

CONTEMPLATING ZODIACAL DREAMTIME

Anthony Thorley

The year 1917 marks the centenary of the discovery of the Glastonbury Zodiac by Katharine Maltwood. It is also more than twenty-five years since I started researching into landscape zodiacs in England, so perhaps this is a good time to take stock and contemplate what I feel reasonably confident I can currently say and share about this perennial mystery. I should really say mysteries, because over forty zodiacs have been described in the English countryside alone since 1917, but for the sake of brevity I shall confine myself to the first one ever recognised, the Glastonbury Zodiac, or as Katharine Maltwood always designated it: Glastonbury's Temple of the Stars.

First let me say that Glastonbury's Temple of the Stars is very real, and it is here to stay. Since Maltwood first published her first full map of the Zodiac in 1935, countless people, published and anonymous, have walked its fields, lanes and riverbanks and have trodden the pilgrim's path exploring the mysteries of its giant images. So whatever the nature of its original provenance, conscious usage and ongoing research since 1917 have strengthened the impression and sense of its reality. As the decades have slid by, layer upon layer of additional knowledge and increasingly deeper insights have been grafted onto, or found within, the template of the twelve astrological signs of the Zodiac and the additional thirteenth effigy that is in the form of the Girt Dog of Langport. Today the subject of the Zodiac has an enduring and very profound appeal: witness the wide variety and richly heartfelt accounts that make up the contributions to this book. In these accounts it is evident that none of the writers has been able to avoid the magical touch of the Zodiac itself.

Perhaps the first person ever to experience that magical touch was of course Maltwood herself – and as we read elsewhere in this book – she set down that life-changing personal epiphany of discovering the Leo figure at Somerton, several times in her writings. What is important about this powerful personal event is that sometime in the months following, around the end of the First World War, Maltwood identified all the figures of her Temple of the Stars as zodiacal effigies carrying additional Arthurian significance. Before Maltwood's discovery of the whole frame of the Zodiac and the Guardian Dog on the earth of Somerset, to the best of our knowledge, no-one in written history, had ever reported or clearly hinted at the existence of a complete Zodiac in this part of England. To further strengthen this assertion of Maltwood being the first zodiac 'discoverer', there is no evidence from any of the other English landscape zodiacs (all of which postdate 1917) of any written or oral history of their existence pre-dating the moment of their modern discovery. So in that sense landscape zodiacs are a modern phenomenon.

Now this is usually the point where sceptics and the academics come crashing in.¹ As landscape zodiacs are modern and there is no evidence of prior history, they argue, these zodiacs cannot be ancient, and so the opinion proffered is that fundamentally they must be projections of a fevered or fabulous imagination in the minds of their discoverers. Anyone with imagination can look at the myriad lines on a county map and through psychological projection, conscious or unconscious, through hope, through sheer luck or simply through dogged determination, can find the outline of a recognisable dog (or whatever) in the landscape. Richard Muir, a sometime professor of geography,

¹ See for example, Ivakhiv, A., *Claiming Sacred Ground: Pilgrims and Politics at Glastonbury and Sedona* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001) pp.112-113; Rhatz, P. and L. Watts, *Glastonbury: Myth and Archaeology* (Stroud: Tempus, 2003) p. 63.

writing in this sceptical mode in 1981, tells us he spent a short two hours outlining a delightful teddy-bear on the map between Glastonbury and Wells.² Additionally, he added folklore and a patina of history around King Arthur as Artos the Bear and even a dash of Welsh ‘Winnie the Pooh’.³ This is very amusing to read, yet on the face of it seems a devastatingly effective argument, pointedly ridiculing all those who take landscape zodiacs seriously. Of course, those of us contributing to this book do take landscape zodiacs seriously and we have a whole mass of experience, history and factual evidence which makes Professor Muir’s playful dismissal all the more wanting and superficial. Let us review some of that evidence.

First, consider the matter of psychological projection. Certainly it is possible to discover the effigy of an animal in the myriad lines on a landscape, like seeing castles in the coals of a fire or butterflies in the pattern of a Rorschach test. However, an exercise to find a specific animal form on *any* part of *any* landscape is more difficult, unless you take the street plan of a crowded cityscape or suburb such as, for example, London’s Croydon, where the density of names, shapes and associations allows you to find anything you wish for. In the sparsely-populated Somerset countryside, however, the matter of projecting twelve or thirteen effigies in the appropriate astronomical and astrological order in an approximate circle eleven miles across is more difficult.

I remember some years ago I was working on a presumed landscape zodiac in Wiltshire with a like-minded researcher. We sensed the presence of a circular zodiac some seventeen miles in diameter. For nearly three years we hunted (and no doubt strongly exercised our powers of psychological projection) for animal effigies in the field and on the map, but none could be clearly and convincingly seen. Eventually the zodiac crystallised in a different format: no animal effigies but rather strict 30 degree sections making up the circle, sections full of revealing history which illuminated the zodiacal nature of the whole.

