may be said to be a presentation of the world of

reality, it is like a rich pattern woven in all the variegated colours of the rainbow in the web of consciousness, which explains the etymology of Arachne's name as well as the fact of the competition being held in the art of weaving. Arachne's parentage—she is the daughter of a famous dyer in purple—serves to indicate her relation to will, which, in virtue of its high aspirations and the power to achieve its end is the only factor which can be truthfully described as the maker of kings, converting, as it does, the 'white' of colourless, indifferent commonalty into the 'purple' of Royalty and Power.

As regards the punishment of Arachne, it is intended to describe the true nature of the faculty of finite 'thought,' which, when stripped of the surplusage of false glory that has been added to it by the superabundant enthusiasm of some of its admirers, is but a simple weaver of 'presentations' in the warp and woof of consciousness. It is this very faculty which is described as intellect or understanding in modern thought, though we had better let Prof. Deussen explain its function to the 'uninitiated' masses. Writes the learned Professor (*Elements of Metaphysics*, pp. 25—29):—

"Every representation contains as such two supplementary halves, a representing subject and a represented object. These two make with the representation not three (as a sneering epigram of Schiller has it), but one. No representation is without a subject, none without an object. Now, nothing exists for me but representations, therefore also no subject without an object, no object without a subject. All objects of my subject are such, either immediately or mediately. As immediate objects I can never have anything else but affections of my ego, that is, sensations within me (represented physiologically as certain specific irritations of the sensory nerves extended in the organs of sense). All other objects, the whole exter-



nal world and even my own body, as far as I regard it from without, are known to me only as mediate objects: It is only through the medium of these nerve irritations that I come in contact with them. Thus all data by which I attain to a knowledge of the external world, are restricted to these affections of the nerves which are given as immediate objects. They are the only thing which comes to my intellect from without, that is, independent of itself. Consequently all else, all that distinguishes wide-spreading nature with its immeasurable riches from those scanty affections of the nerves, must come from within, that is, must originate in my intellect itself. If we compare the perceptual world, which is our representation, to a textile fabric in which subjective and objective threads intersect as warp and woof, then all that is objective, independent of myself, given *a posteriori* is limited to those affections of the nerves and may be compared to the thin, isolated threads of the shuttle. The warp, on the contrary, which is previously, that is, *a priori*, stretched out to receive little by little these interweaving threads and work them into a fabric, is the natural, innate form of the subject, the totality of which forms just that which we call Understanding or brain. The task of metaphysics consists in finding out what things are in themselves, that is, independent of our intellect. We must, therefore, first of all, deduct from things that which our intellect contributes to them, namely, those forms which inhere in it originally, that is, *a priori*, and in which it ranges all materials furnished from without so as to weave them into experience. The following six criteria may serve to distinguish these *a priori* elements of knowledge or innate functions of the Understanding from those which come to it *a posteriori*, or through perception. They are to us what reagents are to the chemist. They may also be regarded as six magnets, by means of which we extract the iron of our *a priori* knowledge from the mixed ore of experience. (1) Whatever is necessary to transform perception, given as affection, into perceptual representation, and, consequently, precedes all experience as a condition of its possibility, cannot originate in experience, but only within ourselves. (2) Whatever comes to the intellect from without, has the character of contingency, it might be otherwise, or it might even be not at all; that is, I can imagine it as non-existent. Now, in my representation there are certain elements which cannot be thought away like every thing else, from which it follows that they do not belong to that which exists inde-

pendently of myself, but must adhere to the intellect itself. (3) For the same reason, all data given from without merely suffice to state what is there, but not that something is necessarily so and not otherwise. Perception has no tongue for the word necessity, consequently all determinations of things, with which is associated the consciousness of necessity, must originate, not in perception, but within myself. (4) From this it follows that sciences the doctrines of which have apodictic certainty, cannot have obtained it from perception, and that consequently that part of the perceptual world to which they refer must belong to the elements originally inherent in my intellect. (5) Perception can only furnish me with sensations. These are, as such, isolated and fragmentary, for, difficult as it is to grasp at first, the materials of sensation given from without contain only the sensations themselves, but not any connection between them, for such a connection is merely the link between the different sensations and therefore not itself sensation. Consequently that faculty, which makes of the variety of perception a unity and so creates coherence between my representations, must belong to me *a priori*. Therefore, whatever serves to establish the continuity of nature, belongs to the innate functions of my intellect. (6) Perception can never embrace infinity. If, now, I find in my representations of things elements of which I am conscious as being infinite, it follows with certainty, that I have not taken them from perception, but must possess them as forms of intellect, wherefore, however far I proceed in representing, I can never get beyond them, in which precisely consists their infinity."

Such is the conception of Understanding, the original of the personification Arachne, which one of the "baby" progenitors of our race—and one not known to have been an abnormal or supernormal type of the tribe of the apish man, or mannish anthropoid, to which according to our most 'authentic' views he must have belonged—has bequeathed to us in the form of the story of the rivalry between the Olympian Patroness of wisdom and a conceited mortal maid. It may be that after all Narcissus is not dead, since the echo of his spirit is still to be found moving on the

face of the depthless waters of modern wisdom and wit.

We must now pass on to a consideration of the legend of the fall which is the theme of the present chapter and which belongs to the most difficult type of mythical lore. But we shall first of all clear the ground by establishing, so far as is needed for our present requirements, the power of suggestion, especially of auto-suggestion, to influence the conditions of existence.

It is now well-known that thought is a force of tremendous potency and has the power to materialize all mental beliefs and affections in the body of flesh. This principle is so well-known and established that it would be but a waste of time to enter into the nature of proof available in its support. The sceptic would do well to study the works of Dr. J. H. Hudson and others, where he would find ample proof of our statement. It suffices for our present purpose to point out that the living cell is moved by mental impulses and actuated by mental stimuli. The microscope reveals all this, and it reveals the structural lines of communication between cell and cell and between the central controlling intelligence and each particular cell (Hudson). These cells are controlled by the subjective mind which has full control over the functions, sensations and conditions of the body. The subjective mind is, in its turn, amenable to control by "suggestion," which has been defined by hypnotists as "the insinuation of a belief or impulse into the mind by any means, as by words or gestures, usually, by emphatic declarations." It is not possible to deny these facts, or the conclusions

they lead to, any longer. The law of suggestion is the grandest discovery of the nineteenth century for the nations of the West, though long before that it was well-known to the orientals. The subjective mind obeys the suggestion given to it and imparts it to the multitude of cells under its control, and these tiny little entities faithfully carry out, as it were, the orders of their chief, so far as it is possible to do so. The suggestion may come from outside, as from a hypnotist to his subject, or it may be what is called an auto-suggestion, which means a suggestion given by a person to himself. The subjective mind does not enquire into the truth or falsehood of the suggestion, but accepts it as correct without any investigation. Hence, it will assume any attitude, however false, which might be suggested to it. Thus, if it is suggested to a hypnotized subject that he is a dog, he would instantly assume the attitude and perform the acts characteristic of a dog, so far as it is physically possible for him to do so. In short, any character suggested, be it that of a fool or a philosopher, an angel or a devil, an orator or an auctioneer, will be personated with marvellous fidelity to the original, just so far as the subject's knowledge extends. The wonderful histrionic ability displayed by hypnotized subjects in personated, suggested characters has often been remarked. But it is not acting a part. It is much more than acting, for the subject believes himself to be the actual personality suggested. A suggestion that is known by the subject in his normal condition to be absolutely false will always excite, at least, a momentary opposition ; for suggestion

acts most effectively on lines of least resistance. Repetition, however, overcomes all resistance, so that when the subjective mind is confronted by two opposing suggestions, the stronger one must necessarily prevail. It is a necessary corollary to this that suggestion becomes most effective when the subject is induced to believe in its truth in his normal condition. There is no difficulty now in our laying down the two following propositions, namely :—

(1) that as one thinks so one becomes, and

(2) that belief, or faith, is the greatest factor in facilitating the materialization, or manifestation, of the suggested condition.

