Mr Gurdjieff's Legacy: The Poetics and Aesthetics of Reality in the Thought of a New Age Guru

Vrasidas Karalis

Gurdjieff's aesthetics can be encapsulated by the uncomplicated empiricism of a Balinese proverb: "we have no art", it is said, and "we do everything as well as we can". Indeed, if Gurdjieff had any incidental ideas about the so-called aesthetics, they were firmly incorporated within his whole anthropological system. Generally speaking, for Gurdjieff "art" is one of the many participants in the transhistorical questions that form the process towards the great "awakening" into what he believed to be "the real world". Yet such "incidental" to him ideas have played a considerable role in forming individual poetics and have shaped various discursive practices, spanning from literature to music, and from the theatre to film studies. Because of their creative appropriation by a number of writers and artists, his ideas deserve to be re-iterated and to a certain extent to be re-conceptualised within the context of postmodernist aesthetics of today.

It is known that Gurdjieff was never interested in art as a special or specialised activity of the mind; as a matter of fact he doesn't seem to have ever espoused the idea that art is something distinct from anything else that is done consciously or intentionally by human beings. In his famous *Institute for the Harmonious Development of Man* he attributed much more importance to digging water furrows or to the art of gardening than talking about art, aesthetics or philosophy, As a writer, he was himself rather indifferent to any form of stylistic effect or structural complexity (despite the deep complexity of his works). As an American literary critic stated, Gurdjieff was "a very bad writer with no idea of composition or how to develop and present his themes" (Taylor,

1998:172). Yet it seems that a number of very good writers have been deeply influenced by his writings; also one of his main books was listed as one of the 100 most influential books in history (Seymor-Smith, 1998).

Anthony Storr, a very sensitive and sensible judge of intentions, appears puzzled by Gurdjieff's influence on so many creative people. "Gurdjieff", he observes, "claims our interest because he, or his doctrines by his disciple Ouspensky, bewitched so many interesting and intelligent people, including the writer Katherine Mansfield; A.R. Orage, the distinguished socialist editor of the *New Age*; Margaret Anderson, the editor of the *Little Review* and her friend and co-editor Jane Heap; the surgeon and sexologist Kenneth Walker; Olgivanna, the third wife of Frank Lloyd Wright; and John Godophin Bennet, later to become a guru himself. The psychiatrists James Young and Maurice Nicoll, and the psychoanalyst David Eder were also followers. T.S. Eliot, David Garnett and Herbert Read intermittently attended Ouspensky's meetings. Ouspensky, who first encountered Gurdjieff in 1915, became chiefly based in London and was therefore more accessible to interested people than the guru himself" (Storr, 1996:23). The list of his eminent friends can multiply; one of them, the Australian born P.L. Travers, author of the allegorical children's book *Mary Poppins*, stated about him: "His mere presence gave out energy. To receive his glance was to receive a moment of truth that was often very hard to bear. A master like Gurdjieff is not someone who teaches this or that idea. He embodies it himself… I think I saw in him what every true master has: a certain sacrificial quality as though he clearly had come for others" (Travers, 1973:30).

Undoubtedly he must have been an extraordinary individual with the complexities and the contradictions that we usually find in all people who assume intellectual authority and spiritual leadership. Many scholars have called him affectionately the "rascal guru" whereas others dismissed him as "a great fraud" or even a criminal in whose hands the delicate and rather suicidal Katherine Mansfield died of negligence or debauchery (Shirley, 2004:5-9).

In this paper we won't insist on such antinomies of character although these were exactly the reasons that Gurdjieff became so attractive to people as diverse as Kate Bush, Keith Jarrett, Henry Miller, Jean Toomer, and the British director Peter Brooke who in 1979

presented his esoteric and rather introspective version of Gurdjieff's *Meetings with Remarkable Men*. The other guru of the hippy generation Timothy Leary and the neo-Gnostic Lucifer Colin Wilson seem to have grown out of his personal contradictions, whereas his writing can be detected in the short masterpiece written by the French writer Rene Daumal, *Night on Mount Analogue*, one of the strangest and most provocative stories composed in the last century—which started been considered as one of the most important books published in France. To all these we must add a musical (performed successfully in New York) by John Maxwell Taylor, under the very apt title *Crazy Wisdom: the Life and Legend of Gurdjieff*.