Psychological projection can logically explain the outline of an effigy – even two or three – but thirteen all in the right place on the map is more problematic. Such a pattern can still happen by chance, but the odds of such a process happening in this way are huge. Maltwood sensed this herself and tried to put a figure on it in her *Air View Supplement* of 1937.⁴

In addition to the outline of the effigy or effigies are all the aspects of history, folklore, legends and modern happenings which are found to relate to each zodiacal sign in an extraordinarily rich and apposite way. Finally, there is the fascinating evidence of changing place-names across history which only when recognised in the twentieth century seem to confirm the form or name of the specific effigy. Thus there is so much more relevant and associated material making up each specific sign of the zodiac than simply the shape of the effigy and it is the depth and detail of this additional associated and interconnected material that make landscape zodiacs so fascinating. It is as if all the information which coincidentally and identifiably relates to a zodiacal sign – place-names, history, legends and the personal experiences of the researcher – all connect together, or cohere, into a recognisable whole, not only in space and place, but sometimes through changing history and across time. I have called this process of associative glue Informational Coherence. And I would contend that on its own, psychological projection cannot explain the complexities of Informational Coherence.

² Muir, R., *Riddles in the British Landscape* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1981) pp.127-128.

³ Williamson, T. and L. Bellamy, *Ley Lines in Question* (Kingswood: World’s Work, 1983) pp. 169-170.

⁴ Maltwood reported odds of 479 million to 1! See Maltwood, K. E., *Air View Supplement to a Guide to Glastonbury’s Temple of the Stars* (London: John M. Watkins, 1937) p. 3.

One could examine any of the thirteen images of the Glastonbury Zodiac to make this point and so explore Informational Coherence, but I will briefly restrict my considerations to the richness of just one of them, the thirteenth effigy, the Girt Dog of Langport. Some five miles long, this huge figure in the approximate position of Canis Major (the Great Dog constellation), acts as the traditional guardian dog of the Zodiacal circle and may have first been recognised in the seventeenth century Somerset wassailing carol:

The Girt Dog of Langport he burnt its long tail

And this is the night we go singing wassail.⁵

This wassailing carol dates from some two hundred years before Maltwood described the Dog around 1917, and suggests that the girt (meaning great or tethered) Dog may have been known for centuries. However, one explanation for the venerability of this carol is that it refers not to a dog effigy in the landscape but to the tradition of the Danes (known as the black dogs or wolves) being defeated by Alfred in 878 at nearby Edington. Another story I was told some years ago by a local resident was that in the distant past, the heraldic arms of the ancient town of Langport had been supported by two greyhound dogs. Further research has shown this tale to be unlikely, but it may reflect the ownership of the Manor of Langport by the influential Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond, in the fifteenth century. Great-granddaughter of John of Gaunt, tireless Lancastrian and mother of the first Tudor king, Henry VII, this formidable lady inherited the heraldic tradition of the greyhound both from her great-grandfather and from the designation of the White Greyhound to the title and honour of Richmond. Henry VII replaced the English lion with a white greyhound on the royal coat of arms and so it remained until King James I. So there are strong historical canine associations in the Langport area long before the image of a dog was eventually recognised by Maltwood.

Indeed, looking at the map in the early twentieth century as Maltwood presumably did, it is clear (once you have seen it!) that the shape of the head and the field design is strikingly canine. It might have also been recognisable as a dog in the late eighteenth century after the final drainage of the sea from the low-lying Somerset Levels exposed new boundaries, but because of this late exposure it is unlikely that any dog could actually be discerned on a map before this later period. We have therefore to conclude that the existence of a dog outline in the landscape in the Langport area is not ancient, thousands of years old, but relatively modern.

Zodiac enthusiasts have often pointed out the remarkable synchrony of the Girt dog's place-names. Here are some examples: Earlake, by the ear; Othery, by the other ear; River Tone, the tongue; Head Drove on the head; Little Hook and Leazeway where the lead would be on the neck; Walkeys Lane close by the nose; Heals, by one of the feet; Wagg, a long drove road where the tail would be. In addition, a collection of names over much of the effigy integrating the prefix *cur*- including Curland, Curload and Curry Rivel. These canine-related names account for well over half of all the place-names in the vicinity of the Girt Dog figure. In the light of this, the argument that the canine words are simply derived through biased selection from a presumed mass of available animal names on the map (which would therefore have to include a range of alternative animals producing for example, tigers, giraffes and crocodiles), becomes rather less valid. For whatever reason, the Girt Dog seems simply to carry a strong loading of canine-type place-names.

⁵ Oxford Book of Carols, 'Somerset Wassail Carol, No. 32' *Oxford Book of Carols* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964) p. 64. A variant of the carol is 'The Black Dog of Langport has burnt his long tail.'

We can see that all these names carry indisputable doggy-ness. Some even go back to the Somerset Domesday Book of 1083 and the British names may go back to the Iron Age, but their Informational Coherence as being canine only clearly emerges in the last two hundred years. Many of the names are British or Saxon in origin and whilst broadly sounding the same as their modern counterparts, they have completely different original meanings which are definitely not canine.