All mental processes are forces of tremendous power, and when set in motion must produce their appropriate results, unless countermanded by similar processes of a higher and subtler quality. There is nothing strange in this, for, as Mrs. Besant points out, all round us we see habits of thought moulding the dense matter of our material bodies and stamping character on the face of the race ; virtue causing health and beauty to come into expression, and vice furrowing the features with lines of disease and ugliness. It is pointed out :—

“This is a fact so common that it makes on us no impression, and yet is significant enough ; for if the dense body of matter be thus moulded by the forces of thought, what is incredible, or even strange, in the idea that the subtler forms of matter should be equally plastic, and should submissively take the shapes into which they are moulded by the deft fingers of the immortal Artist, thinking Man.”

Even Western thought is slowly coming round to recognize this fact. Professor William James writes :

“Mental states occasion also changes in the calibre of the blood-vessels, or alteration in the heart-beats, or processes more subtle

still, in glands and viscera. If these are taken into account, as well as acts which follow at some remote period, because the mental state was once there, it will be safe to lay down the general law that no mental modification ever occurs which is not accompanied or followed by a bodily change."

The effect of suggestion on spirit or soul, which is pure intelligence in essence, is even more remarkable, mere thought sufficing to produce immediate depression of spirits and the like.

So far as faith is concerned, the rule is that the completeness of the effect to be produced and the length of time necessary to produce it depend on the degree of belief in the potency of thought, the law being that whatever one believes one becomes. This is why Jesus and the other teachers of our race always insisted on faith. Without faith we may go on forming mental conceptions and images as much as we like, but they will never be productive of any result; for faith is necessary to impart stability to thought, and stability of thought is a necessary condition to the materialization of mental ideas and conceptions.

As regards the efficacy of faith, mental healing, Christian science and other like methods are instances of the power of mind to produce wonderful phenomena. When one comes to think that the only difference between a living being and a corpse is that in respect of mind, one ceases to wonder at the seemingly incredible claims that have been made for it by the adepts of old. Christ declared that if one had as much faith in his teaching as could be thought of in connection with a mustard seed, he could perform the most astonishing of miracles. There are many passages in the Bible, containing 'pro-

mise of power,' of which Mark XXI. 16—20 is a striking instance.

These passages are now generally regarded to be either worthless interpolations, mistranslations of the original text, or even ravings of religious enthusiasts. Those of a pious turn of mind, anxious to believe their scriptures to be infallible and yet unable to reconcile the text to the stern realities of life, satisfy their intellect with the idea that the 'promise' was only intended for the ages gone by. Truth, however, lies the other way; for the promise is neither false nor limited to any particular period of time, but a real living truth, possessing as much vitality now as it did at the time of its formulation. We do not understand it, and have no faith in its truth on account of our ignorance of the science of mental power which we have hitherto considered "immaterial, airy metaphysics," and, therefore, beneath the dignity of any learned or scientific man to study. The only "material metaphysics" with us are mammon, long robes, high places, hypocritical salutes, and crocodile tears, which Christ used to comment upon unceasingly. How, then, can there be any manifestation of the truth of the word of the Saviour in our midst? Understand what Christ meant by faith, and rest not till you have found it, for it is the one mysterious power which brings about the realization of the Kingdom of God from within. Take it to heart. What faith can do, nothing else can. In the sacred literature of all religions, faith has been considered the most essential requisite for success. No disciples were made or accepted unless they passed the period of probation—usually this consisted of a number

of years—successfully, which meant that they had developed a capacity for faith. For the great virtue of faith is that it secures freedom from mental agitation, and furnishes a stable basis for thought. Faith has nothing in common with the wordy, windy protestations of the present-day man, and indicates a complete saturation of mind with a principle, or idea; it is a state of belief equalling conviction. If you have faith in a thing, your mind should be utterly incapable of entertaining the condition to the contrary. Faith pre-supposes conviction, and, if destroyed, must be acquired afresh by wisdom.

Such is the fundamental doctrine of faith, the failure to understand which has caused all the wickedness, godlessness and sin in the world.

We shall now enquire into what is meant by the fall of man, and how and why it came about. A very graphic and instructive account of it is given in the first book of Moses, called Genesis, with which many of us are already familiar. Those who have read the account will readily confess that they were not much impressed with it, and simply remember it as a sort of nursery tale in which Adam, the hero of the story, was punished (might be a little too harshly) by the Lord God for a seemingly trivial and insignificant act of disobedience to which considerable importance was attached. This, however, is exactly the reverse of what is actually meant by the story. We ought not to pass by this legend in a summary fashion. Remember, there is a gateway somewhere in this maze through which the powers of darkness crept in once to the ruin of our race, and left a legacy of sin. The importance of the subject



may be judged from the serious notice which God is said to have taken of the act of disobedience. Not content with punishing the guilty, with a degree of severity which appears, at first sight, to be out of all proportion to the trivial nature of the fault committed by them, he actually condemned their whole progeny, for all eternity, to a life of suffering and sorrow on earth. Such a subject cannot be considered a nursery tale by any means, and deserves the utmost attention on our part. The failure to see that the whole secret of human wretchedness and sin lay concealed in this apparently meaningless and mythical account of the Fall of Adam has been the cause which has delayed the discovery of truth so long, and each day augmented the estrangement between man and happiness.

The circumstances surrounding the tragedy need not be gone into in detail. Briefly put, Adam, by the favour of the Almighty God, was residing in the Garden of Eden with his Consort Eve. Now, the Garden of Eden contained two extraordinary trees which are of special interest to us. One of these, which stood in the midst of the Garden, was called the Tree of Life, and the other the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. It is the latter tree round which interest mainly centred in this little drama. The Lord God had commanded Adam, saying :—

“Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat : but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it ; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

For a long time, neither Adam nor Eve thought of eating of the forbidden tree, and the legend adds :—

“And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.”

Then came the temptation. The serpent approached the woman and tempted her to eat of the tree in question. She at first refused, saying :—

“God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it lest ye die.”

With more persuasion she yielded, because she saw that it was good for food and pleasant to the eye, and a tree to be *desired to make one wise*. The immediate result of the transgression was that their eyes were opened. They knew that they were naked, and fearing to appear in nakedness before God, hid themselves. The result was that when God came to know of it, he punished all the three, the man, the woman and the serpent. To Adam, he said, “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground ; for out of it wast thou taken : for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.” And to himself the Lord God said, “Behold the man has become as one of us to know good and evil ;” and, thinking “lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever,” drove him out of the Garden of Eden, and made provision for guarding the approaches to the Tree of Life by placing cherubim and a flaming sword which turned in every direction round it. This, briefly, is the account of the catastrophe. We can best interpret it by observing the results which are said to have ensued from the act of transgression. Adam ate the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil, but became ignorant! \* That was one result. Another result was

---

\* That the general condition of humanity is one of ignorance will hardly be denied by any one to-day.

that he felt his nudity for the first time after the eating of the forbidden fruit. It was not the tree of sight, but the transgressors felt as if their eyes had been opened, and observed their nudity for the first time in their lives. Yet another result which ensued from the act of transgression was fear. Adam used to walk in the company of the Lord God, fearlessly and like a friend, but felt afraid to appear before him for the first time after the act of disobedience. The most fatal consequence of all, however, was the loss of immortality. Man was not forbidden to eat of the Tree of Life till the commission of sin, but after that he was simply denied admission to the Garden where that Tree stood.

