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Ever since the Westminster Review called his The Rosicrucians, their Rites and Mysteries "the most absurd book it has ever been our fortune...to review,"1 and A. E. Waite poured scorn over his "ill-digested erudition," poor Hargrave Jennings has had a very bad press. The previous owner of my copy of The Rosicrucians has written on it: "Rubbish, as far as I can make out," a sentiment echoed by every discriminating or scholarly reader who has leafed through this disconcerting volume. The situation is scarcely improved by the "very unwholesome undercurrent" (as the same reviewer calls it) which manifests in The Rosicrucians as an interest in sexuality, both symbolic and physiological. The historian, however, cannot dismiss Jennings so readily. First, he occupies a crucial place in that no-man's land of the mid-nineteenth century, as a harbinger of the great occult revival of the 1880s. Second, he is an unrecognized pioneer in the exploration of oriental metaphysics and the reconciliation of East with West. Those are two good reasons to study him, and more may appear in the course of this article.

The contributor of the entry on Hargrave Jennings to the Dictionary of National Biography has little more to offer than a bibliography, and surmises that he was born in 1817. He himself tells us that his family circumstances were "not poor, though not overwhelmingly rich." He grew up in the West End of London, and as a child would accompany his mother to church at St. James's, Piccadilly. Here is his own character-sketch.2

1 was always a strange, moody, unaccountable child; fond of solitude—drawing all my mental nutriment from reading—setting with indomitable perseverance to the perusal of every book which fell in my way; and studying and restudying my favourite authors with loving pertinacity. I grew very superstitious, contemplative, and fanciful. The faculty of 'marvellousness' was largely
developed in me very early. I read works of imagination with avidity. The town became filled to me with phantom romance-pictures. I led a life quite out of my real life.

As a result, Hargrave Jennings would later claim than from his childhood he had been fully acquainted with everything about Spiritualism that was "reliable and philosophical." A precocious writer, at the age of fifteen he contributed a series of sea-sketches to the *Metropolitan Magazine*, whose editor, the novelist Captain Marraty, was amazed when he learned how young their author was. It is hard to say what, if any, was Jennings's profession. The *DNB* says that he was for many years secretary to Colonel James Henry Mapleson, manager of various Italian opera companies in London from 1858-1887, but he finds no mention in Mapleson's chatty *Memoirs*. Nevertheless, Jennings must have been well-connected socially, to judge from the dedication of his *St. George (1853)*, a "Poetic History of the Champion of England." The work is inscribed [significantly enough, in view of the theories of The Rosicrucians] to the "Knights of St. George, or of the Garter." Since the printer of the work is styled "Bookseller to the Queen," the dedication can hardly have been made without proper permission from someone in the Order.

There is some sparse biographical material on Jennings in the works of R. Swinburne Clymer, founder of one of the American Rosicrucian orders, but it would be imprudent to repeat it without corroboration from surer sources, especially anything concerning Jennings's putative position in some Rosicrucian order, and his initiation thereinto of Paschal Beverly Randolph, the American mulatto medium and writer on sexual magic. Jennings does make one guarded allusion to Randolph, in a letter of 1887: "I first knew Randolph the American 35 years ago, he was, physically, a very remarkable man." Likewise, it has not been possible, up to the time of writing, to find the sources of the interesting connections proposed by Peter Tompkins. In short, Jennings still awaits his biographer, and the disinterment of his letters, if any still exist. We can add that in 1854 he was living in Harmwood Square, Regent's Park. His brother lived at Ambassador's Court, St. James's Palace, and Jennings would himself use this address in later life. Whether or not he actually lived in such a desirable locale, he died there on 11 March 1890. There has been no sign of the reminiscences he is supposed to have completed shortly before his death.

Although his early publications were fictional and topical, Jennings was claiming as early as 1858 a "lifelong devotion to metaphysics" and "years of research and reading" in preparation for his first philosophical book, *The Indian Religions*. Stated to be "by an Indian missionary," it was written to criticize and correct the lack of understanding of the Orient, especially as shown in an essay on Buddhism published in the *London Times* in the Spring of 1857, and, more generally, in the climate following on the Indian Mutiny of May-September 1857. Among the books Jennings lists as having consulted "in the attainment of the following philosophical results" are the works of Cornelius Agrippa, Paracelsus, J. B. van Helmont, and Swedenborg (all in English); Thomas Taylor's translation of Plato; recent books on magnetism and spiritualism; Catherine Crowe's *The Night Side of Nature* and Ennomos's *History of Magic*, the *Asiatic Journal* and *Asiatic Researches*, and Ward's *The Religion of the Hindoos*.

The author of these *Times* articles, published on April 17 and 20, was in fact F. Max Müller, and this was practically his first venture into Buddhist studies. Müller thought the Buddhist aspiration to a Nirvana of utter annihilation little short of insane, but allowed that individuals, through not understanding it properly, had triumphed over the madness of its metaphysics. Jennings thought the anonymous author woefully ignorant in thinking Buddhism atheistic, whereas in point of fact: "We, in this religion, stand face to face with an Antiquity when men, even in our own suspicion - in our own granting - were very greatly more near God." (The awkwardness of style always appears when Jennings is speaking of matters close to his heart.) He goes on: "Brahminism may be considered to be the starred and decorated, and the human-marked child of its inexpressibly sublimely descended parent, Buddhism"; a very early anticipation of the Theosophic teaching that the primordial wisdom of mankind lies in the pre-Gautama, esoteric Buddhism. This wisdom is metaphysical in nature, and it stretched Hargrave Jennings's powers of expression to the utmost as he strove to explain it to his audience of 1858:

In the theory of the Buddhist philosophers, life being an accident, something has passed on and is passing on, behind to make it so. And this unknown, moveless, passionless REST, in which life should be impossible, being form or the Pythagorean number, is their Nirvand, or non-existence.