Wagg in Saxon is *wag*, meaning wall or boundary (probably a sea wall from the encroaching sea on the Somerset Levels); Earlake is derived from the Old English word *ear* meaning the sea, a sea-lake or lagoon; the prefix *cur-* is derived from the British word *cyrig* or *cryw*, again meaning a boundary. So it is only the evolutionary development of these words into modern parlance that correlates with doggy-ness or canine features. It is as if the land has been gradually evolving or generating canine Informational Coherence over hundreds of years, so as to be eventually recognised as a whole by an eccentric lady millionairess artist in the final years of the First World War.

I have to ask at this point, is this process, this drift into doggy-ness, as it were, merely random, a matter of incredible chance events over the centuries. Or does it have some form of chronological organising coherence of its own, so seeming to anticipate its own eventual discovery? I shall not pursue this conundrum further at this stage, but simply say that following close study of similar phenomena of organisation through time, and finding rich Informational Coherence present on all the other signs of the Glastonbury Zodiac (and other zodiacs I have researched), I am inclined to the view that some kind of organisational process, some overall organising principle, is at work. From this perspective, the Zodiac is not a mosaic of random events but the product of some as yet ill-understood overarching organising principle.

This is a good point at which to pause and simply ask the question, who or what made the Zodiac? Or who or what is this ill-understood organising principle?

Katharine Maltwood appears to have been in no doubt about who it was. Having derived a date of the Zodiac's origin of around 2700 BCE, making it over four thousand years old, she considered that it had been shaped out of the land by the ancient Sumerians from Mesopotamia, fresh with their engineering skills from building great ziggurats in the desert between the Tigris and Euphrates. In the 1920s and 30s, following the wild ideas of L. Austine Waddell,⁶ an author quoted by Maltwood, the deep influence of Theosophy and the absence of good corrective archaeology, the idea that there was direct and significant cultural contact between Britain and the Middle East in ancient times was widely held by intelligent educated people. Gradually, the absence of any archaeological evidence of such a presence (the Sumerians in Somerset!) and the failure of any serious archaeological research or interest in the Zodiac itself, left Maltwood perpetually disappointed in her later years in Canada.

Identifying the original 'engineers' is of course only part of the story of a landscape zodiac, for it is also necessary to explain how all the associated features of history, legend and place-names come to be present on the effigies. In her early years of zodiac research, Mary Caine may have also favoured the 'ancient civilisation' explanation, but in her later years she was more agnostic and recognised that something much more complex seemed to be at work, which was very difficult to pin down. She did believe that some of the old Celtic Saints associated with the Glastonbury legends had fascinating

⁶ See for example, Waddell, L. A., *The British Edda* (Hawthorne, CA: Christian Book Club, 1930); Waddell, L. A., *The Phoenician Origin of Britons, Scots and Anglo-Saxons* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1924).

links with zodiacal features in specific parts of the zodiacal map and wondered if there were some ancient tradition which held the ‘secret’ of the Zodiac over the centuries.⁷

This kind of view of the development and conservation of ideas and indeed changes to the zodiac over the years, as a secret process passed down from secret group to secret group until it is in the hands of the usual suspects, the Knights Templar, the Rosicrucians, the Freemasons and the Occult Revival of the nineteenth century as a kind of zodiacal apostolic succession, still has its enthusiastic adherents today. As a slightly romantic fantasy (which conveniently can explain everything!), however, it is almost totally without any basis in real historical evidence. Since this is a form of secret transmission of the zodiacal principle over the centuries, with no evidence of an open and accessible or overt explanation, I refer to it as Covert Transmission.

It seems to me that Covert Transmission survives as an explanation for the origins and continuance of the Zodiac only because its grounding in secrecy means it can never be proved or disproved. It therefore inevitably survives, supported I feel by a vein of romantic sentimentalism in its protagonists.

As an explanatory principle, Covert Transmission is seemingly further supported where the view is taken that all the prime movers and makers of the individual parts and processes which make up the construction of a zodiacal figure over the centuries ‘must have known’ about the Zodiac! For example, if St Dunstan in the tenth century did indeed master-mind the re-routing of the River Brue to create the head and chest of the Arthur/Hercules figure of Sagittarius at Baltonsborough and create Dunstons Dyke, it would be claimed that he ‘must have known’ about the Zodiac. My view, based on some degree of history, is that he was simply keen to give the village of his birth, Baltonsborough, a watermill of its own to grind corn and this involved diverting the river. I would argue that Dunstan knew nothing of the Zodiac (much of which was still under water in the undrained land of the tenth century) but he may have unwittingly carried out a piece of major engineering which later, by chance, or through some ‘ill-understood organising principle’, came to make an excellent part of the Sagittarius figure. Similarly, that fascinating esotericist, Dr John Goodchild, occasional visitor to Glastonbury and Celtic dreamer in the late years of the nineteenth century may have described and outlined the Beckery Salmon in the area now broadly occupied by the Piscean fishes of Maltwood’s Zodiac, as if he ‘must have known’ about the Zodiac, but there is no evidence that he did from his visionary writings.⁸ More likely in my view, is that either by complete chance or through the influence of some ‘ill-understood organising principle’ he came to identify a fish, calling it the Celtic salmon of perpetual wisdom, in an area of land that was inevitably destined to further express itself through fish symbolism some twenty years later in 1917. The land around Pisces, the sign of the fish, was already drifting into fishy-ness just like the Girt Dog drifted into doggy-ness, and Goodchild’s Beckery Salmon was an interim expression of that process.