Now, ordinarily, it is impossible to connect the transgression with the results that are said to have ensued from it. How strange that you eat knowledge and become ignorant, and lose your immortality also into the bargain! The true interpretation of the narrative must, therefore, be different from its apparent sense. When we dive beneath the surface of words the whole thing becomes clear and intelligible at once. This is what is actually meant by the story: Adam was happy and immortal so long as he believed himself to be one with God, the state of at-one-ment with the Lord leaving no room in his heart to feel his imaginary nudity. The overflowing joy, consequent on a feeling of being at one with his true Self, had preserved him in a state of godly innocence, and prevented all notions of phenomenal duality and differentiation from obscuring his clear vision. Notions of nudity and inferiority had not sullied the purity of his heart till then. Then, the ser-

pent, the emblem of crookedness and impersonation of desire which is the root of ignorance and all other troubles, appeared before him and tempted him, through his wife, and led him to believe that the forbidden fruit was '*a tree to be desired to make one wise.*' The inevitable consequence of this change in the mental attitude of Adam was that his faith in his previous state of happiness was lost, and he felt that he would be happier with the additional knowledge to be acquired by eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. This attitude implied that he no longer believed in his own happiness and wisdom. It was a confession of being ignorant and unhappy, for there was the desire to become like Gods. The result was that by virtue of the unchanging, immutable laws which govern the forces on the mental plane, the state of this inner conviction of unhappiness and ignorance was materialized in an outward phenomenal form. Man would like to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, but he must pay its price first! The mere circumstance that there is in you a desire for knowledge is a clear admission of your ignorance. This admission expresses your condition in your own words, and the law of Faith, which materializes mental impressions, is at once set in motion, and works out the rest. This is why man became ignorant to begin with; this is why the immediate result of the eating of a little from the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil was ignorance.

We have already seen that the true state of happiness for man can be none other than the consciousness of being the Sat-chit-ananda himself, that is, of his own

Godhood. This was the condition of Adam till he ate of the fruit of the forbidden tree. His confession of ignorance at once threw him down on a lower plane of existence since the Sat-chit-ananda state does not admit ignorance within it. It was truly a fall from Godhood to wretchedness and misery. Adam felt that he was not God, and believed that by eating of the tree he would become intelligent and rise to the status of Gods. He mentally put himself much below the Gods, and, thus, ceased to be their companion. The abode of Gods was not the proper place for the residence of those who did not believe themselves to be Gods, and the genius of Adam's mind consequently threw him down below with the quickness of thought. This is why Adam discovered his nudity for the first time after the eating of the forbidden fruit, and felt afraid. The metamorphosis was not what he had expected it to be. He instinctively felt that some tremendous blunder had been made somewhere, but could not see where and in what it lay. Fear, the creature of ignorance and the cause and forerunner of Death, came into existence. Man in one stroke lost his Godhood and immortality, and became mortal.

We now see why it was that man was forbidden to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. It was not a whimsical or capricious order; but one, the disobedience to which, it was known, would have such dire consequences for the race. Why do you want to distinguish between good and evil? What is there to distinguish at all? The self, or soul, alone is everlasting and eternal; and it is the self which counts.

All the rest is an illusion of names and forms. What is the use of your knowledge of good and evil, when there is neither good nor evil? Thus, the prohibition was one of great moment to man; the God within had pointed out the most fatal belief that could be entertained—the notion of the body being the man. Life is self-sufficient and blissful; it is above good and evil both, and has no idea of nakedness or dress. Nudity is felt only when you put limitations on the Self, identify it with the body of matter, and consider yourself to be other than God. When you begin to distinguish and differentiate between the outward shapes and appearances of things, losing sight of your inner Reality, you feel as if you had been stripped of your robes, as if your glory had departed from you, or as if you had been picked out of the ocean of Love, and, with a rude hand, cast away into a dreary, waterless wilderness, where there are lamentations and gnashing of the teeth. These dire consequences must inevitably follow a sense of estrangement from God, for it is the Law. It is said:—

“As water falling down on an inaccessible mountain-top quickly runs down, thus, seeing qualities of the Lord as separate, a man runs down to darkness.”—(*Katha Upanishad*, IV. 14.)

To put the same thing in different words, the failure to realize that the Atman, *i.e.*, the individual soul, is the true God is the cause of our ‘nakedness.’ We have left our Godhood, and set up the little body of matter in its stead. What is in reality an ocean now regards itself as a drop, and must remain a drop till it begins to think itself to be the whole ocean again, because the law is ‘as one thinks so one becomes.’

The coats of skin, the Lord God is said to have made for Adam and Eve, signify the limits put on their sense of individuality which they regarded as extending to their outer skin, but no further. In consequence of this sense of limitation, man regards himself as identical with the physical body, enveloped by the skin; and it is this false and erroneous sense of individuality which is at the root of all notions of duality between God and man and is the selfish, grasping, appropriating, copyrighting self—the apparent man.

As regards fear, we have already observed that it came into existence with ignorance. The calamitous metamorphosis, brought about by the loss of God-consciousness, consequent on the fatal desire to become like Gods, could not but carry conviction of their utter helplessness and degradation to the minds of the transgressors. They had hoped to acquire the wisdom of Gods, but the very first thing they became conscious of was not wisdom, but its antithesis, that is, ignorance. Fear took hold of their souls, and made them tremble for their safety against the forces of nature, as yet but dimly perceived. Belief in immortality was gone, and its place taken by a sense of powerlessness and terror. The false ego was the child of ignorance and desire, and God declined to foster it up. Man had no alternative left but to nurse it himself. Thenceforth, its bringing up and preservation from harm became the sole care of man, and brought him all sorts of conceivable trouble and worry.

It only remains to point out the physiological effect of fear. It paralyses healthy action, generates worry,

and is exceedingly pernicious to life. Worry corrodes and pulls down the organism; fear and worry will finally tear the body to pieces. Fear is the antithesis of self-composure, and the cause of cowardice and terror. Under its influence the countenance becomes pallid, the face is pulled down, and the chest drawn in. It paralyses all the bodily muscles and consumes the vital force. When one remembers that the fear of death is a constant terror with mankind, what wonder is there that death should actually supervene?

As to the effect of the emotion of fear, Darwin observes ('The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals,' pp. 306 to 309):—

"The frightened man at first stands like a statue motionless and breathless, or crouches down as if instinctively to escape observation. The heart beats quickly and violently, so that it palpitates or knocks against the ribs...the skin instantly becomes pale, as during incipient faintness. ... The hairs also on the skin stand erect, and the superficial muscles shiver. In connection with this disturbed action of the heart, the breathing is hurried. The salivary glands act imperfectly; the mouth becomes dry, and is often opened and shut...One of the best marked symptoms is the trembling of all the muscles of the body; and this is often seen in the lips. From this cause and from the dryness of the mouth, the voice becomes husky or indistinct, or may altogether fail. As fear increases into an agony of terror, we behold, as under all violent emotions, diversified results. The heart beats wildly, or may fail to act, and faintness ensues; there is a death-like pallor; the breathing is laboured; the wings of the nostrils are widely dilated; 'there is a gasping and convulsive motion of the lips, a tremor on the hollow cheek, a gulping and catching of the throat.'...All the muscles of the body may become rigid, or may be thrown into convulsive movements. ... As fear rises to an extreme pitch, the dreadful scream of terror is heard. Great beads of sweat stand on the skin. All the muscles of the body are relaxed. Utter prostration soon follows, and the mental powers fail. The intestines are



affected. The sphincter muscles cease to act, and no longer retain the contents of the body."