This, he says, is the Buddhists' "much-belied abyss of atheism," misunderstood because the West can only conceive of God as a being, whereas the ultimate, in Buddhism, is beyond being or, as Jennings elsewhere calls it, "sublime 'Non-Being'". There were few Western minds in the mid-nineteenth century capable of entertaining the conception of God as a "spiritual gulf of nothingness," or of Non-Being as metaphysically prior to Being. Nor were there many willing to follow him into the mentalistic territory which had, admittedly, been cultivated by a few Western philosophers such as Bishop
Berkeley:

But the mistake that is made, in the objections to Buddhism, is just this, that the objectors will insist upon starting upon the premiss that life is real. Ideas, by which we converse with that outside, are all which we arc. And these are not real things, but mere delusive lights of the master phantom-light of intelligence.21

The ideas in question are not even held in the mind of God, as they are in Bishop Berkeley’s philosophy, and, in a sense, in Plato, but are delusions dependent on the greater delusion of Being itself. Jennings, with the Buddhists, is radical in his mentalism:

Take the human mind from the world and it exists no longer. The human mind is the world. It makes it.

Space is nothing, for we know it only by that which is in it.

Time is nothing. It is simply a question begged, and a delusion settled, to make things exist. That is, it is necessary for man and the ‘visible’ to be possible. Space and time are simply power: the very existence of which is a confession of limit and proof of want of power.22

Given the nullity of the universe in the face of Nirvana, there are still certain laws, or habits, to which the great illusion is obedient. What Jennings calls “the master phantom-light of intelligence” is elsewhere alluded to as Nature, or the soul of the world, or “final conceivable mechanical intelligence.”23 It works through the opposites, or complementaries, such as Light and Darkness, Life and Death.

Darkness and Light are brother and sister... Light is darkness, indeed, wrought visible, and is the soul of matter: the ficer the deeper we go out of our sensations. Thus Light, itself, is no less material than all other visible things.24

Since God is nothingness, any idea we have of “him” is bound to lead us into delusion. In many places, Jennings condemns human reason as a deceiver, because it makes us form ideas about the formless, and erects itself as a substitute for direct intuition. If there is a devil in his theology, it is Reason.

Divinity must be complete and clear [out of idea], and therefore nothing... Thus the human reason infallibly, under all its various heavenly deceits and just the more successfully according to its perfection, leads FROM God, and the idea of God [which is not God] is the very opposite of God, and being the very opposite of God, it must be the Evil-Principle.25
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So how are we to know the unknowable, non-existent Absolute? Only, it seems, through the direct replacement of our consciousness by the inconceivable:

...he is only ultimately and really possible in the divine immediate possession, or in the supernatural trampling on idea, and [to the world] madness or ecstasy. We can never rise to Him. He must descend to us... He is only possible in thus snatching us out of the world, or out of ourselves.26

Failing the mystical assimilation to the Absolute which he struggles to describe here, Jennings seems to have nothing better to offer than to seek God in “miracle.” He understands miracles not as God’s occasional contravention of the laws of nature, but as the multifarious phenomena that contradict the petty reasoned order of the illusory thought-world. Hargrave Jennings evidently saw the breaking-down of the over-rational mind as the necessary first step towards the assimilation of the Buddhist world-view, and to the experiences that may follow.

In the remainder of the book, Jennings is unspiring in his tirades against the British in India and their “hundred years of inexpressible misrule” which he holds responsible for the Mutiny.27 He castigates the “proselytizing colonels” who bully the natives into conversion and the general insensitivity to the religious rites of the Hindus, asking how the British would like their own religion to be treated like that.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the boldness and originality of The Indian Religions, coming as it did twenty years before Sir Edwin Arnold’s The Light of Asia (1879) presented Buddhism to the public in a glow of admiration. At mid-century, the knowledge of Buddhism in Europe and America was still at a very elementary stage. For example, the American Transcendentalists, whose admiration for Hindu doctrines was based on the ample source material provided by Sir William Jones and others, found Buddhism chilly and negative by comparison.28 Even those who knew the subject best, the French scholars Eugène Burnouf and Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, painted Buddhism as a gloomy religion of negation, and Nirvana as nothing more or less than extinction; then exclaimed with astonishment that a third of the world’s population could be so stupid as to embrace such a faith. Barthélemy was the sort of scholar who could say of his chosen subject: “The Buddha was one of those naive and blind thinkers who, starting from Being to end up with Nothing, are unaware of the crushing weight of this unbearable contradiction.”29 Max Müller was simply following in the footsteps of his French masters. Jennings stands alone in his realization that, in order to understand Buddhism as a reality, one’s mind must be disburdened from every prejudice of rationality. If he had had any predecessors in
the West, they are the theologians of the Thrice-Unknown Darkness: Dionysius the Areopagite, Meister Eckhart, Jakob Boehme.

Jennings's next book would be directed at sapping the foundations of rationalism by forcing attention to the inexplicable and the supernatural. The idea for the book, called *Curious Things of the Outside World*, was conceived in 1851. It was begun in October 1858 and worked on up to "the present" (the Preface, where Jennings tells us this, is dated 28 November 1860), except for the interval of December 1859 to March 1860 when the author was "otherwise occupied." Curious Things, in two volumes, is a philosophical treatise prefaced by a collection of ghost stories and tales of the supernatural such as were popular at the time, as witness the better-known works of Crowe, Christmas, Ennemoser, and Owen. Jennings says that his purpose in presenting these instances of miracle and anomaly is to show:

That there is an universal connection in nature, and a mutual reciprocity in symmetrical and anti-pathetical contrasts, but which cannot be perceived by the waking senses...That a spiritual communion exists between man and man, and therefore also between man and superior beings...That in science nothing yet is certain, or fixed, respecting nature and spirit, the soul or body, or the possibility, or probability, of reciprocal influence.

