

## *The fourth source*

### *A justification*

How is the fourth source opened? It is opened by walking a certain path – the path of loving insight or understanding love. Even in daily life friends only open up to one when one's insight is 'lived'. However, when one has to get to know someone through his writings, it becomes seriously difficult. An insight must be developed that is no longer intellectual but also not only receptive.

One only finds this fourth source of insight 'beyond' pure thinking, 'beyond Saturn'; it must live beyond the stars.<sup>1</sup> That should not be just a poetical expression, but must be a new path of knowledge. Pure thinking is a thinking that only thinks thoughts that do not originate from the senses. Daily thinking is only sometimes pure, because it almost only has sensual (sensorial) content. Aristotle's statement is well-known: *Nothing is in the intellect that was not first in the senses*. In our time we must add to this: *except for the intellect itself*. Thus one finds true pure thinking in the thinking of the intellect itself.

This fourth source of knowledge can be found through the indications given for nurturing spiritual insight that are presented by ... Rudolf Steiner.

*He* has given us the ways to prepare ourselves to get to know an individuality from the inside in his or her full livingness. When we have applied these methods, we develop in ourselves the ability to gain lively insight into the human being. Should we not also apply these methods to

---

<sup>1</sup> See Friedrich Schiller: *Ode to Joy*

understand the individuality of the teacher himself?

The fourth source thus lies beyond pure thinking.

In pure thinking one has already had to leave behind all one's opinions and judgments, which are in the intellect. One has developed a thinking that has exerted itself so much in order to live only in thinking itself, that it has released itself from egoism, from subjective sympathy and antipathy. It is a thinking which thus can think along with *every* content, totally objectively, without opinion or judgment – because these cannot survive in pure thinking. One only *experiences* the content, and it is a pure experiencing, free of judgment. *Patience* in experiencing finally provides us with judgment: we do not form it, but it happens to us.

I myself started reading the books and lectures of Rudolf Steiner in 1983. In the year 1986 I began with systematic meditation and a meditative contemplation of *The Philosophy of Freedom*. In 1987 I had my first experience of pure thinking, together with pure Self-experience. Since then, I have been studying and meditating on the work of Rudolf Steiner with a capacity which 'lies beyond the stars'<sup>2</sup>. In 1994 I described this capacity in a book: 'Seek the Light that rises in the West'<sup>3</sup> and in 2005 in 'The Holy Grail'.<sup>4</sup>

With this ability which I have had now for over 20 years, I turn to the teacher, who still lives, who one can find, who one can recognize.

This book originates from no fanatical worship, but from

---

<sup>2</sup> See the lecture of 6 Feb. 1923 in Rudolf Steiner, *Anthroposophical Community Building*, GA 257

<sup>3</sup> Mieke Mosmuller, *Seek the Light that Rises in the West*, Occident 1994

<sup>4</sup> Mieke Mosmuller, *De heilige Graal* (The Holy Grail), Occident 2005

a pure notion, a pure understanding, which unfolds in relationship with the sense of the I.



## *Reading the works of Rudolf Steiner*

Reading is a wonderful human skill. We can form words out of a combination of signs, and from a combination of words we can form sentences, which we understand. We add these comprehended contents to our already existing concepts, or else we find a contradiction or no connection at all.

When we can insert the new content in our thinking organism, we say, relieved: yes, that is clear!

If we find no connection, we say: I do not understand this. A healthy soul will search further until the connection is found and it can say to itself: now I have understood it! However, the 'unhealthy mind' will, when it does not understand, very soon declare: that is not right!

Most difficult is the inner experience of a contradiction. Hereby a complicated process gets going, and the reader must test himself. Is it subjective antipathy? Has something been said that is unpleasant? Has what was said offended against any pre-existing opinions or judgments? Or is it an objective antipathy? What should one do with the contradiction?

The unhealthy mind does not even test itself at all; it is impulsive and does not look at itself in its own soul. It quickly 'exclaims': I have a different opinion! I do not agree with that! That is not right at all! etc.

Being able to take up or having to reject the contents of spiritual science in the beginning strongly depends on the character that the soul has always had. Therefore, one

cannot convince people who strongly resist spiritual science. One can not know how it works in the depth of the soul. Anthroposophy may be rejected as uncongenial by superficial thinking and feeling habits, while in the depths something totally different is going on. A free state of mind in relation to spiritual science must be absolutely respected. One can truly only strive oneself to read with as little prejudice as possible, and at most explain to other people what is actually written there. Whether this is accepted or rejected is a question of the other's freedom.

Let us assume that a human being willingly relates to spiritual science, that he can take in its contents without irritation, that he can understand on the whole what is offered. How should such a person read?

Actually, all casual, swift reading should be avoided. It is better to read only *one* line, and take it in the right way than to read a whole chapter or a whole lecture quickly. Not the desire to know must encourage the reader, but the desire to increase one's insight into the content as well as one's power and capacities. In fact, the whole work of Rudolf Steiner is intended to become something living, that grasps life, as the leaves sprout on the branches in spring. However, it can also remain wood, from which nothing new can grow. It then stiffens even more, becomes only material for quotation and in this is given over to dogmatism. Not a word of spiritual science should ever become dogma, because that is as unknown to it as death is to life. However, seeds of death exist everywhere in spiritual science where only the intellect is operative. Too much life can also be present when the intellect withdraws altogether in favour of feeling. The intellect *itself* must become alive, and then the whole of spiritual science which has been taken in will become alive and be able to keep growing, blossom,