That death should result from a constant fear of it gnawing at the vitals and constantly interfering with the healthy activity of the body, is not strange at all; indeed, what is strange in the life of man is that he should live even as long as three score years or so. M. Jean Finot, analyzing the causes of death, in 'The Philosophy of Long Life' (pages 106 and 107) observes:—

"We do not die even centenarians. Why this premature death? Why do we die? This is the eternal debate which has already given us so many explanatory treatises explaining nothing whatever. To attempt to give a *résumé* of the reasons which have been given us by writers from theologians to biologists would be a task demanding hundreds of volumes, besides being completely useless. ... Let us, then, put aside the thousand and one causes quoted by our predecessors, and let us give one which deserves more honour than is generally accorded to it. This despised cause is the fear of death. Man, arrived at a certain mental state, undergoes a sort of auto-suggestion of death. He then believes himself to have reached the end of his days, and feeds as much on the fear of death as on bodily foods. From this moment onward death fascinates him. He hears its call with terror everywhere and always. The philosophic and salutary consciousness of a hereafter gives place to a cowardly and nervous fear of separation from life. The victim feeds upon this fear, intoxicates himself with it, and dies of it. The man possessed by this thought eats badly and digests even worse. His nervous system is disorganised and his organism remains deaf to the stimulus of the outer life. Regrets for the life which he believes to be fading away make him waste the vital resources of his organism in a limitless sorrow and nameless maladies."

No need to cite further authorities on this simple matter, which any one can observe by studying the effect of the emotion on himself and others with whom he comes in contact; suffice it to say that the culmination is reached when the individual will is completely para-

lysed and the organism left at the mercy of its natural enemies, which soon bring about its dissolution. We shall deal with the action of will on the body, and the effect of such action, in dealing with the question of immortality later on, when we come to discuss the theory of *karma*. Meanwhile, let us conclude our explanation of the 'Fall.'

The curse pronounced on the erring couple and the tempter by the Lord God, after the transgression, is full of psychological import. If we would study ourselves, we should observe that we are endowed with two functions or psychical faculties, the will and intellect, which unite in the ego, or self, making it a complete whole. We should also notice that neither the ego nor the intellect deals directly with the outside world, and that the *manas*, the central organ of sensation, is the instrument, or vehicle, through which they come in contact with it. In the allegory of the Fall, Adam represents the ego, or the individualized will; Eve symbolizes the intellect (the Sanskrit *buddhi*); and the serpent stands for *manas* (the lower, or objective mind). Now, intellect is the handmaid or servant of will, and, at the same time, its preceptor. It is the servant, because it has no other function than to discover, determine and adjust the relations of will as individualized in its objective expression, the body, with other bodies, and, also, with its higher, *i.e.*, the divine aspect; and it is its preceptor in so far as it controls and directs its activity into proper channels, and, by educating it, leads it to the realization of the Self in the highest degree, which is the final goal of education. The primary function of intellect, however,

is only that of presenting perceptions, which it spins out of the raw material of sensations furnished by the mind (*manas*). Hence, the word 'woman,' from the Saxon *wif man* (*wif* in Saxon, and *weib* in German, from *weben*, to weave), signifies the one who weaves, and is, therefore, fully symbolical of the faculty of intellect. *Manas*, also, never comes directly in contact with the self, but influences it through the intellect; hence, in the allegory of the fall, Eve is first tempted by the serpent, and then, in her turn, tempts the ego. The compiler of the Pentateuch, struck with the more intimate connection between the ego and the intellect than is represented by the relation subsisting between a child and its governess, likened it to that of husband and wife. The ego depends on the intellect as a husband depends on his wife in household matters, and the latter studies its wants and comforts, and clings to it as a woman does to her husband.

With this necessary prelude we may now proceed to elucidate the nature of the awful curse pronounced by God on the transgressors. Adam, being accused of disobedience by the 'still small voice' of intuition, at once throws the blame on the woman, *i.e.*, the intellect; and she, in her turn, points to the serpent as the cause of error and temptation. The anger of the Lord flashes first of all against the *manas* (serpent), and the terrible curse is uttered: "Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." Hence, *manas* 'goes on its belly,' *i.e.*, lives and moves in dust, or, in other words, is confined to the phenomenal, hence, chained to matter. The food of *manas* is vibrations

which reach it through the media of the senses ; therefore, it is doomed to eat vibrations, which, as such, are recognized as the irreducible units of matter, hence dust. The enmity put between the woman and the serpent psychologically symbolizes the relation between the intellect and the *manas*. The latter loves to wander from place to place, and is in its element when roving about ; but the former needs rest for its higher work of forming concepts and judgments, and, therefore, tries to check its fiery nature and hold it on to a point. Hence, the *manas* bites the heels of intellect to make it dance, and the latter crushes its head to stop its prancing. This is still more pronounced in the case of the seed of intellect, which is judgment and, in the highest sense, Wisdom. Wisdom, the child of intellect, conceived in an immaculate manner, tries to break away from the *manas*, to regain his 'lost' Godhood, but the *manas*, so long as its head is not crushed, bites his heel to drag him down to the world of senses, each time that he endeavours to soar above it, for Self-realization. This is best illustrated by the story of the child Krishna subduing the Serpent-King, Kāliya, by crushing its head, in the river Jamuna (allegorically, the mind-stuff). The lesson to be learnt from the story is that, in order to attain Nirvana, or, in Christian terminology, to be redeemed, or saved, one must subdue the 'fiery serpent' of one's mind, *i.e.*, the desiring *manas*\* at an early date in life.

---

\* *Manas* is the Minotaur (man and beast) of the Greek mythology, its human element representing reason, the faculty of reflection, and the bovine, pure animalism, that is, uncontrolled sensuality.

The curse pronounced on the woman also refers to the nature of Intellect of which she is the earthly symbol. Conception and sorrow are her lot, whether we take them in their literal or their psychological sense; for intellect is noted for its prolific production of concepts, as well as, for sorrow, that is, worry, in developing, *i.e.*, forming and delivering judgments. She is the hand-maid of the ego, her husband, and, consequently, must surrender herself to him, at his sweet will and pleasure, and *conceive* for him. The identity between Eve and Intellect is put beyond doubt by Genesis, III. 20. Adam called his wife Eve, because she was *the mother of all living*. This description cannot possibly refer to the human female, because she cannot be regarded as 'the mother of *all living*,' in any sense; but it is fully applicable and appropriate to the Intellect, on whose functioning as the weaver of presentations in the warp and woof of consciousness, depends the perception, hence, in a sense, the existence, of all forms.

The punishment of Adam also is equally natural for the ego who exclusively employs his intellect to discriminate between the good and evil of phenomena. Since the pursuit of the phenomenal gives rise to the notion of duality, *i.e.*, separation between God and man, and creates fear and worry, the fallen ego, personified as Adam, has necessarily to eat his bread in the sweat of his brow. Thistle and thorns, and sorrow and tears are his lot, for, as already observed, there can be no happiness for him who is engrossed in sensual lust.