But how can we explain and account for Gurdjieff's appeal? His books are really very hard to read and somehow they are extremely uneven. They were first written in Armenian, and then translated into Russian and from there to French or English using a strange terminology and an army of incomprehensible neologisms that have generated in many occasions mockery and disgust in many literary critics. His famous *Beelzebub's Tales to his Grandson* is indeed a very strange piece of writing, something between an allegorical satire and a mystical treatise of negative theology. His second book, already mentioned, *Meetings with Remarkable Men* is undoubtedly one of the most lucid and transparent works of symbolic journey ever written since Homer's *Odyssey*, something between the *Arabian Nights* and Dante's *Divine Comedy*. It is composed around a deep structure of narrative time, with a strong sense of deterritorialised authorial subjectivity and punctuated by extremely fascinating implied sub-texts. Especially in this book, Gurdjieff achieves to integrate a strong sense of purpose in an almost "grand" style of long expectations and lengthy diversions that create an epic formal amplitude, a narrative space established at the moment of reading in which the exotic and the nostalgic converge in a unity of references always implied but never articulated within the book. The story becomes the landscape for its reading; the reader is an active participant to the "reality" of its message which lies outside its pages. All his other books are interesting by their titles alone: *The Herald of the Coming Good*; *Life is real only when "I Am"*; and finally *Views from the Real World* (although the last two books are rather incomplete and somehow incoherent collections of unrelated lectures and addresses).

However, there is something exceptional that makes Gurdjieff interesting: as a guru he had organised his own secret, arcane rituals and dances; he also had composed his own music together with Thomas de Hartmann, one of his most loyal friends and disciples, and de Hartmann's wife Olga. His music, brilliantly performed by Keith Jarret in the past and recently released in twelve volumes, offers a stimulating background to his theories and illustrates indeed the deep concern, which characterised his vision, to make everything actively present through sounds and tonalities—therefore through artistic means. Gurdjieff's music was composed so that "it could be performed by an idiot", as he himself wanted. However derivative it may sound, Gurdjieff's music composed in collaboration with de Hartmann aspired in de-addicting both players and listeners from the noise and the complacency of the habitual and the meaningless. As de Hartmann noted, by composing they had to find "scales within scales" (De Hartmann, 1964: 19) and their music became an exercise in micro-aesthetics, working through the silence between the notes and avoiding the romanticisation of sound which was and still is the dominant way of listening to music.

As was the case with his philosophy, with his music Gurdjieff tried to establish the poetics of intentional composition by eliminating all superfluous embellishments due to virtuosity or self-conscious mastery of the idiom. He simplified artistic praxis by diluting its components and maintaining the bare essentials that make sound audible. His music is like the oriental dromes which underlie all music without becoming dominant or disturbing the melodic lines that function as a kind of framing device for the micro-sonorities of a subconscious communication with music. As in Sufi music, Gurdjieff tried to work on a "single chord" which "holds so many personalities in a single bond of harmony" (Hazrat Inayat Khan, 1996:138).

However, despite his constant preoccupation and involvement with music, Gurdjieff never wrote anything about art. On the contrary, in his allegorical satire mentioned above he devoted a whole chapter in a rather sardonic style to completely demolishing any significance in "such mechanical activities", as he called them; thinking of them as silly pastimes for a bored, idle and affluent bourgeoisie, instead of trying, like a good philosopher, to find the meaning, value and the intention in each work of art. Gurdjieff had no interest whatsoever in theories. He exhib-

ited a spectacular absence of curiosity for all contemporary discussions about art; he also thought of modern art as a fashion and an industrial product made for consumption which had lost touch with the source of human creativity and was thus unable to offer the satisfaction and the empowerment that the creative act used to offer in previous centuries.