Evidently we have moved from the metaphysics of The Indian Religions to cosmological theory, and Hargrave Jennings is already writing like a Rosicrucian, with the characteristic world-view based on Hermetic correspondences. His own enthusiasm is evident when he summarizes the doctrines of the Gnostics:

Those souls, or divine possibilities, which, in their reception of the Light, are enabled to clear themselves of the fogs of the worlds of being, will, at the dissolution of their sense-bodies, transcend into the Pleroma. The souls that are unable to illuminate themselves out of it, continue in the deictes, and therefore thraldom, of Matter - however beautiful or grand be it: and they remain under the sceptre of the King of the Visible, and will, at death, transmigrate into other bodies, losing all trace of their previous stages - the nature of which are alone known to God - until, in purification, they really AWAKE. At last - in their escape into the Pleromae, or state of the eternal Matterless Light - they triumph over its imitation and over its master, this King of Bright Shadows, Devil, or Great Demiurgus. This is the pure Transmigration of Pythagoras, and the Buddhism sic which, in its truer or false forms, prevails over all the East. And will be found, indeed to be the foundation and parent of all religions.

Hargrave Jennings envisages the destiny of the human being as a dual path, leading either to the dissolution of self in the Pleroma (the Nirvana of The Indian Religions), or else to a purifying series of reincarnations in the world of the diabolical Demiurge which have the same end-result. He is correct in saying that this is the doctrine of Buddhism, which envisages transmigrations around the Wheel of Existence that can be arrested only by dissolution of the ego while in the human state. It also appears to have been the teaching of the Orphics, and hence of the Pythagoreans, as well as of some Gnostic schools. Such a view of human destiny is of course contrary to the teachings of Catholic and Protestant churches alike, since it leaves little room, or necessity, for vicarious salvation. Nor could anything be more different from the sentimentialty of Jennings's contemporaries the Spiritualists, obsessed as they were by the apparent proof of personal survival. Indeed, the "presumed Spiritual Disclosures" which followed the Hydesville rappings of 1848 were, in Jennings's view, nothing more than a reflection from the minds of the living, and had done much harm in discrediting the general subject of supernaturalism.

Since The Indian Religions had been published pseudonymously and in a small edition, it was natural for Hargrave Jennings to make use of it in his more extensive (though scarcely more ambitious) work. Consequently, in the second volume of Curious Things, he repeats verbatim the crucial passages on Buddhist metaphysics in The Indian Religions, from which the above extracts are mostly taken. But the intervening years had brought him new knowledge: he attributes these doctrines to "the mystic Buddhists and their modern successors the Rosicrucians. By now he had discovered Robert Fludd's *Mosaical Philosophy*, he knew the history of the Rosicrucian manifestos and the importance of Johann Valentin Andreae, and he could cite the Rosicrucian manuscripts of Dr. Rudd, "who appears to have been an adept," in the British Museum (Harleian Mss. 6481-6) - but without any evidence that he had looked at them. He gives much disorganized information on these and on the "Fire-Philosophers," whom he calls a fanatical late-sixteenth century sect, active in almost all the countries of Europe. [What he means are the alchemists and Paracelsians,] I cannot believe that Jennings had discovered all this source-material on Renaissance magic and the early Rosicrucians on his own initiative: his subsequent work never shows him to have been a serious researcher in libraries, always a compiler from secondary sources. It seems far more likely that in 1858, Jennings penetrated circles in which these things were studied, and which we will treat below.

The explanation of the work's odd subtitle, "Last Fire," follows. Whatever it was for the old Rosicrucians and alchemists, fire had become for Jennings a polyvalent symbol. Possibly he himself was not
always clear as to whether he meant by it the Non-Being or Nirvana in which all things become annihilate ("Fire turns things into real NOTHING") or "the fiery soul of the world - or the Binding Magnetism, which as the last of the physical, and the last possible thing to be known, Zoroaster, the supposed founder of the Religion of Fire, elevated into a god to be worshipped." In *The Indian Religions* it was the former, as in Buddhism Non-Being is the supreme and only reality. But all the elaborations which fill several erudite chapters of *Curious Things* are in the spirit of the second interpretation, that is, of Fire as the first creative impulse that brings a universe out of nothingness—which one may as well call God.

Having once posited Fire (or its companion, Light) as the first principle of all religions and mythologies, a vast field for comparative study opened up before our philosopher, because these symbols are found wherever one looks—so long as one knows to look beneath the surface. As he neared the conclusion of *Curious Things*, Jennings commended to the reader a "special group of books" that share this approach to comparative religion. They were Godfrey Higgins' *The Celtic Druids* and *Anacalypsis*, and Sir William Drummond's *Oedipus Judaicus*. Evidently Jennings was as unaware of these sources as he was of the Rosicrucian literature when drawing up his booklist at the start of *The Indian Religions*, but in his subsequent books he never failed to mention them with great respect. Jennings even cites as the "keynote" of the second volume of *Curious Things* a "well-supported though surprising assertion" that is taken verbatim from Higgins.

That extraordinary race, the Buddhists of Upper India [of whom the Phoenician Canaanite, Melchizedek, was a priest], who built the Pyramids, Stonehenge, Carnac, etc., can be shewn to have founded all the ancient mythologies of the World, which, however varied and corrupted in recent times, were originally ONE, and that ONE founded on principles sublime, beautiful, and true.

Jennings says that the basis of his work is the recognition that every religion has an exoteric and an esoteric half, and concludes by admitting that, in order to show the inner side of his supernaturalism, the title of the present work ought to have run:

"Curious Things of the Outside World. Concerning that, also, which is to be understood in the Divinity of Fire. By Hargrave Jennings, F.R.C. (Rosicrucian); Author of *The Indian Religions*. Towards the Philosophical Substantiation of their Sublime groundwork, Buddhism." The styling of himself, in 1860, as "F.R.C." (—Frater Rosae Crucis) is tantalizing. Was it merely to be taken as a statement of spiritual allegiance, or was there some actual order which Hargrave Jennings had joined since completing *The Indian Religions* in 1857 or early 1858? Was it his discovery of a new field for research and for the confirmation of his eclectic philosophy that prompted him in October 1858 to go to work on his seven-year old project? There is no easy answer to these questions, only a couple of hints towards the end of *Curious Things*.

First, Jennings assures the "guardians of the more recondite and secret philosophical knowledge, of whom, in the societies - abroad and at home - there are a greater number, even in these days, that the uninitiated might suppose," that he has not made unguarded disclosures. This is evidently meant to convey the impression that Jennings himself is initiated and possesses knowledge that he is sworn not to reveal.