The curse uttered by the Lord also foreshadowed the perishable nature of the sensual ego; yet it is not the

death of the ego, but of the body alone. As a pure spirit, the ego is birthless and deathless, being eternal and uncreate; but in association with the impurities of sin, adhering to it in the shape of different kinds of vestments of matter, it is subject to birth and death both. Hence, the significance of the warning—"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The emphasis, it will be observed, is not on the day of death, since Adam did not die on the day that he ate of the forbidden fruit, but on the liability to death which is forced on all unemancipated souls by the companionship of matter. As matter is atomic and constantly in motion, no organism composed of it can ever be conceived to be permanent. Yet it is not the demise of the soul, but of the body alone which occurs in nature; the ego regards it as his own death, on account of having identified himself most intimately with his body. But this is a point for the future.

The idea of nudity also arises with reference to embodied existence; for, as pure effulgence, spirit neither wears nor needs clothes.

Thus, the legend of the fall is intended to open our eyes to the great differences between a pure, perfect soul and the ego of desires: the former is blissful and immortal, and has a raiment of glory, but the latter is nude and unhappy and is also firmly held in the claws of death. These differences, though seemingly great and unbridgeable, are nonetheless such as can be easily removed, since they are due, solely and simply, to the element of desire by the eradication of which the status of Gods can be acquired with ease.

The story of the fall of Brahma in the Hindu Puranas, which covers a larger field than the Biblical myth, is also an allegorical account of the psychic functions of the soul. It is, however, too long to be reproduced here in its entirety; but the student of mythology would find its interpretation easy, if he would bear in mind the numerous psychological aspects in which spirit appears in conjunction with matter, and which are personified as gods and goddesses in the Puranas. In order however, to explain the true nature of intellect, we shall give the ending of the legend in a somewhat abridged form. The Biblical account of the 'Fall,' based, as it is, on the Vedantic view of things, stops short with the utterance of the curses, and is, therefore, likely to mislead one as regards the true position of intellect, which is depicted there in its worst aspect. As a matter of fact, redemption or emancipation is simply out of the question without its guidance, since it is the only instrument of knowledge in the condition of the "fall."

But the weakness of intellect lies in the fact that it has no will of its own, and may not refuse to serve the ego in any way he pleases. For this reason, the Biblical legend makes the woman eat the forbidden fruit only at the will of her husband, though she had an opportunity of doing so earlier by herself. It is thus clear that it is not the intellect which is the mischief-maker in the world, but the power of choice which determines the nature of the work the intellect is required to perform for will. As the faculty of discrimination, its function is only to impart knowledge to the ego, or will, but the kind of knowledge which it is required to

impart is to be selected not by itself, but by the will. As we might use a lantern to light our footsteps to a place of worship or to a gambling den, so might we employ our intellect to impart to us the wisdom which leads to bliss, or to instruct us on matters whose knowledge is fraught only with suffering and pain. As a matter of fact, whenever and wherever the intellect has been employed in the right direction, it has never failed to lead the ego to the highest heights of glory and power, and, finally, also to Nirvana. Its influence is pernicious and harmful only when the ego employs it exclusively to define and determine the relations of its body with other bodies in the world. Hence, the lesson to be learnt from the profound teaching of the Bible is that if the error of setting up the body in place of the real Man be avoided, and the intellect employed to further the progress of the soul instead of to pander to the will, it ceases to have evil influence and becomes the most potent instrument for good.

It is worth any amount of trouble to understand that faith cannot possibly be acquired without a proper use of intellect, since nothing but Reason is capable of destroying our doubts. It is true that testimony is also capable of affording a temporary sort of satisfaction; but, since it is impossible for it to cover all possible points, and since its worth, reliability and interpretation have to be determined before its acceptance, it is not within its pale to remove all doubts. Hence, he who depends on testimony is like the man who builds his house on sand. It is for this reason that schisms arise endlessly when people begin to rely on the word of



mouth of the founders of their faith, to the exclusion of rational thought. Besides, the satisfaction which testimony seems to afford is more apparent than real, because knowledge is like food, which must be digested in order to become ours. It is no use to us if somebody else eats the food, not even when it is done Brahmana-like,—in the name of and for the benefit of another. Just so with knowledge. Testimony is not only incapable of affording a solid foundation for faith, but also goes to make the confusion worse confounded, since it at once opens the door to a whole host of questions as to the possible interpretation and explanation of the statements made, to say nothing of the reliability and trustworthiness of the witnesses from whom they emanate. And, since it is not possible to settle the differences of opinion conclusively, without the discovery of the nature of things and the laws of Nature, intellect, and intellect alone, is the final judge and the sole arbitrator of the disputes of men, in the first instance.

We can now follow the Puranic legend without difficulty. The story goes that Brahmâ, desirous of performing a sacrifice, once upon a time, proceeded to Pushkara, and made the necessary preparations. But, his divine consort, Sâvitri, delayed in coming, and, though the hour for the *yajna* approached nigh, she was not to be found by the side of her Lord. Incensed at her conduct, the god asked Indra to find him another bride, and the latter promptly brought the lovely milkmaid, Gâyatri by name, who carried a jar of butter in her hand. Brahmâ called her the Mother of Vedas, and was united to her. Just then Sâvitri appeared on the scene,

and, enraged at the sight of her smiling rival, pronounced diverse curses on the gods who had taken part in the ceremony. She then walked away, leaving the gods in a state of consternation. The young bride, thereupon, herself modified the curses of her divine rival, and promised all kinds of blessings, including final absorption into him, to all the worshippers of her Lord. Finally, Vishnu and Lakshmi brought back the angry Sâvitri, and Gâyatri threw herself at her feet. Upon this Sâvitri, having raised and embraced her, said,

"Since the virtuous wife will do nothing to displease her husband, therefore let us both be attached to Brahmâ."

Gâyatri, too, bashfully murmured in reply :

"Thy orders will I always obey, and esteem thy friendship precious as my life ; thy daughter am I, O goddess ! deign to protect me."

The explanation of this legend lies in the psychological functions of the will, personified as gods and goddesses in the Puranas. There are two tendencies in the will which appear as intuition and intellect. As Bergson says :

"The two tendencies, at first implied in each other, had to separate in order to grow. They both went to seek their fortune in the world, and turned out to be instinct and intelligence.....Life, that is to say, consciousness launched into matter, fixed its attention either on its own movements or on the matter it was passing through; and it has thus been turned either in the direction of intuition, or in that of intellect" (*The Creative Evolution*).

Intuition is the sense which gives rise to immediate self-awareness, and in the highest sense means omniscience pure and simple, but intellect is the faculty which deals with forms. In the Puranas the former is personified as the goddess, and the latter as the milkmaid. The jar of butter which Gâyatri carries in her hand indicates

her nature, for intellect extracts principles from experience, as one extracts butter from milk. Being the two distinct tendencies of will (personified as Brahmâ), they are described as the two wives of the god. But, since intuition has the preference over intellect, therefore, Gâyatri is made to fall at the feet of her divine rival. However, since intellect is the only means of knowledge in the condition of the 'fall,' its personification is described as the Mother of Vedas (literally, knowledge).