At a more mundane level, all the natural and man-made features of the recognised Zodiac would have to either reflect a vast conspiracy of farm-workers, landowners and churchmen, fully cognisant of the Zodiac and its emerging effigy plans over the centuries, working apparently to some master-plan, or that their efforts and constructions of ditches, boundary fences, tracks and churches are simply driven by the practical forces and contemporary considerations around them. There is no Zodiacal conspiracy here, only random activity, or activity possibly influenced by some more fundamental ‘ill-understood organising principle’.

⁷ Caine, M., *Celtic Saints and the Glastonbury Zodiac* (Chieveley: Capall Bann Publishing, 1998).

⁸ Benham, P., *The Avalonians* (Glastonbury: Gothic Image Publications, 2006) pp. 37-41; Goodchild, J. A., *The Light of the West: an Account of the Dannite Settlement in Ireland* (London: Kegan Paul, 1898) pp.108-110.

If there is some form of ‘ill-understood organising principle’, we might expect it to show its effect by proto-Zodiacal phenomena like Goodchild’s Beckery Salmon and the possibility of earlier Zodiacal hints or constructions arising before 1917. Examples of these proto-Zodiacal associations may be found in some of the stories of early Christian saints in the Glastonbury Zodiac area as discussed by Mary Caine, but these slight and unrelated fragments across many centuries do not amount to an ancient and ongoing awareness of a complete zodiacal system.⁹ There is an important difference here between an overall ‘organising principle’ predisposing towards zodiacal realisation in the landscape over many centuries and an enduring and ancient knowledge of a complete zodiac, albeit covert. In my opinion, the former is much more likely than the latter.

I think it is clear that I have little time for the principle of Covert Transmission explaining the full complexity of the landscape zodiac. Although there are many instances of individual episodes of construction which will eventually be part of zodiacal effigies and there may be historical moments of fathers passing on traditions to sons, there is no evidence of an overall coordination of this process or some kind of master-plan. Indeed, even if it existed, such secrecy in historical process is always subject to information leakage. We do not have zodiacal whistle-blowers, disenchanted members of secret zodiacal groups revealing all, similar to the process which has so usefully informed research into Freemasonry, nor do we have obvious evidence of a ‘Chinese Whispers’ effect: garbled zodiacal lore being passed down the line over the centuries leading to distorted contemporary belief. Covert Transmission may be attractive to those who do not examine it too closely, but for those who do, it fails the test of historical credibility.

Rejecting Covert Transmission is difficult and somewhat uncomfortable for some because in the absence of any other logical process of temporal causality, we are apparently left with a vacuum of reasonable explanation for the Glastonbury Zodiac. Ancient peoples did not set it up and historical groups overtly or covertly do not seem to have brought it to fruition in an organised process. We are therefore left with completely random processes, the vagaries of pure chance which simply come together and produce at the endpoint a moment of recognition by the discoverer (Katharine Maltwood in our case) of the whole Zodiac package: effigies, history, legend, place-names and contemporary synchrony. Pure chance *can* be the logical explanation, but the extremely high odds are deeply uncomfortable to contemplate as sensible and so I am inclined to search for some other kind of explanation.

I return to the sense of the landscape of the zodiacal effigy seeming to be subject to some as yet ‘ill-understood organising principle’. What could this be and how might we approach exploring this idea?

One way is to ask the question when was the first moment of recognition of the Zodiac as a whole. This appears to be sometime in late 1917 and the moment, Katharine Maltwood’s. She is unique in that she is (as far as we know) the first person to actually have the perception and experience of the whole Zodiac, certainly as effigy images on the map. Her perception is the culmination of a fascinating and complex aggregative process that appears to have gone on for hundreds, if not thousands of years. Each bit of the final and complete Zodiac has slowly come together with the next bit, as if the metaphoric dots gradually join up over the centuries: each fence line, each field boundary, each drainage dyke, each local legend, each place-name gradually changing, each example of connected iconography, each episode of relevant local history, and possibly most significantly, each instance of startling synchrony in the life of the discoverer. And then a moment comes, Katharine’s moment, when she perceives the whole Zodiac. This could be seen as a real eureka

⁹ Caine, M., *Celtic Saints*, pp.18-23.

moment, a powerful flush of overwhelming emotional insight, or a more slowly burning realisation over a number of days, but in that moment or burning period of time the Zodiac is recognised or more accurately, finally realised. Before that moment the Zodiacal effigy (and I would argue all the associated symbolism and synchrony) does not really exist. Until that moment it is only a potential, and perhaps, like we have already speculated about the Girt Dog, it might not have even physically existed so as to be perceived as such until the drainage of the Somerset Levels brought its full potential to the fore. The moment of perception of the discoverer becomes the moment of the Zodiac first being realised, and is its breakthrough into manifest reality.