Such pessimistic approach to art may give the wrong impression about the contribution of Gurdjieff and his school to the artistic practice of the 20th century. As was the case with the Theosophical movement of Helena Blavatsky before him, Gurdjieff's contribution raises questions about the influence of modern occult movements in the development of modern art. We tend to forget that behind the great cubist, suprematist, futurist and constructivist movements of the early 20th century looms large the benevolent and equally misunderstood figure of Helena Petronva Blavatsky or the serene idealistic and angelic didacticism of Rudolf Steiner (even more so than a conscious movement called modernism). But suffice to say that the dissolution of organised religions, the erosion of the abstract language of theology and the gradual obfuscation of the hermeneutics of artistic phenomena by professional terminology, led many artists in the pursuit of completely new languages of problematisation, conceptual frameworks of reference and assumed metaphors as common myths for artistic experimentation against the background of a firm symbolic repository of self-replicating meanings, as given to them by tradition. In turn this led to the isolation of academic, highly professionalised and self-referential discourses on artistic reflection from all creative attempts to restore the "state of grace" found in older works of art without "the ache of modernity" or "the poison of individuality". Modern Art struggled for the "spiritual" not only after the domination of secular religions but after the gradual dissolution of all grand narratives about humanity's history. Therefore artists looked for the "spiritual" not in the disembodied universe of allegorical representations or metaphysical absolutes but in the actual historical experience of specific individuals or in their own place within the turmoil of events and ideas that shook the foundations of a cosmos perceived as order and interpreted as beauty. After such certainties were shattered, there emerged a new quest for the sanctification of historical experience and the translation of human need for belonging into a language that could construct new mythopoetic potentialities.

Gurdjieff addressed precisely that issue; of how we could re-define the function of sacred art, of the sacred in everyday life and thought ordinary means. As matter of caution, we must try to avoid any kind of essentialism in the definition of what is art, sacred or even ordinary; we take for granted that art is a specific dimension of writing or producing images or constructing meaning. However, we must go beyond this level of core-elements of substantive essences combined and recombined in order to produce art or create a specific emotive affect that we usually interpret as artistic.

Gurdjieff made quiet an interesting, and rare, statement which has to be discussed in this context: "Love not art with your feelings. Real art is based on mathematics. It is a kind of script with an inner and outer meaning. In early times, conscious men—who understood the principles of mathematics—composed music, designed statues and images, painted pictures and constructed buildings—all of which were such that they had a definite effect on the people who came in contact with them: on their feelings and senses." (Nott, 1961:67)

The central dimension in Gurdjieff's art is what he calls "objective" or "conscious" work, any work made consciously, experimentally, with a cognitive intent, a strong communicable message and finally the desire for connecting human activities. The message does not have to be verbal or conceptual; by rejecting "affective", romantic, art, Gurdjieff privileged an artistic work that was mainly constructed with bodily effort and "intentional suffering", any work that does not have as its purpose to instruct or sublimate but on the contrary to become impersonal, objective and "out-there". Gurdjieff saw art as a phenomenon and not as an epiphenomenon, as the *prima materia* of being instead of its actualised effect. So he suggested that art has to be produced the same way as any other "work", like digging, or cooking or exercising, for example.

Undoubtedly the idea sounds rather simplistic and somehow ridiculous to all those who have a Kantian belief in art as "disinterested delight" or the Hegelian perception about the transcendental form or the manifestation of the absolute spirit. But if we examine Gurdjieff's approach closer, it would be clear that for him art was a conscious activity outside the provenance of what has been considered as artistic by dominant ideas and horizons of perceptual recognition. Gurdjieff's

art had an almost yoga-quality in its structuration; it realised its form by bodily contact, intentional engagement, and conscious involvement of the individual and not by renunciation, or sacrifice or some kind of Freudian compensation or other "subconscious" strategy. For him artistic praxis, the poesis in action, brings out the unfolding of dramaturgic re-enactments in space. This means that for him art consists of the daily endeavour to be your actualised self that is that individual that you really are, as opposed to the imagined or delusional self-perception imposed by social roles, false consciousness and forms of normativity.