Again, inasmuch as intellect alone establishes the divinity of the soul, and thereby leads it to Self-realization, and since Self-realization means the freedom of the soul from bondage and pain, therefore, intellect itself is said to have modified the curses of its rival.

We give below the curses pronounced by Sâvitri on some of those who took part in the ceremony, and their modifications as made by her rival, together with their interpretation. Should any difficulty be experienced with these interpretations, they should be read again after the perusal of Chapters IX, X, and XI.

Name of the god or goddess cursed.	Nature of the curse.	Nature of the modification.	Interpretation.
Brahma ...	Not to be worshipped in a temple or sacred place.	Brahma may cease to be worshipped, but his worshippers shall obtain all kinds of blessings, including final absorption into him.	Brahmâ is the revealed aspect of that which is the unmanifested, hence the personification of individuality, or soul, which is endowed with the faculties of Intuition and Intellect. Hence, Savitri, i.e., Intuitive wisdom, and Gâyatri, i.e., Reason, are the two wives of Brahmâ. Reason at first debars one from intuitive <i>Jnana</i> , and, thus is the cause of the fall. Brahma cannot,

Name of the god or goddess cursed.	Nature of the curse.	Nature of the modification.	Interpretation.
Indra ...	To be bound in chains by his enemies, and to be confined in a strange country. He is also to lose his city and station.	Shall not remain in bondage for ever, and shall be released by his son.	therefore, be worshipped as a world-God ; but, since the soul is the true Redeemer itself, those who worship their own Self obtain all kinds of blessings, including the final release from the <i>samsara</i> .  Indra is life, which waxes and wanes in power, according to circumstances and beliefs. Its enemies are the different kinds of karmic force, or desires. The strange country is the realm of matter ; and the loss of city and station signifies the state of bondage. The Liberator of the soul, i. e., Life or <i>Jiva</i> , is Wisdom, personified as the son of the god.
Agni ...	To be a devourer of all things, clean and unclean.	*The unclean things shall become pure at his mere touch.	Agni is the personification of the fire of <i>tapas</i> (asceticism) which purifies all things—Hence, the curse and its modification.
Vishnu ...	To be born amongst men, and also to endure the agony of having his wife ravished from him by his enemies.	He shall regain his wife eventually.	Vishnu is the personification of <i>dharma</i> or <i>jnana</i> which incarnates amongst men. His enemy is ignorance who steals away his wife ( <i>jnana</i> , in its objective aspect), through the door-ways of senses. But, since an actual separation between the Knower and Knowledge is not possible in reality, and also since the soul acquires perfection in <i>jnana</i> prior to the attainment of <i>nirvana</i> , Vishnu is to recover his wife eventually.
Shiva ...	To be deprived of his manhood.	The loss of manhood shall not interfere with the	Shiva represents Will, the Thing in itself, which is free and irresistible by nature. Its

\* Agni is here described as the devourer of all things, clean and unclean, because it is only when the effect of its good and evil actions is burnt up by the fire of asceticism (*vairāgya*) that the soul attains to *nirvāna*.

Name of the god or goddess cursed.	Nature of the curse.	Nature of the modification.	Interpretation.
		<p>worship of the <i>lingum</i>, as the symbol of the god.</p>	<p>entry into matter deprives it of its freedom and irresistibility to a considerable extent; hence, the god is to lose his manhood. The <i>lingum</i> is the symbol of creative power, which is the function of Will; hence its worship by men. Shiva is also the impersonation of <i>vairāgya</i> (renunciation), whose nature, as such, is fully in keeping with the curse of Sāvitrī.</p>
Lakshmi ...	<p>Not to remain stationary in one place; and to constantly abide by the vile, the inconstant, the contemptible, the simple, the cruel, the foolish and the barbarian.</p>	...	<p>The goddess personifies prosperity or wealth, and her nature is only too well-defined in the curse of Sāvitrī to need any further explanation.</p>
The wives of gods collectively.	<p>To remain barren, and never to enjoy the pleasure of having children.</p>	<p>No regret is to be felt for the inability to bear children.</p>	<p>The goddesses are the personifications of certain abstract qualities, powers and virtues, and, as such, neither capable of begetting offspring nor of grieving for their barrenness.</p>

The above explanation of the mythological account of the marriage and the consequent 'fall' of Brahmā, it is to be observed, furnishes a complete explanation of the nature of the faculty of intellect, and describes how *moksha* cannot be attained without it.

The allegorical account of the sons of Adam, given in the fourth chapter of the Book of Genesis, also makes it perfectly clear that emancipation cannot be attained, except through the agency of intellect. Eve, *i.e.*, intellect, conceives and brings forth Abel and Cain who are incompatible by nature, so much so that the former is

ultimately murdered by his brother. Now, Cain is reason which deals with inert matter by the dissecting, analysing and classifying processes of induction ; hence, he is described as the tiller of soil which is a symbol for matter. But Abel is Faith which is directed towards Life itself. He is, therefore, described as the keeper of sheep, the symbol of live-stock, hence life. The Lord loves Faith, but is less inclined towards Reason, which can primarily only offer him the produce of matter as an offering. Hence, the offering of Abel is acceptable to the Lord in preference to that of Cain. This upsets Reason, which makes short work of Faith and destroys it. The curse pronounced by the all-knowing God describes the principal features of Reason as distinguished from blind Faith. The riddle of the universe is a source of worry to Reason, hence Ground is not to yield her strength unto it. Another characteristic of induction is a constant wandering in search of experience, hence is Cain to become a fugitive. Again, because all the mischief\* that exists in the world is the outcome of Reason, it is called a vagabond too. And, finally, because Reason alone is affected by sleep, it is said to become a dweller in the "Land of Nod."

Cain's supplication to the Lord is also symbolical of the nature of Reason. Its punishment is more than it can bear. Every one who discovers its real nature is likely to abhor it, since it leads to trouble and bond-

---

\* It is interesting to note, as Schopenhauer points out, that in acknowledging a fault we endeavour to father it upon the head in preference to the heart, thus sacrificing away reason to defend good intention.

age, and entangles one in the cycle of births and deaths. It, therefore, fears to be despised. Hence, Cain is made to say : " And it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me." But, inasmuch as, after the Fall and the consequent destruction of blind Faith, Reason, if rightly employed, is alone capable of re-establishing the state of at-one-ment between man and God, by establishing the divinity of the soul, he who refuses to be guided by Reason, in the condition of Fall, must remain ignorant of his true nature and entangled in the cycle of births and deaths. Hence, the Lord is made to say : " Therefore, whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him seven-fold " Lastly, the statement—" From thy face shall I be hid."—is also fully appropriate to Cain as representing Reason. Taken in a literal sense, it is simply absurd to say that anything can be hid from the face of God from whom nothing can be concealed ; but, philosophically, omniscience and reason are two opposite aspects of the one and the same thing, namely, the soul, the former being the function of pure spirit, and the latter an attribute of the ego involved in impurity. For this reason, so long as the soul remains in a condition of impurity it cannot exercise its natural function of omniscience ; but when the impurities are removed, reason is replaced with all-embracing knowledge and godhood attained. Hence, divinity and reason cannot exist together, which explains the speech of Cain.

The third son of Adam is Seth, which means appointed, that is, he who was appointed to take the place of the murdered Abel (*i.e.*, blind faith), hence, wisdom.