Contemplating this ‘first perception scenario’ some years ago, I found myself speculating that if Maltwood’s eureka type moment or period of incandescent personal realisation could be considered as a massive package of information, an intense flash of her consciousness, perhaps it could in some dimension unknown to myself and obscure to rational science, travel in all directions in time and space: forward to affect minds in the future (including my own!), sideways in the present to affect those around her, and most significantly, backwards in time to affect all those aggregative processes which form to make the Glastonbury Zodiac real. Perhaps, even in that moment of perception and realisation, time and space somehow collapsed and all was in the now of the moment. My wild speculation rested on the fact that the only person who first knew about the Zodiac was the discoverer, and therefore maybe in the moment of her perception she sent back in time all the information necessary to create through the centuries all the features which would come to be the final Zodiacal product. And maybe it follows that this is a process which only she can create and only she can then recognise. So in this scenario, Maltwood’s eureka perception, travelling back in time provides the ‘ill-understood organising principle’ which creates the complete Glastonbury Zodiac in all its complexity.

Of course, the idea that a single person’s flash of consciousness could influence processes in times past might be seen as total lunacy. Surely if that kind of retroactive causality was a reality, the world and our past history would and could have been very different?

Then I found (to my amazement) a rich and intriguing scientific literature about ‘backward causation’ in quantum physics and ‘retro-intention’ in radical psychology.¹⁰ There were published and replicated experiments in quantum physics laboratories all over the world where ‘participant observers’ were able to influence the status of subatomic particles in such a way that the only rational explanation was that causality had moved backwards. And not all this was in the micro – at the subatomic level. I read original reports of experiments in psychology and physiology where subjects had been able to influence their own heart and breathing rates several days *before* the experiment had taken place. At the level of objective measures of global consciousness, I read of evidence that the tragedy of 9/11 was slightly anticipated up to three weeks before and intensely anticipated up to twelve hours before the actual event took place.¹¹ I read published symposia where physicists and psychologists were coming together to share data and contemplate the profound implications of these types of findings.¹² The only reason these avenues of research are not more widely known is that an everyday rational world that still proceeds along Newtonian principles of cause and effect which deeply values the

¹⁰ For an introduction to the field see Davies, P., *The Goldilocks Enigma* (London: Penguin, 2007); Wheeler, J. A. and K. Ford, *Geons, Black Holes and Quantum Foam: a Life in Physics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998); McTaggart, L., *The Intention Experiment* (London: Harper Element, 2007).

¹¹ Nelson, R. D. and P. A. Bancel, ‘Anomalous Anticipatory Responses in Networked Random Data’ in Sheehan, D. P., (ed.), *Frontiers of Time: Retrocausation – Experiment and Theory* (New York: American Institute of Physics Conference Proceedings, Vol. 863, 2006) pp. 260-272.

¹² Sheehan, D., P., (ed.) *Frontiers of Time: Retrocausation – Experiment and Theory* (New York: American Institute of Physics Conference Proceedings, Vol. 863, 2006).

cultural security of temporal causality and has not yet absorbed ideas of what is referred to as ‘quantum weirdness’ into popular culture, finds any more radical thinking deeply counterintuitive or downright threatening. I have found that most mainstream scientists avoid these issues and their implications even though they would admit that they are supported by the experimental method. For non-scientists and sensitive thinkers in the humanities, the idea of ‘backward causation’ carries a grandiose Promethean implication and courts a certain degree of moral repugnance. If, as posited, man’s thought or intention can retroactively create the universe (and for some of the quantum mathematicians it can) for most people the whole world order would be thrown into confusion. And believers would say, surely man cannot think like God.

However, this is not the place to pursue these findings and wider issues in more detail. Clearly, influencing the status of subatomic particles over a few microseconds or influencing your own heart rate through retro-intention is not retroactively constructing an entire landscape zodiac, but it does raise logical possibilities which I consider merit more serious consideration and further enquiry.

What I take away from this brief dip into the Quantum world of ‘backward causation’ is that Katharine Maltwood’s consciousness, or her mind, is not actually a passive neutral instrument in the creation or generation of the Glastonbury Zodiac. It may never be possible to prove to everyone’s satisfaction that Katharine created the entire Zodiac package by backward causation, but I am left with a strong sense that neither is she entirely passive in the process. I sense some real quality of active participation and the use of her consciousness in the creation of the Zodiac. Let me explore this idea a little further.