Second, Jennings suggest a novel interpretation of what the old alchemists meant by the "Philosophers' Stone," namely that it might have signified the "magic mirror, or translucent spirit-seeing crystal, in which impossible-seeming things are disclosed." I believe that everything points to an acquaintance with the brilliant and versatile young scholar, Kenneth Mackenzie [1833-86]. Mackenzie was active in London in the late 1850s as a Member of the Royal Asiatic Society and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. He did know of the Renaissance "fire-philosophers," and would later write a report on Dr. Rudd's manuscript. Mackenzie also knew the people who were currently using crystal-gazing for occult research, notably the veteran occultist William Hockley, and the astrologer "Zadkiel" [Lieut. Morrison] and his circle in London. Finally, Mackenzie gloried in the creation of secret esoteric orders, of more or less tenuous existence, and would have been the natural person to plant in Jennings's mind the idea which would obsess him to the end of his days: that of the Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross as an invisible coterie of adepts whom one might hope, but never expect, to meet.

Hargrave Jennings could certainly call himself a "Rosicrucian" if he wanted to after October 1870, in which month he was admitted to the Societas Rosicruciana in Anglia. But since the S.R.I.A. was founded in 1866, one has to look elsewhere for any "Rosicrucian" adherence in 1860. One possibility is that Jennings was holder of the 18th degree, called "Rose Croix," of the Ancient and Accepted Rite of Freemasonry. Apparently this degree, which claims a Templar origin, was worked very seriously in the 1820s in the "Jerusalem Conclave" (or "Encampment") of Manchester and in Nottingham. In Manchester, it included a play of Christian Rosencreutz's resuscitation. After a temporary suppression, the Manchester conclave was revived in 1851. Its earlier activities are probably the
source of the reference to modern Templars and Rosicrucians in Higgins’ Anacapsis.52

According to Westcott’s History of the S.R.I.A., Kenneth Mackenzie, during his youth in Germany, been in touch with German adepts who claimed a descent from previous generations of Rosicrucians [probably offshoots of the Gold- und Rosenkreuz]. These, says Westcott, had admitted Mackenzie to some grades of their system, and had permitted him to attempt the formation of a group of Masonic students in England.53 Westcott quotes a letter from the Rev. T. F. Ravenshaw, Grand Chaplain of England and one of the earliest members of the S.R.I.A., to the effect that the German fraternity also permitted distinguished members to confer Rosicrucian grades on suitable persons.54 Who knows what orders Mackenzie amused himself by bestowing on suitable candidates? Again, Westcott says that a certain Venetian ambassador to England in the eighteenth century had conferred Rosicrucian grades and knowledge on English students, which were in turn handed on to others. One of the last of these was William Henry White, Grand Secretary of English Freemasonry from 1810 to 1857. On White’s retirement, the relevant papers came into the possession of Robert Wentworth Little, who founded the S.R.I.A. in 1866.55

I am unable, at the time of writing, either to confirm or deny Hargrave Jennings’s relations with the Jerusalem Conclave of Manchester, with Kenneth Mackenzie, or with R. W. Little; but these are three possible routes by which he might have come to style himself “F.R.C.” in 1860. As R. A. Gilbert has pointed out to me,56 if Jennings had had any more impressive “Rosicrucian” credentials, he would not have failed to trumpet the fact to the members of the S.R.I.A. as soon as that scholarly, rather than initiatic society was founded. There seems little doubt that he was acquainted with the circles of “proto-Rosicrucians” and crystal-gazers which numbered among them Mackenzie, Morrison, Frederick Hockley, Francis and George Irwin, and John Yarker.57

The English Rosicrucians, that is, the members of the S.R.I.A., do not seem to have been certain how to respond to Hargrave Jennings’s next major book, The Rosicrucians, Their Rites and Mysteries, published in 1870 after having purportedly been twenty years in the writing.58 John Yarker, in the Preface (dated 8 November 1871) to his Notes on the Scientific and Religious Mysteries of Antiquity, is careful to say that “the whole [of Yarker’s book was] in manuscript before the appearance of a recent work on the Rosicrucians,”59 yet he later quotes from it.60 The S.R.I.A.’s Journal, The Rosicrucian, never gave Jennings’s book a proper review. A very short one appeared in 1875, saying that the book was “more suggestive than positive,” and that Jennings must keep the truth disguised; the notice was followed by the reprint of an article from The Gentleman’s Magazine on the Order of the Garter61 which, in the context, was a deliberate affront to Jennings, who had devoted so much of his book to his own theories on the Garter and its origins.

How does one respond to The Rosicrucians, Their Rites and Mysteries? First, with exasperation at the slapdash way in which Jennings throws together his facts and fantasies. Some of this is explicable, though not excusable, by the wholesale transfer of several chapters from Curious Things. Second, with pity for a writer so often reduced to incoherence when he comes to express his deepest philosophy. Third, with disgust at the poor standards of scholarship set by this much-reprinted work, which have been the curse of historical writing on esotericism to this day. Yet there is also an engaging side to this author as he progresses on his lonely intellectual adventure with minimal support, moral or financial, from anyone.62

The Rosicrucians is impossible to summarize or describe except by saying that the one thing it is definitely not, is the history of the Rosicrucians promised in the Preface. Nor are any rites or mysteries described within its pages. Its torrent of information serves primarily to frame the theory of sexual symbolism that Hargrave Jennings had derived from reading Godfrey Higgins, and hinted at in Curious Things.63 This now becomes the point at which all religions and mythologies meet. But there is also a practical dimension to this teaching. Here is a passage from the earlier work, taken over verbatim into The Rosicrucians, in which Jennings seems to be fulfilling towards a description of sexual intercourse practised as a mystical exercise:64

The hollow world in which that essence of things, called Fire, plays, in its escape, in violent agitation,—to us, combustion,—is deep down inside of us: that is, deep sunk inside of the time-stages, of which rings of being [subsidences of spirit] we are, in the flesh,—that is, in the human show of things,—in the OUTER. It is exceedingly difficult, through language, to make this idea intelligible; but it is the real mystic dogma of the ancient Guebres, or the Fire-Believers, the successors of the Buddhists, or, more properly, Bhuddists.

