

apostles. . . . This case destroys the very theory that it is adduced to support. The iniquity of Judas put an end to his apostleship." The question is asked, Does the Canon "actually hold that Judas, after the betrayal, could have celebrated a valid sacrament?" As the Church forms and dogmas represent the materialized conception of the occult mysteries upon which the Church is based, and from whose real nature she draws life and force to the extent that she approximates their truth, it is the duty of every Theosophist to see with what intelligent and sympathetic appreciation he can assist the better understanding of the things that are unseen, thus leading to a knowledge of that which underlies the outer and visible symbols. In controversy with Dr. Watson (Ian Maclaren) on the same subject, Canon Hammond meets with a retort which is so apt to the present U. B. occasion that it cannot be left out of consideration. Canon Hammond asks: "Were Hophni and Phineas priests of God or not?" Dr. Watson answers "without reserve or hesitation that, in a literal sense, those two infamous men, Borgias of their day, may have been priests, although, as you are aware, criticism has thrown something more than doubt on the orders of the Jewish priesthood; but that in any religious sense it appears to me—I judge no other man—profanity to associate their names with God. I believe, with many a passage of Holy Scripture to support me, that their sacrifices were an abomination to the Lord, and that no man in Israel who feared God and did righteousness ought to have had anything to do with such men. I believe that the duty of every member of God's Church in that day was to separate himself from them and all their works, as the Anglican Church did from Rome in the sixteenth century, and to take up a position of spiritual and ecclesiastical dissent." And we may feel with Dr. Watson, also, that the statement that the Master "demands obedience (for His ministers), not because they have, in some poor measure, His own character, but because they have office and succession, is astounding."

"A THEOSOPHIC SCOT" writes in approval of THE LAMP ideals. It would be difficult, he thinks, to put into words the very high ideals he formed on first reading about Theosophy, "but the first rush of feeling was unutterable gratitude for the infinite goodness which had brought this Wisdom to my door. Then a firm determination to try and become a wiser, nobler, and better man than ever before I had dreamed it possible to be—but now, through this wise teaching, I saw I must become—so that in good time I also might be able to help as I had been helped. Such was my ideal. And such, I believe, are the first honest impulses of most true-hearted seekers for truth who drink from Theosophic wells. . . . Having never joined an E. Section, I had no concern with their squabbles. Some people had to get their lessons and find their strength and weakness there. I found mine elsewhere. But we all have to go through it. There are other 'Schools of Occultism,'—God help them!—where men and women may be tried as in a fire, and come out with the dross burnt out of them—or be burnt. My salvation I can now see was, that everything I took up had for its end in my mind to make me fitter to serve the Theosophical Society, and that is to promote the work of Universal Brotherhood constantly kept before all members by the First Object. Did I learn nothing in these other Societies? Yes, I learnt that it was not necessary to feed on pigs' meat. And I also learnt this, that I did not want what they had to teach, and it is perhaps a greater thing than appears at first sight to know what you don't want. . . . Let any group of students who desire to work the work of the Theosophical Society meet together and draw up the simplest possible rules for that group. Any well-conducted debating society rules, for example, would form a basis. Let them be simple and clear. Then draw up a scheme of work for public meetings—a syllabus. Let the members take the papers, or get friends to do them. That is to say, a friend might not be specially interested in reincarnation, but deeply interested