My own research and interviews with landscape zodiac discoverers suggests that the zodiac landscape seems to call its discoverers, to pull them into the discovering process so that they come to have a profound sense of dialogue between land and person. It is as if the land speaks. So often have I been told: ‘I didn’t discover the zodiac [on the land], it discovered me!’ But how can this be?

One feature which commonly occurs in landscape zodiac discoverers is that they are single-minded in their pursuit of the reality and whereabouts of the zodiac. Many carry an enduring and persistent hunch that the zodiac is somewhere out there, or present in a particular locality, without any definite indication of its actual whereabouts. Many have carried out a great deal of research about that part of the countryside, poring over books and maps and walking the land, sometimes for years, before, like Maltwood, they experience some kind of breakthrough. What is very evident in this process is the role of a passionate focussed intent, which may in some zodiac enthusiasts border on obsession. This intense focus, fuelled by active research and background reading, seems almost to be a prerequisite of eventual zodiacal discovery. Without it, the breakthrough is unlikely to come. So we might ask, what is going on here?

To understand more clearly, we have to consider the other half of the perceived dialogue: the land itself. For if somehow ‘the land speaks’, passionate focussed intent from the discoverer-to-be is only half of the picture, the other half being some form of conscious expression originating in the landscape being considered: what we might perceive as a deeply chthonic process. In contemplating this idea of a sentient landscape, we join a rich tradition, for peoples and cultures across history and all over the world have recognised that the land carries its own influence, its own spirit of place. In ancient Greece and Rome this principle was known as *genius loci*, literally translated as ‘spirit of place’, and it was acknowledged as deeply significant. The *genius loci* was not only a protective force for all who lived there, but it came to influence and conserve all the characteristics of the land and all its inhabitants: the look of the local landform, the shape of rocks and stones, the form of human faces

and behaviour, the habits of animals and the types of plants. As the second-century CE neoplatonist, Plotinus, wrote:

The effect of place is not limited to plants and animals; it rules human beings too, determining their appearance, their height and colour, their mentality and their desires, their pursuits and their moral habit.¹³

It was also considered so powerful and pervasive that newcomers to the area or new plants brought into that landscape would gradually change over time until they took up the local characteristics generated by the *genius loci*. Variations of this viewpoint exist in many indigenous and traditional cultures all over the world, and it is only our own post-Enlightenment secular world-view that eschews and rejects such ‘magical’ thinking.

Fortunately this rejection is not universal because at the present time there is a growing body of thoughtful authors and academic writers who are re-examining the value of a concept of spirit of place especially when dealing with some of their own experiences and philosophies which are inadequately served by more conventional thinking.¹⁴ For example, one of the features noted by a number of writers and researchers into spirit of place is that often it does not reveal itself immediately but requires repeated visits to the land or a specific place in the land. It almost seems that the landscape spirit is awaiting real commitment from the person, or only through committed passion and genuine interest from that person does the land eventually open up to dialogue. This has been noticed by dedicated gardeners, who, starting a new garden and developing a design for its pathways and varied plants find that after several months of working in the garden a moment seems to come when the garden itself begins to inform them how it would like to be created. Jeremy Naydler, a philosopher academic and professional gardener, has written of this process in his book ‘Gardening as a Sacred Art’. He writes:

The key to gardening ‘atmospherically’ is to abandon the pretension that one is alone the creative architect and designer of the garden. One endeavours instead to be a collaborator in a greater creative process. Rather than the gardener feeling that he or she is the creator of the garden, exclusively responsible for bringing together all its different elements, it is possible to reach the experience that *the garden is composing itself* through the gardener’s awareness of what needs to be done in the garden. This presupposes an attunement of the gardener’s imagination to the spirit – and spirits – of the place, which seek through the gardener to become ever more fully alive and ‘present’ in the garden. And so the garden, as a work of art, results from a dialogue between the gardener and the spirit (perhaps one could equally say ‘soul’) of the garden that is seeking to attain a fuller expression.¹⁵

Much the same process leading to dialogue with the land or a particular site on the land has been found by archaeologists surveying and studying an ancient place such as a standing stone or long-barrow. It is only after many visits to the site through the changing seasons, at all times of the day in

¹³ Michell, J., *Simulacra* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979) pp.16-17.

¹⁴ For example, Abram, D., *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-than-Human World* (New York: Vintage Books, 1996); Curry, P., *Ecological Ethics: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011); Harding, S., *Animate Earth: Science Intuition and Gaia* (Dartington: Green Books, 2006); Harvey, G., *Animism: Respecting the Living World* (London: Hurst, 2005); Kane, S., *Wisdom of the Mythtellers* (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 1994); Thorley, A. and C. M. Gunn, *Sacred Sites: An Overview. A Report for the Gaia Foundation* (London: The Gaia Foundation, 2008); Trubshaw, B., *Singing up the Country: The Songlines of Avebury and Beyond* (Avebury: Heart of Albion Press, 2011).