What is explosion? It is the lancing into the layers of worlds, wherein we force, through turning the edges out and driving through, in surprisal of the reluctant, lazy, and secret nature, exposing the hidden, magically microscopical stores of things, passed inwards out of the accumulated rings of worlds, out of the [within] supernaturally buried wealth, rolled in, of the past, in the procession of Being. What is smoke but the disrupted vapour-world to the started soul-fire? The truth is, say the Fire-Philosophers, in the musing of fire: we suddenly come upon
vertical lines, he was detecting yonis in moons, discs, and horizontals---and all this, while Siegmund Freud was but a schoolboy! But while his predecessors were scholarly Deists, or, in the case of Inman, complete sceptics, Hargrave Jennings was both mystically and practically inclined.

The most surprising revelation of The Rosicrucians, concerns the origin and purpose of the Order of the Garter. With circumspect delicacy, Jennings informs the alert reader that what the Countess of Salisbury dropped on 19 January 1344 was not a garter, but the belt holding her menstrual napkin, whereupon King Edward III silenced the onlookers by picking up the embarrassing object, uttering the immortal words “Honi soit qui mal y pense.” The purpose in founding an order of chivalry to immortalize an eminently forgettable event was as follows:

It was in honour of Woman, and to raise into dignity the expression of the condemned ‘means’...which is her mark and betrayal, but which produced the world in producing Man, and which saved it in the person of the Redeemer, ‘born of Woman.’ It is to glorify typically and mystically this ‘fleshy vehicle,’ that the Order of the ‘Garter’—or ‘Garder’—that keeps it was instituted.70

In so doing, King Edward was, according to Jennings, reviving the chivalry of King Arthur, whose Round Table, with its 26-fold division into alternating red and white sectors, symbolized “the same object as that enclosed by the mystic garter”71 and ruled by the 13 full and 13 new moons of the year. Both chivalric orders were devoted to the feminine aspect of Divinity, which is not shamed but glorified in the physicality of woman.

One cannot exaggerate the boldness of Hargrave Jennings in airing such thoughts, hardly more acceptable today than they were in the Victorian era, but bearing witness to an underground current of awe [and male envy] for the magical power of the menstruating woman that can be traced in folklore, chivalry and myth.72 But can one ever forgive him for his pun on the Garter motto: “Yoni soi...”73

After being given full rein in The Rosicrucians, Jennings’s erudition was next applied to the special case of Christianity, and lent, in particular, to the High Church side in the current debate over the place of ritual in the Church of England. Live Lights or Dead Lights [1873] was written “in conjunction with two members of the Church of England,” and ostensibly treats the question of whether there should be candles on the altar of a church, or whether that object is merely to be treated as a table commemorative of the Last Supper. Jennings’s “fire-philosophy” comes into its own here, as the altar candles “typify Immortal Light, the great fiery ‘Idea’ which annihilates matter and crushes it to light.”74 Once again, the central statement of the book is couched in almost incomprehensible
language, but he seems here to be contrasting, in Gnostic fashion, the true God with the deceptive lights of creation by a demonic power.

It was the meaning of the Great Sacrifice on Calvary, to which those lights on the altar and before the altar rise in mystic, glorious, fiery testament—fire seeking its fellow-flame through the farthest limits of the terrestrial and the celestial worlds—that there shall be no ultimate ruin or darkness, that there shall be no LAST DEATH; that the swathes of dissolution and of blackness shall be consumed, that the great false lights of the devil or Lucifer (then once called 'Light-Bringer' or 'Matter-Bringer,' shall be extinguished in the greater master-light or GOD'S LIGHT. That light which is 'dark in its own excess,' because it extinguishes the man's means of seeing it, and puts out the smaller in the greater. In this stormful warfare of St. Michael, and of the Saviour, the Gates of Hell shall literally be broken-up, and light shall flow through all.75

Live Lights develops many of the ideas of The Rosicrucians on Christian symbolism, particularly that of church architecture in East and West. Sexual symbolism is there, too (the twin candles being, for example, the “cleft” through which the Sun of Righteousness appears), but put in such a way that the innocent reader could easily miss it. Some of the interpretations are strangely anticipatory of René Guénon's Symbolism of the Cross, for example: "The axis of the world, and the axis metaphysical of 'possibility,' are the true cross."76

But the conclusions of the book are starkly at variance with such an approach, for they are nothing less than a defence of the Personal God, which one would have thought as far as possible from the ideas of divinity that have filled Jennings's work so far. Perhaps it was his two collaborators who insisted on saying that, since the essence of Christianity is that man is made in the image of deity, therefore God must be personal, like ourselves, and on ending the book with the words: "We think we have thus demonstrated the necessity of the 'Personal God.'"77

In the same year, 1873, Jennings published another work with Christian associations, One of the Thirty.78 Calling himself only the Editor, he tells of the misfortunes that befall those individuals, from 33 C.E. to the present, into whose hands passed one of the silver shekels for which Judas Iscariot sold Jesus. It is a collection of short stories in historical settings, some prosaic, others bizarre and romantic "in the best German tradition." One would have no difficulty in recognizing Jennings's own style and interests, particularly his love of London and of the sea. However, the book is one of those teasing productions to which the Victorians were prone, in which the author tries to dissemble his authorship. The story Jennings tells in his Epilogue, with much circumstantial evidence to persuade the reader of its truth, is that in 1854 he became friendly with an old German gentleman, Mr. Böhrer, owner of a curiosity shop and guardian of the silver coin in question. Later he met Böhrer's uncle, Mr. Carodus, resident of Greenwich and habitué of the British Museum: a man of indeterminate age who, in his conversations, would tell of distant historical events just as if he had been an eyewitness. About the first of March 1870, Carodus told Jennings that he was going to Paris, and gave him power of attorney to deal with his effects. A letter from Paris, dated 10 June 1870, was his only subsequent communication, instructing Jennings to dispose of the property and to publish the manuscript of One of the Thirty. Carodus had apparently begun it in June 1856, in London, and written off and on ever since.79

In Carodus' letter to his "dear friend H. J.," he says that his book has been commended by "those worthy ones... of whom you little dream," he refers to the accounts in encyclopedias of a "Brotherhood which is supposed to have existed, and which preferred singular claims adjudged to be of the most preposterous kind." Carodus has been in search of traces of this Society for a long lifetime and in most countries of the world; he does not know if he will succeed in finding them before he dies. Jennings adds the notes: "Remarkable events followed in France after this date, as all the world knows" [the Franco-Prussian War began on July 19]; and: "The reader will remember the red-crosses which swept through Western Europe during the latter part of the year 1870 [sign of the R.C.?] and which were to be encountered at every corner even in London, although so unlikely to have such strange marks displayed in it."