Since his youth Gurdjieff was fascinated by machines especially by their inflexible repetitiveness and their ability to be fixed, improved or totally discarded—and he thought that such mechanical model of understanding human mind was not simply the dominant conceptual framework employed to talk about mental activity but furthermore it had become the only way of articulating the introspective conscience itself. In Gurdjieff's anthropology art crystallised for each human a situational reality which was so obvious and so conspicuous that passed unnoticed and remained totally un-perceived. The purpose of bodily experience was to make the unreal illusions about hidden meanings vanish so that conscious thinking would bring to the fore the immediate presence of the art-object itself. Samuel Butler insisted that the better an organism 'knows' something, the less conscious it becomes of its knowledge. So we talk about art and we look for art because we don't 'know' where art can be found or how to look for art. So the modern artistic quest for a new art or new aesthetics is essentially, according to Gurdjieff, a delusion, an evasion of the real problem, or better an escape away from the problem of the real.

In some militant Marxist works of the 60s and 70s art was considered an enemy of the people precisely because of its occluding and sublimating character. Marcuse tried to re-affirm the negative quality of culture and found that sublimation itself creates the necessary distance between the subject and its mental formation so that all false consciousness dissolves and vanishes. With a very strange twist of the cunningness of reason Gurdjieff seems to have a similar belief about the meaning and function of art. He argues: "I have already said before that sacrifice is necessary. Without sacrifice nothing can be attained.

But if there is anything in the world that people do not understand it is the idea of sacrifice. They think they have to sacrifice something that they have. For example, I once said that they must sacrifice "faith", "tranquillity', or "health". All these words must be taken in quotation marks. In actual fact, they have to sacrifice something in reality they do not have. They must sacrifice their fantasies. This is difficult for them, very difficult. It is much easier to sacrifice real things." (Ouspensky, 1949:274)

For Gurdjieff "art" or even "art-talk" belong to the phantasies of humanity and essentially hinder a clear and lucid perception of what humans actually experience in life. Such belief is linked to the overall project inaugurated by Gurdjieff in order to create the conditions for the "awakening' of consciousness. In the introduction of his book subtitled *All and Everything* he stated that "all books written according to entirely new principles of logical reasoning and strictly directed towards the solution of the following cardinal problems: FIRST SERIES: To destroy, mercilessly, without any compromises whatsoever, in the mentation and feelings of the reader, the beliefs and views, by centuries rooted in him, about everything existing in the world. SECOND SERIES: To acquaint the reader with the material required for a new creation and to prove the soundness and good quality of it. THIRD SERIES: To assist the arising, in the mentation and in the feelings of the reader, of a veritable, nonfantastic representation not of the illusory world which he now perceives, but of the world existing in reality." (Gurdjieff, 1999:I)

Within such clearly articulated project Gurdjieff composed his three books revealing himself as an oriental myth-maker and raconteur with the first (*Beelzebub's Tales to His Grandson*), a suggestive story-teller and decentred narrator in the second (*Meetings with Remarkable Men*) and a cryptic prophet in the third (*Life is Real only when "I Am"*). Within this project it would be good if we look at the personal artistic presuppositions. In his short book *Gurdjieff: A Very Great Enigma*, J. G. Bennett observes that Gurdjieff's method in everything is "the Sufi Way of Malamat, or the method of Blame", which meant that people following that method "represented themselves to the outside world under a bad light, partly in order to avoid attracting praise and admiration towards themselves, and also partly as a personal protection" (Bennett, 1984:62).

The Sufi way can be also seen in Gurdjieff's poetics especially I what has been called the "diffusive way". Whereas the reader expects the text to be the locus of a revelation, such as we know from romantic texts (being either the revelation of the self or that of a higher truth) the Sufi way of Gurdjieff diffuses the theme into totally irrelevant narratives that are not connected in any "logical", linear and sequential way. A fine example of this tradition can be found in the *Arabian Nights*, in which one story comes out of another story *ad infinitum*, or even the love-story Sufi novels which, having another level of meaning, are not love stories at all. In other treatises by Sufi writers, for example *On the Divine Names* everything else is analysed in the book except problems raised by its title. Finally, we must never forget that at the centre of the Sufi initiation a book could be found which the disciple had to open and read; its pages were completely blank and yet the disciple was asked to explain the meaning of its missing words.