Seth figures as the Messiah in later Jewish tradition (Encyclo. Brit., 11th Ed., Art. Seth) ; and Enos (Man) is the son of Seth who calls himself (by the name of) the Lord.\*

Let us pause for a moment to explain the significance of the expression 'the knowledge of good and evil' as used in the Bible. Every one knows that good and evil† are only comparative terms, neither of which signifies anything in particular in itself, but, when taken in relation to some specific thing, they convey the idea of utility, benefit or advantage, in the one case, and of uselessness, harm, or disadvantage, in the other. That which determines the good or evil of any particular thing, at any particular time, is, in the first instance, our own body, or personality, so that when a thing acts, or is likely to act, on our personality, or body, in a beneficial, or advantageous, manner, we call it good, and, in the converse case, evil. Hence, 'knowledge of good and evil' means the knowledge of the relations in which our body, or personality, stands to the remaining bodies in the world ; in other words, the knowledge of the phenomenal. And, since the knowledge of the phenomenal is possible only through sense-organs, the knowledge of good and evil, in its ultimate analysis, only amounts to sensual experiences of pleasure and pain. As said in the Mundaka Upanishad, 'two sciences must be known, the highest

---

\* See the marginal note to Genesis, IV. 26.

† Cf. "It is things out of place that are bad ; not things in themselves. All evil is relative, and its relation is with higher forms of goodness."—'Reason and Belief,' by Sir Oliver Lodge, p. 140.



and the lesser ;' of these, the highest is the science of the Supreme Spirit, and the lesser, the science whose object is to show the cause of virtue and vice and their consequences (Shankara )

It would be now obvious that the Bible does not condemn the intellect itself, but only its exclusive employment for the gratification of sensual lust. The third and fourth chapters of the book of Genesis, taken together, cover the entire field of the Puranic legend given above, and point to the power of intellect itself, when rightly employed, to raise up the fallen humanity.

The lesson to be learnt from the doctrine of the "fall" is that those who aspire to attain to the status of God, to enjoy ever-lasting bliss, must make up their minds to control the fiery serpent of their desiring *manas*. They must also see that they do not make their intellect spend all its energy in pandering to the vanities, passions and tastes of the physical body, the seat of false personality, but should apply it to study the requirements of the soul, the real, *i.e.*, immortal man.

Man alone, of all beings, in this world, is endowed with the capacity, and enjoys the opportunity, to think on his destiny. He alone has the power of shaping his future, for weal or woe, as he pleases. But this capacity is so hopelessly crippled by his wrong desires, the worst of which is the desire for the sensual knowledge of good and evil of the phenomenal world, that unless he can crush the head of the hydra of his desiring *manas*, he has no right to hope for salvation.

Man's physical concerns may, and, indeed, do come to an end with the physical death ; but the continuity

of the soul, after death, requires that the physical concerns alone should not be allowed to occupy the uppermost place in his thoughts. Sir Oliver Lodge is the first European to get a partial inkling of the truth of the doctrine of the "fall;" but he seems to place the emphasis on the "management of the world" rather than on 'self-conquest.' Concerning the origin of self-consciousness, he observes :—

"How it all arose is a legitimate problem for genetic psychology, but to the plain man it is a puzzle; our ancestors invented legends to account for it—legends of apples and serpents and the like; but the fact is there, however it be accounted for. The truth embedded in that old Genesis legend is deep; it is the legend of man's awakening from a merely animal life to consciousness of good and evil, no longer obeying his primal instincts in a state of thoughtlessness and innocency—a state in which deliberate vice was impossible and therefore higher and purposed goodness also impossible,—it was the introduction of a new sense into the world, the sense of conscience, the power of deliberate choice; the power also of conscious guidance, the management of things and people external to himself, for preconceived ends. Man was beginning to cease to be merely a passenger on the planet, controlled by outside forces; it is as if the reins were then for the first time being placed in his hands, as if he was allowed to begin to steer, to govern his own fate and destiny, and to take over some considerable part of the management of the world." (*Life and Matter*).

No doubt, a man brought up in an atmosphere full of worldly politics cannot but lay stress on the "management of the world," but religion only accepts those who are prepared to give up worldly politics for the sake of self-conquest. For the less advanced souls, religion does not altogether forbid political activity, but only makes it subordinate to spiritual evolution, so that the world-conquest may not interfere with the conquest of the lower self. It is no use denying the fact that our

so-called taking part in the management of the world has hitherto been a very unsatisfactory affair, and whatever we may say in our own praise, or in that of our civilization, it is abundantly clear that no such praise is merited, even if we do not deserve a strong condemnation for our behaviour towards animals and, in many instances, towards our own race. It is true that we can point out our material accomplishments to Mother Nature with a modest pride in our achievements, but she can always retort by directing our attention to those natural forces and means of which we are almost wholly ignorant even in the twentieth century of our civilization. What are our railways and telegraphs to the faculties of telepathy and clairvoyance lying dormant within our souls? What *happiness* have they brought to the race, or to any one at all? All our vaunted boasts get ultimately reduced to this that we have succeeded as individuals, and also as nations, in amassing large fortunes, and in devising various means for squandering them at expensive hotels and card-tables, and on sickening carcasses of animals and intoxicating drinks, to say nothing of other degenerate forms of living only too nauseating to be specifically mentioned. These are practically the limits of our culture, whether we spell it with a c or a big K. But surely, it is only by a mere perversity of sense and language that one may claim the modern civilization to be the outcome of the Sermon on the Mount. In very truth, it is the violation, in every essential, of the Master's philosophy that has brought about the culmination of the modern times which it pleases us to call civilization. Without

violating in letter, as well as in spirit, the Messianic command, "But whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also," no one could have ever dreamt of subjugating the nations of the world; nor without trampling down the equally forcible mandate, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth," could any one amass wealth. The truth is that man's power of speech enables him to disguise his true feelings, not only from his fellow-beings, but, quite as often, from himself. Failing to understand the nature of the ideal set before the world by the great Propounders of Religion, the modern man seeks to hide the cancer of unhappiness at his heart by impotent sentimentality and self-deceiving ideas of his own importance and morality. The richest nation on earth may possess the most enormous amount of wealth, its country may be very beautiful to look at, and it may boast of all the luxuries of life which the ingenuity of man has ever put at the disposal of wealth, yet the question arises and must be asked, what individual happiness has been conferred upon the people constituting it? The answer in the negative is so self-evident that one need not take the trouble of recording it. It is not that we deny the great advantages of such institutions as the school, the hospital and the poor-house, but, in very truth, these very institutions furnish evidence condemnatory of our civilization. Our schools impart education, it is true, but it is also true that the education they impart tends not to advance the cause of individual happiness, but leads to atheism, impiety and godlessness. The increasing necessity for hospitals and poor-houses goes to indicate

that people do not live in harmony with Nature, and, consequently, suffer from poverty and disease. The greatest defect of materialism is that it prevents us from the realization of our divine nature, by unduly developing the objective and sensual sides of life. The following comparative table, taken from Hudson's 'Divine Pedigree of Man,' will be found sufficient to show the godly nature of the subjective side of Life, from the realization of which we are at present debarred by our ungodly materialism :—

Objective Mind.		Subjective Mind.	
Pure Intellect.	{ Inductive reasoning. Deductive reasoning (imperfect). Memory (imperfect). Brain memories of emotional experiences.	1	Instinct or intuition.
		2	Controlled by suggestion.
		3	Deductive reasoning (potentially perfect).
		4	
		5	Memory (potentially perfect).
		6	Seat of emotions.
		7	Telepathic powers.
		8	Telekinetic energy.

} Limitations.