The figure of Carodus is obviously modeled, partly on that of the Comte de Saint-Germain, and partly on Jennings himself as the lifelong seeker for the Brotherhood, who may well have started in 1856 to write the stories of One of the Thirty. The whole editorial fiction [as I take it to be] is designed to open the reader's mind to the possibility of Rosicrucians existing here and now. Böhrer, on the other hand, may have been a real person, since a letter from him to an unidentified correspondent, dated from Stratford, 21 April 1886, is printed in The Letters of Hargrave Jennings.80 In this incoherent and ungrammatical letter, Böhrer seems to be planning to strike facsimiles of the silver shekel, which hardly seems to accord with his philanthropic character, considering the damage that the original is shown to have done!

One of the Thirty, according to the Epilogue, carries the banal moral of "the native clinging curse which rests upon money as mere money" and the terrible retribution for undue greed of it.81 Its message is:

that the Gospel is TRUE and not philosophical only, and that the eternal mission of the SAVIOUR and the miraculous narrative of
HIS LIFE ON EARTH are at once real, and vital, and exact; though not perhaps meant in the senses which are involved when reason sets in to examine—for men, through reason, will never find out the things of God.82

Elsewhere, the author proclaims his belief in “a real, personal God who can both see me on my knees and hear me,” admitting that this is “childlike and therefore ridiculous in this Neo-Platonic and Neo-Christianised [or non-Christianised] age.”83 The squib against Neoplatonism is telling, was it aimed at the S.R.I.A. members who were beginning to take an interest in Thomas Taylor? Jennings has evidently shelved, for the present, the philosophical attitudes of The Indian Religions, while his anti-rationalism now takes the elementary form of Christian pietism.

The only other new book that Jennings published in the 1870s was The Obelisk,84 a short occasional work celebrating the arrival in London of “Cleopatra’s Needle.” It is dated October 1877, when the monument was floating somewhere in the Bay of Biscay, having been mislaid on its way from Alexandria. Jennings writes of the origins of obelisks among the iconoclastic Shepherd-Kings of Egypt, worshippers of the Sun whose rays the obelisk symbolizes of the various needles already set up in Europe, and of the ubiquity of similar forms already to be found in London, thanks to the Masonic fraternity. He concludes with a rhapsody on London’s two sacred stones from the East: the Stone of Scone in the Coronation Chair, and its larger brother, soon to arrive. Later he would complain that the obelisk should have been set up, not on the Embankment, but in front of St. Paul’s Cathedral.85

Jennings’s lively sense of London and its life, and his emotional involvement with the capital, come out in the mixture of “serious sermons” and “interesting narratives” that he brought out in 1883 under the title The Childishness and Brutality of the Time.86 Chapters on newspapers, life insurance, advertising, drama, opera, lawyers, fashion, and the American penchant for novel machines show that he was anything but an unworldly scholar, while the bitter title indicates his general attitude to an England which, he says, “is governed by the three selfish classes: the Jews, Lawyers, and Publicans.”87 He fills up this book of over 300 pages with a long narrative of a supernatural experience at sea, and a philosophical Appendix on the “strange Buddhistic idea of the nonexistence of everything,” in which he reiterates the findings of The Indian Religions:

The deeply metaphysical Buddhists, too, have originated in their humiliating, although very profound, reveries the idea the Man is asleep, by which we mean... that the Human Race is buried in a dream of many thousand years’ duration—that nothing is real, because there is nothing really real at the back of anything to make it real.88

In 1880 there appeared, to a very select audience, the first of a number of books acknowledged by or attributed to Jennings, some of whose titles are so similar as to warrant a list here. Certain of them form part of what was called by the reticent publisher [George Redway] the “Nature Worship and Mystical Series”; otherwise the “Phallic Series,” intended to comprise ten volumes in editions of about 200 copies.

Phallic Worship: a description of the mysteries of the sex worship of the ancients, with the history of the masculine cross; an account of primitive symbolism, Hebrew phallicism, Bacchic festivals, sexual rites, and the mysteries of the ancient faiths. No author. [London:] printed for private circulation, 1880. 72 pages. 2nd ed. 1886. 3rd ed. 1891. Cover title: The Masculine Cross.89


Illustrations of Phallicism. Consisting of ten plates or remains of ancient art with descriptions. No author. [London: Redway], 1885. [Given free by the publisher to subscribers to the previous work.]

Phallicism: a description of the worship of lingam-yoni in various parts of the world, and in different ages, with an account of ancient and modern crosses, particularly of the crux ansata (or handled cross) and other symbols connected with the mysteries of sex worship. No author. London: privately printed, 1889. Cover title: Crux ansata. 85 pages. 2nd ed., 1892. No.1 in series.90

Phallic Objects, monuments and remains; illustrations of the rise and development of the phallic idea (sex worship) and its embodiment in works of nature and art. No author. N.p.: privately printed, 1889. 76 pp. No.3 in series.

Fish, Flowers and Fire as elements and deities in the phallic faiths and worship of the ancient religions of Greece, Babylon, Rome, India, etc. with illustrative myths and legends. No author. London: privately printed [for] A. Reader, Orange Street, Red Lion Square, 1890. 97 pages. No.5 in series.