¹⁵ Naydler, J., *Gardening as a Sacred Art* (Edinburgh: Floris Books, 2011) p. 95.

all weathers, using all the human senses, that the site begins to reveal its deepest layers of meaning. An example of this experience has recently been published by Tom Graves and Liz Poraj-Wilczynska, respectively dowser and archaeographer, in their study of spirit of place as process at the Melas Knap long-barrow in Gloucestershire.¹⁶ They write:

Direct subjective interaction with ‘spirit of place’ is probably the most challenging activity of archaeography work – not least because the discipline requires the researcher to be rigorously honest about what is sensed and felt, and to record the results exactly, without censoring, no matter how uncomfortable or professionally embarrassing it may first appear ‘irrational’....

They note that

During the earlier stages of the project, the ‘conversation’ with place was essentially one-sided, a personal record of subjective experience...This continued for some months until... there was a kind of breakthrough into what was experienced as something much more akin to a true two-way ‘conversation’, and also a sense of being ‘guided’ by the place itself.

They then go on to acknowledge that that this conversational guidance led them to discover archaeological artefacts at the site which without the dialogue they would have been less likely to find. These experiences of dialogue with landscape and the idea that the land has a sentient quality raise the question of how commonly professionals like archaeologists and geologists working on the land formally acknowledge this ‘irrational’ experience. In his sensitive novel *Thursbitch*, which closely examines the power of place across time and space in the Cheshire countryside, Alan Garner’s two main characters, a medical doctor and Dr Malley, a professional geologist, debate the sense that the land carries consciousness.¹⁷

‘...But I’ve got this niggle that it could be connected why this place knows we’re here.’

‘You are not still serious about that, are you?’

‘Of course I am. Most geologists agree about sentient landscape. If you do enough fieldwork, you can’t avoid it. Some places have to be treated with respect, though that doesn’t get written up in the literature.’

Another thing that doesn’t get written up in the literature is the way in which individual signs on a landscape zodiac unconsciously influence people. This is a controversial area simply because it is easy to be accused of bias or selectivity when recounting these stories, but to the researcher they appear to have a powerful significance. Nicholas Mann, a scholarly historian living and writing in Glastonbury, is sceptical about the idea of ancient origins of the Zodiac but not about its influence in his life. He writes:

Having lived in four different signs of the Zodiac for several years I can only confirm the profoundly imaginative idea of the Glastonbury Zodiac does exist...A very definite sense of place arises from living within a Zodiacal constellation. The quality of each sign begins to permeate actions.... Even people who normally do not give esoteric matters a second thought

¹⁶ Graves, T. and L. Poraj-Wilczynska, “‘Spirit of Place’ as Process: Archaeography, Dowsing and Perceptual Mapping at Belas Knap”, *Time and Mind* (2009) Vol.2, (2), pp.185-186.

¹⁷ Garner, A., *Thursbitch* (London: Harvill Press, 2003) p. 87.

find the quality of the zodiacal giant on which they live permeating their thinking and informing their lives.¹⁸

And what of those people who are living on a Zodiacal sign but have no knowledge of it? Some years ago I visited a newly established pottery by the side of the road in the Scorpio sign of a zodiac on the Scottish Borders. Only myself and about six other people knew where the Scorpio figure lay in the landscape. Inside, I found the potter making the most incredible ceramic dragons with excessively Scorpionic tails. I asked him whether he had always made them. He told me that the idea for such dragons had only come to him since he had recently moved up from South England, and that now they were his best-seller. He had no awareness of the zodiac and I said nothing about the Scorpio figure.

On the same Border Zodiac, a new family moved into a prominent house on the nose of the guardian dog effigy just where the main road entered the dog figure. At that time there were no published maps and no publicity about this Zodiac, but the new owners rapidly set up two huge five-foot-high white-painted stone poodle statues in their front garden, clearly visible from the road, as if to say: 'Now you are entering dog territory'.

I could recount similar stories on virtually all the signs of the Glastonbury Zodiac: a lion carved out of an old stone gatepost by a determined Somerset countryman living on the Lion's rump at Charlton Mackrell, but with no knowledge of the Zodiac; a stone statue of a goat in a garden hidden from public view but sited exactly on the tip of the nose of the Capricorn figure; a rifle-range in the 1920s unwittingly pointing exactly at the bull's eye of the Taurus figure; and many more.