Some writers on New Psychology mention an additional faculty, namely, that of clairvoyance as belonging to the subjective mind ; but Hudson does not assign to it a separate place in the table, holding that its phenomena are only telepathic in reality. Whether clairvoyance be regarded as a separate faculty of the subjective mind or not, the list is sufficient to convince any one, at a glance, that the nature of the human soul is essentially divine. To facilitate further comparison, the following table, also

taken from 'The Divine Pedigree of Man,' is given below :—

God.	Man.
Omniscience ...	{ Instinct or intuition. Deductive powers (potentially perfect.) Memory (potentially perfect). Telekinetic energy. Telepathy. Natural emotions.
Omnipotence ...	
Omnipresence ...	
Infinite love ...	

These comparisons leave no doubt about the human soul being the repository of all godly virtues, which only need unfoldment to bloom into perfection. By far a vast majority of mankind, however, are quite unconscious of these godly powers of their souls, and, therefore, unable to attain the perfection which is within their reach, since conscious exertion is necessary for spiritual evolution, and since conscious exertion can only be made in the case of things which are known. Our ignorance of these great powers and virtues of the soul is to be attributed, as already stated, to the employment of intellect to pander to sensual lust. Reason being, thus, the tenure by which man holds his free moral agency, and the power which enables him to train his soul, for weal or woe, it is not difficult to see why its employment as a procuress to the will has been described in the old Genesis legend as a 'fall.' Those who deride the ancient Indian civilization should remember that that much derided civilization was founded upon the spiritual requirements and necessities of individual life and society, and was calculated, on the one hand, not only to offer no resistance to the human soul in its spiritual

evolution, but, also, to actually advance and facilitate its progress, and, on the other, to secure the greatest good of the greatest numbers, even in respect of material peace and prosperity, in so far as these are consistent with the spiritual aspirations of the real man. The same statement cannot be made in respect of modern civilization, which, if anything, is anti-spiritual in its tendency.

It is no use minimising the pernicious and harmful nature of the influence which the present-day civilisation is exerting on the souls of men, since it tends to make them disregard the teaching of religion which alone is the path of what has been described as entering into life. What with its fashions and conventions, its licensed saloons and beer-shops, its niceties and novelties in food, dress, and the like, to say nothing of the thousand and one other forms of the anti-spiritual occupations and pursuits which it provides for its votaries, the modern civilization is calculated only to pamper sensualism at the cost of the spiritual nourishment of the soul. The one most marked feature of distinction between the two forms of civilization, the ancient and the modern, is in respect of the cost of living which is going up daily, and which the majority of men find it hard to meet, in spite of devoting their whole-time labour to its procurement. Such being the case, it is not surprising that people should have neither time nor inclination for the study of religion, not to mention the practising of those methods and means which alone lead to the attainment of the ideal of the soul. The path of sensualism—another though slightly less repulsive name for animalism—is directly opposed to that of spiritualism, and it

requires no great familiarity with the canons of Logic to predict that if the latter be the only means of attaining to the perfection of Gods, the former cannot possibly lead to aught but suffering and pain. The ancients could undoubtedly have given us a civilization equal to our own, but they very well knew that the moment prominence was given to the enjoyment of the senses, the cart would necessarily come to occupy the place of the horse, and, therefore, wisely kept down all those sensual tendencies of men which constantly try to break loose in the name of development and culture. We might refine sensualism as much as we like, but it would never become anything else. As black takes no other hue, so does sensualism maintain its loathsomeness, notwithstanding all the veneer of cultured refinement under which we constantly try to conceal its hideous nature.

To conclude, the elucidation of the legend of the 'fall' has shown us that it is not an historical record of the actual doings of a primitive pair of human progenitors, but an illustration of the operation of certain important psychic laws, which no one, desirous of attaining immortality and bliss, can afford to ignore. The object of the ancient teacher, who took pains to leave a record of his views behind, was not to amuse us with a nursery tale, nor yet to furnish us with an opportunity to smile at his 'crude and childish simplicity,' but to bequeath to us some of the most valuable secrets of Religion, the Science of all sciences. The thirst for happiness is a natural craving with all living beings; and the man who does not long, consciously or otherwise, for the joy of Gods is yet



to be born. The ancient seer knew this full well, and left a record of his views on the subject for our guidance. What we have been accustomed to look upon as an historical narrative of Adam's disobedience and punishment is, thus, a recipe for the general complaint of suffering and pain, from which all are anxious to escape. This remedy consists, as has been demonstrated in this chapter, in the realisation of the great formula of faith, the '*aham Brahman asmi*' ( I am Brahman) of Vedanta.

A word about the nature of the flaming sword and the cherubim that bar man's way to the Tree of Life, and we shall pass on to a consideration of the doctrine of Redemption. The former represents the lower mind, the ego of desires and lusts which it seeks to gratify with sensory stimulus from the external world. As restlessness is a characteristic of this mind on account of its being the seat of desires, it is described as turning in every direction. It should be borne in mind that mind is a clumsy word to be employed for the idea which is intended to be conveyed. The Sanskrit *manas* is the most appropriate word for expressing the sense. It means that organ which prevents knowledge from being acquired simultaneously, and which acts as a gate-keeper\* at a show who lets in only

---

\* The nearest equivalent to *manas* in English is attention, which limits our perception of things to one at a time only, in other words, which prevents our taking cognizance of things simultaneously. If we study ourselves in the attitude of attention, we shall observe that our senses do not work simultaneously and together, so that when the mind is linked to a particular sense-organ, it ceases to work through the remaining channels of sensation. The same is the case with thinking, which also requires exclusive attention being paid to its object; and even the experiences of pleasure and pain are no exception to this rule. Attention, then, is the instrument of exclusion of knowledge. The soul is like a mirror which reflects all things which exist at the same time; but it is attention which debars us from taking cognizance of them all at once, and confines the percep-

one at a time. The cherubim apparently stand for, and represent, sense attractions.\* It is, thus, the Manas and the attractions of the world which are mounting guard over the priceless Tree of Life. Immortality is the reward of him who overpowers them both, and reaches the Life-giving Tree.

---

tive function to that in which we happen to be the most interested for the time being. It follows from this that our interests alone determine the functioning of perception, and prevent us from being all-knowing.

We have said that attention signifies interest, but interest itself is nothing other than desire, since we are only interested in things which we have a desire to acquire or enjoy, or which we wish to avoid. The force of desire, then, is what is meant by attention, *i.e.*, *manas*.

It is also easy to see that desires are only different kinds of forces, since they drag us after their objects—often against our better judgment. They cannot be immaterial altogether, for the conception of a non-entity operating on the soul, and dragging it in certain directions, thus, crippling its perception and narrowing down its field of knowledge, a self-contradictory idea. It is as if the soul were possessed of a perceiving instrument, or rod—a kind of psychic monocle—to survey the world with. This mental monocle is the *manas*; and, since it is only the sharp end of desires, its material shape may be likened to a pencil of rays, thinned and sharpened into a point. Attention, then, signifies the current of different kinds of forces of desire, brought to a point and focussed on the object of enquiry. For this reason it is that it has been described as a serpent in the book of Genesis. Hence, he who would acquire omniscience must curb down his desires, so that his soul may put aside its knowledge-obstructing instrument of perception of which it is enamoured at present.

\* The cheruliam, who are to be distinguished by their knowledge from seraphs whose distinctive quality is love, probably represent the discriminative knowledge of good and evil of things, and are thus symbolical of sense-attractions.