Phallic Miscellanies: facts and phases of ancient and modern sex worship, as illustrated chiefly in the religions of India, an appendix of additional and explanatory matter to the volumes Phalism and Nature Worship. By the author of “Phallicism.” N.p.: privately printed, 1891. 102 pp. No.6 [?] in series.

Nature Worship. An account of phallic faiths and practices
ancient and modern, including, the adoration of the male and female powers in various nations and the Sacti Puja of Indian Gnosticism. By the author of “Phallicism.” N.p.: privately printed, 1891. 105 pages. No.7 in series.

Archaic Cup and Ring Marks, or Archaic Rock Inscriptions: announced in series, acknowledged as “our book” in Nature Worship, p.33, but not recorded as published.

Mysteries of the Rosie Cross, likewise announced but probably not published.

Of these, Phallicism. Celestial and Terrestrial, with its supplementary Illustrations of Phallicism, is by far the largest, the most important, and the only one published under Hargrave Jennings’s name.91 Phallic Miscellanies and Nature Worship are evidently his, too. I have doubts about the others because, while they draw on Jennings’s usual sources (Knight, Dulaure, Higgins, O’Brien, Inman, Forlong), their style does not remotely resemble his. How, for instance, could he have written Fish, Flowers and Fire without a single allusion to his “fire philosophy”? Remembering that in the Prefaces to the second and third editions of The Rosicrucians, Jennings refers to that work’s “Authors” in the plural, I wonder whether he might have been merely a collaborator. In any case, the most noteworthy thing about this series of short, elegantly produced, and semi-scholarly studies is their cold and sober nature. If any of their subscribers were in search of pornographic stimulation, they must have been sorely disappointed.

Phallicism. Celestial and Terrestrial was Jennings’s last major work, and it is his best, gathering most of what was of value in all his preceding ones. He claims, a little ingenuously, that all the facts and theories in it were first brought forward in The Indian Religions, and that others have since enlarged ignorantly on them, introducing the “phallic theory” of all religions,92 but he amply pays out Thomas Inman and General Forlong for their supposed borrowings by drawing many pages at the end of the book from their works. More seriously, he complains that other writers on the subject [not excepting his revered Godfrey Higgins] are destructive to faith and religion.93 whereas he, Jennings, regards religion as true and the present book as constructive of Christian belief.94

A long quotation is merited here in order to show how the metaphysical ideas of The Indian Religions were still alive in Jennings’s mind:

The very root and foundation of the Buddhist theosophic ideas is the impossibility of any phases or forms of being, or recognition, existing otherwise than as evil. All the mistakes of the theologians are derived from their reluctance to admit the

idea that Nirwan, or Nirvana, of the Buddhists means annihilation, or absorption into nothing, which, in truth, the real Buddhism teaches. But this substratum, or ground principle of Buddhism, “annihilation,” is not to be taken in the way which these erroneous constructors of Buddhism suppose. The broad outline of the Buddhist philosophy is a proposition, that all comprehensible existence, that all forms, phases, or formulares of existence, all emotion of any kind, stir, or sense of individuality—the cogito, ergo sum, of Descartes, that everything, in fact, is only good or bad relatively, that in reality, apart from manifestation or acceptance of the thing, there is nothing either good or evil; being only good or evil in man’s necessitated self-delusion: that all life, particularly human life, is a parade of phenomena, of whatever character the movement operating may be. It will follow, conclusively, that extrication, rescue, or permanent and perfect deliverance out of this Masquerade of Being, totally different to what it seems, is Heaven; and that this state of bliss is attainable by the perfect Buddhists [sic], in withdrawing out of Being by repeated purifications, assisted by the multitudinous spirits, into that Nirwan which these abstruse fantastic religionists deem the blessed state of ultimate, never-ending rhapsody of perfect quiet, clear of all stimulus of consciousness. This is an ecstatic state, impossible of deviation, or change. It is the last Light, the Pietoma, or fulness of everything. It may, doubtless, be true, that the philosophy of Buddhism is a shadowy philosophy, but this is the true intent and purpose of it, and, we think, just as clearly stated.95

So far, so good, but how does this fit with the Christian phallicism propounded elsewhere? Apparently through the same transition that we noticed in Jennings’s earlier work, namely from the negative Absolute of Nirvana to the positive Absolute of the source of all worlds. In order to explain the latter, he turns to the Gnostics, as philosophers who were aware of the “greater Divinities who vouchsafed the Sensible Existence,” i.e., the cosmocratic gods. Jennings adds that this is to be understood in the Buddhistic sense, “Buddhism being the first, and the foundation of all the theologies, taking its stand [for earth, and for earthly comprehension] on Phallicism—celestial in the first instant, terrestrial eventually, and witnessed to in the architectural monuments of the whole world, in all ages, and amidst all peoples.”96 Now he is back on the firm ground of his theory of sexual symbolism as the place where all religions and mythologies unite, with its natural corollary: that human sexual intercourse, and the parts of the body concerned, is nothing shameful or indecent, but a replication in the microcosm of the macrocosmic act. Many pages of Phallicism, as one might expect, are devoted to this theme and its extensions. But these do not explain
passages like the following one on St. Michael and St. George:

This idea and representative notion is that of the all-powerful champion-childlike in his "virgin innocence"—so powerful that this God-filled innocence (the Seraphim "know most," the Cherubim "love most") can shatter the world (articulated—so to use the word—in the magic of Lucifer, but condemned), in opposition to the artful constructions, won out of the permission of the Supreme—artful constructions ("this side life")—of the magnificent apostate, the mighty rebel, but yet, at the same time, the "Light-bringer," the Lucifer—"the Morning Star," the "Son of the Morning"—the very highest title "out of heaven," for in heaven it cannot be, but out of heaven it is everything. In an apparently incredible side of his character—for let the reader carefully remark that qualities are of no sex—this Archangel Saint Michael is the invincible sexless, celestial "Energy"—to dignify him by his grand characteristic—the invincible "Virgin Combatant" clothed—and yet suddenly interposes a stupendous mystery, a mystery which lies at the very root of true Buddhism and Gnosticism, for both, in their radical metaphysical bases, are the same—clothed, and at the same time armed, in the denying mail of the Gnostic "refusal to create." 97