Such methods can be seen in all three books by Gurdjieff who abhorred the concept of art as a soteriological, metaphysical and abstract revelation of truths beyond human actual experience. His objective art focused around concrete practices of self-recognition and collective rituals of bonding whose form and significance he attempted to reframe and reactivate. He rejected the aestheticism bias of art as religion (or a close substitute for it) and practiced art, in music, dance and theatre, as an activity that connects centres of emotions, intellect and the body into a harmonious being-ness. For him art never tells us anything about its creator—and if it says something, then it must be bad. If art reveals something about its creator, then it depicts the unreality of its being, the delusional character of consciousness. According to Gurdjieff, art has no intentions; it only has effects. It acts as a catalyst towards psychic integration by "gelling" together all pieces and fragments of the human self. Through its narrative unity and hypnotic circularity, art decentres and defamiliarises its audience living within the mental state of *avidya* (ignorance); and furthermore it makes that audience conscious of its real position by depicting "meetings" with people who have crossed the boundaries of illusion and present themselves as manifestations of consciousness. And yet art can not be a revelation because nothing can be revealed: everything is already at hand, everything is objective and shapes our world but the "automa-

tised" character of modern education and learning makes each individual oblivious of its very reality. Modern "mechanised" thought dematerialises the actual and translates it into imaginary situations which lack coherence and therefore throw individuals into fragmentation and confusion.

One of Gurdjieff's disciples, the French poet Rene Daumal, wrote a short and unfinished story entitled *Mount Analogue: a novel of Symbolically Authentic Non-Euclidean Adventures in Mountain Climbing* in which people want to climb on a mountain which cannot be seen, found or sensed but exists in a certain "curvature of space" which cannot be located or perceived; nevertheless it is there and at "a certain moment and in a certain place certain persons can enter" (Daumal, 1974:67). This is what has been called the "unknowable Mr Gurdjieff" whose *Meetings with Remarkable Men* expresses an art without aesthetics, an art without style, without plot or structure, a work that defies any kind of cultural imprisonment, gaining liberation from its own writer and his culture.

Here we can locate Gurdjieff's relevance to what happens today in the level of theoretical reflection about art; from Roland Barthes "zero degree of writing", which he himself never achieved, to Derrida's deconstruction project or Michel Foucault's liberation from its own episteme: projects equally incomplete and possibly unrealisable, modernity and post-modernity had to relativise reality in many possible ways. Such relativisation, which was not relativism but creative pluralism, gave the opportunity to artists in particular to revisit the myth-making processes of the past and elucidate both their inconsistencies and their liberating potential. Many artists found in Gurdjieff the inspiration and the independence of vision in order to revisit idioms and practices in an innovative and somehow semantically charged way.

Gurdjieff's ideas privileged the situational self as against the inherited essential self of linear uniformity and cohesion. For Gurdjieff there is no art as such; there is music about love and so, without any ornamentation or modern "bon-ton styles", it should impart just that to its listeners: love; by imparting the emotive strength of specific situations of emotion, creative poesis counteracts "the maleficent effects of mechanicality upon the organism of contemporary man" (*Secret talks with Mr G.* 1978:162). Thus creative praxis situates and places the

individual within specific spatial symmetries and analogies that generate the specificity and the uniqueness of its own conscience.