It takes a patient reader to decipher this, but the pages that follow give the clue. Here Jennings discourses on the magical qualities of virginity (clairvoyance, for instance, and a certain invulnerability) and on the consequences of its loss; yet, he says, when maidenhood is maintained too long it is "attended with unutterable mischiefs," that are Nature's revenge for the denial of her purposes. Everything in creation encourages men and women to have sexual intercourse as innocently as the animals do, and the universality of sexual symbolism in art and architecture is a recognition of this. But something has also imposed on the human race a guilt or at least an embarrassment about sex. Most people live in a state of perpetual tension between the forces of desire and prohibition. Monks, ascetics, and also, in Jennings's opinion, the Brothers of the Rosy Cross seek to obey only the latter, mastering their passions; and their way of life, though contrary to nature, has always been esteemed the holiest. 99 The confusing paragraph quoted above names the Archangel Michael and Saint George as models of the virginal type which refuses to create; Lucifer as the patron of those who consent to do so through sexual activity.

In these "strange contradictory theosophical speculations," as he himself calls them, 100 Hargrave Jennings is striving to express the paradoxical existence of two paths of Gnosis, the negative and the positive. The first rejects creation, seeing everything manifested as a sham and an evil, and finds its goal exclusively in the Non-Being of Nirvana. The second accepts creation as holy and aims at unity with its Creator.

Since Jennings repeatedly invokes the names of Robert Fludd and Jacob Boehme when trying to explain his philosophy, it is possible that he got his ideas from these great metaphysical writers and exponents of a theology in which God is both negative and positive, both dark and light. To sum it up in a few words, God's darkness, or non-creative aspect, in which the Deity is enwrapped in itself, spells extinction to all creation. This is Nirvana. God's light, on the other hand, is the first emanated or ejaculated substance, from which the universe is made. This is the origin of phallicism. Each point of view has its devotees. 101

Jennings deserves credit for wrestling with these ultimate questions of metaphysics, in comparison to which the concerns of most nineteenth-century philosophers seem rather trivial. However, just as the average Victorian lived in tension between sexual desire and social inhibition, so the philosopher and spiritual aspirant may experience the tug of negative and positive Gnosis in a way that colours every department of life. (This is only to be expected since, to use theistic language, God must feel it, too!) The psychological pressure caused by these contrary forces can plunge one into a black, world-rejecting melancholy, or else into a riot of life-enhancing experiences—notably sex, drink, and drugs.

Hargrave Jennings knew both sides, without a doubt. On the positive side, he did more than anyone of his time to remove sexual taboos and to restore the worship of Priapus, the god of joyful creation, to its rightful and by no means un-Christian place. On the negative side, he manifested the all too common form of a curmudgeonly rejection of everyone else. One can see this in the series of letters that Jennings wrote to Robert Fryar, the Bath publisher, between 1879 and 1887. 102 Here is a list of those whom he mentions specifically with contempt, disapproval or mistrust:

The American advertisers of Magic Mirrors, and American mediums in general (letter of 12 Aug. 1881)

P. B. Randolph (7 Dec. 1883)

Modern Theosophy and Spiritualism; Moncure S. Conway; W. Oxlcy; Henry Melville; Gerald Massey (26 Apr. 1884)

Women in general; Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland (18 Aug. 1885)

A. E. Waite; A. P. Sinnett; H. S. Olcott; H. P. Blavatsky; Eliphas Levi; Emma Hardinge Britten; Richard Proctor; Petrie and all the "Anglo-Israel" tribe; Major-General Forlong; Rev. George Ouseley (10 Aug. 1887)

If all these were worthless, who was left? Only Hargrave Jennings, apparently. It is embarrassing to read the many passages in the letters in which he praises his own works, particularly The Rosicrucians
poor judgment made Jennings hesitate about collaborating on an edition of the *Comte de Gbabelis*, attributed to the Abbé Montfaucon de Villars, he wrote that he, Jennings, was the “only man in England who knows how to use” this book, and paired it with another, whose apparently unique copy was in his possession: *Disputatis Nova contra Mulieres, qua probatur, eas Homines, non esse* (1595). He considered these texts precious “for various reasons which no one in England [nor in any other country either, for the matter of that] probably can understand except myself.”

One can see why Robert Fryar never seems to have acceded to Jennings’s repeated urgings to come up from Bath for a face-to-face meeting in London. In his old age, at least, our philosopher must have been a cantankerous person to deal with.

In 1887 there appeared the first original work of Arthur Edward Waite, entitled *The Real History of the Rosicrucians* and pointedly bound in format, colours, and decoration almost identical to those of Jennings’s 1870 *Rosicrucians*. Waite disposed of his predecessor in the following terms:

This book, however, so far from affording any information on the questions its professes to deal with, “keeps guard over” the secrets of the Fraternity, and is simply a mass of ill-digested erudition concerning Phallicism and Fire-Worship, the Round Towers of Ireland and Serpent Symbolism, offered with a charlatanic assumption of secret knowledge as an exposition of Rosicrucian philosophy.

At the end of *The Real History*, Waite notes that while his book was in press, Jennings had issued a third edition of *The Rosicrucians* in two imposing and handsome volumes, with new but wholly irrelevant materials and “not one syllable of additional information on its ostensible subject,” justifying further his criticisms of its eccentric author. This is quite true, but as I hope to have shown in this article, there are things in Jennings’s work that would have deserved Waite’s attention if he had not been so incensed by its dismal literary and scholarly quality.

From Jennings’s point of view, his last years were crowned with success. The new edition of his most famous book swept up much of what was worth keeping from *Curious Things of the Outside World*, and a second edition of *The Indian Religions* (1890) took care of the rest. *Phallicism* contained the best of his thought since 1870, while the little volumes of the “Nature Worship and Mystical Series” elaborated on various of its strands. He had handed on his web of arcane and confusing erudition, to tease the curious and please those Brothers of the Rosy Cross whom, he insisted to the end, he had never met. He died at his brother’s residence in St. James’s Palace on 11 March 1890, aged about 72.
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