So by living the specific situation through art, each individual abolishes transference, sublimation or association: the uniqueness of experience becomes a self-referential moment of conscious living that integrates subjectivity and objectifies thinking. Within this process the essential self emerges not as a pre-existing reality but as the outcome of a deep structural transformation. Only then the individual creates consciously and objectively; and as a result the creative act itself and its outcome becomes a catalyst for individuation to its listeners, viewers or readers. As he himself defined it, every conscious creative endeavour becomes an "elucidatory experiment" (Gurdjieff, 1933:69) which unifies all centres of activity, emotion and thought in every human being. Such experiments bring to light the ability to form relations within space under specific acts. Spatial awareness of the self becomes temporal conscience: as humans become more aware of their place and situation, the more acute their realisation becomes about their temporal identity and, as a consequence, historicity. Gurdjieff's attempt to create "objective art" intend to liberate individuals from collective idols and personal myths. With him the great quest of the inner self that dominated Western tradition becomes the persistent exploration of the space within nature or the city and within the artificial landscape of a polymorphous universe established by human creativity. Within such universe, no linearity can be found, no logic can be inferred and no certainty can be deduced. The creative moment is a puncture in space that condenses conscience and liberates mortality from the burden of its own awareness. By being beyond self-consciousness, it cannot be conceptualised and can only be expressed physically by the intentional attempt of the body to reposition itself within the surrounding historical context.

Only within this context Gurdjieff would have raised the issue of the artist's personality as a distinct formation and textualisation of meanings and patterns. It seems that his "objective art" had no place for artistic individuality and the personality of the artist as a special gaze over the experience of life. As Orage indicated in his *Commentary on 'Beelzebub'*: "Minor art is concerned with self-expression. Major art is an effort at conveying certain ideas for the benefit of the beholder;

not necessarily for the advantage of the artist. In speaking of ordinary subjective art, we say that a perfect work of art completely satisfies our sense of harmony—every part of our sensory, emotional and intellectual being. For Gurdjieff's point of view, from the point of view of one aspect of his aim—to wake us out of sleep, the said satisfaction of harmony (which is not real tranquillity but a form of higher sleep) is the last thing to be desired. Aesthetic contemplation is sublime sleep; consciousness is in abeyance" (in Nott, 1961:187).

For Gurdjieff, "aesthetics" represent alienation and suspension of conscious existence. This does not mean in any way that he saw a moral or didactic purpose in artistic praxis. Morality lies beyond the realm of aesthetics, since it can be only relational, and a matter of individual choices referring to the other. We can not reflect or contemplate on any phenomena as manifestations of aesthetic principles of a so-called "beauty"; the immediacy of their presence and their relevance to our lives transfers every experience of form into integrated unities with our conscience. We form existential wholes with ours surrounding forms; we ca not perceive anything aesthetically because we are relying in a utilitarian way on them. Therefore Ludwig Wittgenstein's proposition that "ethics and aesthetics are one and the same" (Wittgenstein, 1961:71) completely misrepresents the different centres of integrating knowledge within individual conscience. For Gurdjieff, contemplation means inactivity and suspension of all creative assimilation of external information. By acting, individuals make themselves positive conduits of moral energy towards the other; action, the "work", has always an object and an objective. The useful can not be beautiful and so the "work" is simply an event that elucidates instead of being an experience that has to be elucidated.

Traditional aesthetics make the artist the ultimate arbiter of meaning; for Gurdjieff's thinking "objective art" co-ordinates the variety of impulses and desires by focusing them on the space of collective identification: the dance floor, or the theatre stage, the music orchestra or the book page. We tend to underestimate the "objecthood" of such situations by privileging states of mind and psychological disposition. However, it is the objectivity itself that produces effects not the psychological predisposition of the artist. Gurdjieff sees the totality of the artistic experience (moment of encounter, state of being, conditions

of thinking etc.) as being more important than the actual content of the artwork or the artefact. The "objecthood" itself transforms the result of subjective work into a natural phenomenon. As Gurdjieff remarked: "No one says of Greek art 'This is strange; what does it mean?'" It satisfies completely. It evokes no inner curiosity" (in Nott, 1961:187). The concept of "inner curiosity" is for him extremely interesting for the understanding of art; as a matter of fact, humans do not understand art: they position themselves in relation to art, as long as the artwork does not subjectivise the mid-world of encounter between the perceiving conscience and the object of our senses as such. For Gurdjieff the meaning of the work of art can be found in the objectivity of its internal composition as a specific arrangement of sensory perceptions that tend to de-mechanise the experience of a different order to reality. "Objective art, he said to Ouspensky, requires at least flashes of objective consciousness; in order to understand these flashes properly and to make proper use of them a great inner unity is necessary and a great control of oneself" (Ouspensky, 1979:298).

For Gurdjieff "art" can have only a cathartic function, in the sense that it *should* liberate the mind from illusions. In that sense "art" can not be day-dreaming, or illusion or some kind of tension-discharge mechanism. As he defined in his overall project, his work had as one of its main purposes "to assist the arising, in the mentation and in the feelings of the reader, of a veritable, nonfantastic representation not of that illusory world which he now perceives, but of the world existing in reality" (Gurdjieff, 1975:1). The project of "nonfantastic representations" was always at the heart of every writing by Gurdjieff; that is of representations that present and embody situations through which a new understanding of the real would emerge. The "real" as a powerful and elusive presence which was de-materialised by psychological needs and rendered invisible by societal necessity is the ultimate poetic legacy of Gurdjieff. The most appropriate interpretation of Gurdjieff's contribution to artistic understanding was given by Rene Zuber: "What did Gurdjieff cure me of? Of imagination. He cured me of imagining my own life instead of living it. Imagining it, moreover, was proof of the deep wish which I had to live it…" (Zuber 1998:353)

REFERENCES

Bennet, 1973.
J. G. Bennet, Gurdjieff, *A Very Great Enigma*, Samuel Weiser, Inc, York Beach, Maine, 1973 (revised edition, 1984).
Daumal, 1974.
Rene Daumal, *Mount Analogue, A Novel of Symbolically Authentic Non-Euclidean Adventures in Mountain Climbing,* translation and introduction by Roger Shattuck, Penguin Books Inc, 1974.
De Hartmann, 1964.
Thomas de Hartmann, *Our Life with Mr. Gurdjieff*, Cooper Square Publishers, Inc, New York, 1964.
Hazrat Inayat Khan, 1996.
Hazrat Inayat Khan, *The Mysticism of Sound and Music*, Shambala, Boston & London, 1996.
Gurdjieff, 1933.
G. I. Gurdjieff, *The Herald of the Coming Good, First Appeal to contemporary Humanity*, Paris, 1933 (reprint by Sure Fire Press, 1988).
Gurdjieff, 1975.
Gurdjieff, *Life is Real Only Then, When "I Am", The Third Series of All and Everything*, E. P. Dutton & Co, New York, 1975.
Gurdjieff, 1999.
G. I. Gurdjieff, *Beelzebub's Tales to his Grandson, All and Everything*, Penguin /Arkana, 1999 (1st ed.: 1950).
Gurdjieff, 1978.
Secret Talks with Mr. G. To A Specially Formed Group as Recollected by his Pupils, IDHHB, Inc, 1978.
Ouspensky, 1949.
P. D. Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous, Fragments of an Unknown Teaching*, A Harvest Book, Harcourt Brace & Company, New York, 1949.
Seymor-Smith, 1998.
Martin Seymor-Smith, *The 100 Most Influential Books Ever Written: The History of Thought from Ancient Times to Today*, Citadel Press, Secaucus, NJ, 1998.
Storr, 1996.
Anthony Storr, *Feet of Clay: The Power and Charisma of Gurus*, FreePress Paperbacks, London, 1996.
Taylor, 1998.
Paul Beekman Taylor, *Shadows of Heaven, Gurdjieff and Toomer*, Samuel Weiser, Inc, York Beach, Maine, 1998.
Travers, 1973.
P. L. Travers, *Georg Ivanovitch Gurdjieff*, Toronto: Traditional Studies Press, 1973.
Wittgenstein, 1961.
Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, trans. by D. F. Pears & B. F. McGuinness, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.

Zuber, 1998.
Rene Zuber, "Notebooks", *in Gurdjieff, Essays and Reflections of the man and his teaching*, Jacob Needleeman and George Baker (Eds), Mary Stein (associate editor), Continuum, New York, 1998.