It seems the Zodiac acts like a magnetic field of synchrony, drawing participants into its influence and expressing its own needs and there are many strange examples of this to be found. One of them is a striking phenomenon of synchronicity I have come across from work on another landscape zodiac in Wiltshire. I have called this an 'Error of Certainty' as it seems to embody a strange paradox of coincidence. On this zodiac I found a remarkable alignment of six churches all of which have dedications to saints directly connected with dragons, e.g., St Michael, St George and St Margaret and I had a strong intuition that they constituted what we might call a Dragon Line. However, much later in my work I found that two of the dragon sites were named in error and the actual churches had been given the wrong names in the published literature I had consulted. In one authoritative book, the village Ogbourne Maizey, reported as anciently named Ogbourne St Michael (and therefore a dragon site) turned out never to have been so named. In another source, the restored church of the village of Enford was recorded in the nineteenth century as being newly dedicated to St Margaret (a dragon saint) and so used this name for over a hundred years. More recent research showed that the attribution of St Margaret was due to confusion with another church from an Enford in Berkshire made by a nineteenth century historian and so now the Wiltshire Enford church has been re-named St Margaret and All Saints. However both these objective mistakes have provided historical association with dragon saints so as to apparently complete or confirm the certainty or correctness of the whole line of dragon churches; hence they become 'Errors of Certainty'. It is almost as if some unconscious force in the land was pushing the dragon images into place for the sake of completion of my hypothesis of the certainty of the existence of a Dragon Line. Or is this evidence for the powerful effect of Informational Coherence? This striking example is only one of a number of Errors of Certainty that I have found when doing landscape zodiac research.

¹⁸ Mann, N. R., *The Isle of Avalon: Sacred Mysteries of Arthur and Glastonbury* (London: Green Magic, 2001) p. 97.

Similar rich material is very evident when we consider that many people walking the Zodiacal effigies on pilgrimage or ritual walks often have or experience powerful synchronicities in their personal lives and sometimes very related to the specific sign being walked upon. Some years ago I remember a middle-aged Englishwoman with Maori roots agonising as she walked on a pilgrimage across the Glastonbury Zodiac Sagittarius figure, whether she should leave a secure job and way of life in England and move to New Zealand and marry a Maori man who seemed to fulfil an ancient prophecy of her Maori people. As she sat down on the grass still in despair about her personal dilemma at a very unfrequented part of the Zodiac, along the path came a young couple: the woman was wearing a long white dress as if for a wedding, and the man, a tank top, with his upper body and face covered in authentic Maori tattoos. ‘There, now you have your answer’, the troubled lady was told by her fellow pilgrims. Sagittarius is the sign associated with long journeys and shortly after she set off for a new adventure of married life in New Zealand. Two years later I was on another Glastonbury Zodiac pilgrimage walk, this time listening to a middle-aged Englishman agonising as to whether he should change his whole life and join up with an old girlfriend in New Zealand. ‘What I need,’ he said to me with a twinkle in his eye, ‘is the advice of a Maori elder.’ As we turned the corner on the path I looked up and there was my Maori lady-friend from two years before, back from New Zealand on a short holiday and taking her sister on a walk in the Zodiac. ‘There you have your elder to talk to,’ I said. And after a short exchange, another amorous adventure was set for the Antipodes! In these moments it felt as if time was all in one – and there are many, many Zodiac stories like this, and they are difficult to dismiss.

Of course these types of powerful synchronicities can happen in all settings in life, but they are more likely in the context of land when a mindset like intense aspiration or ambition, or personal focus and concern, is married with a special and significant form of landscape, like a sacred site or a pilgrimage route (such as the Santiago de Compostela route in Spain) or land associated with rich myth and legend. The Glastonbury Zodiac satisfies all these categories and so as we have learned, synchrony and meaningful chance are some of its most central and abiding features.

The idea of mythic landscape leads me to acknowledge the influence of the fine writing of Alan Garner in my quest for meaning in the Glastonbury Zodiac. For over fifty years Garner has been writing about Alderley Edge in Cheshire. This is not a zodiac (as far as I know!) but a square mile of unique fractured upland rising four hundred feet out of the Cheshire plain. It is redolent with myth, legend and living history from at very least the Bronze Age onwards. Most celebrated is the Legend of Alderley Edge, where a local farmer on his way home after failing to sell his horse at market is confronted by a guardian wizard on the Edge, and is taken through magical gates inside the hill to see first hand the sleeping knights of King Arthur with inevitably mixed consequences. Garner has mined the mythic presence, the legends and history of the Edge and his own fine imagination (he is a classical scholar and amateur archaeologist), creating nine novels and a book of autobiographical essays. His possibly final novel, *Boneland*, published in 2012, is in my view a masterpiece: a complex summary and final statement about loose ends in the previous eight novels and the skilful creation of new ones for the reader to equally wonder over and ponder on.¹⁹ Almost all of Garner’s books seek to reconcile the spirit of place of Alderley Edge with its inherent history and its influence on real people populating his novels in different timelines. He seems to me to have been grappling with these great issues of living landscape and time and place all his writing life, not as a stimulus to write fantasy fiction, but in order to use fiction as a fine intellectual tool to set out truthful experience of a situation which Garner sees not as fantasy but certain reality.

¹⁹ Garner, A., *Boneland* (London: Fourth Estate, 2012).

It is apparent in his writing that Garner has searched for a framework or model of explanation for all the space and time complexity which he (rightly in my view) sees as being our true experience of reality. This has led him to mention Quantum Mechanics, not in his autobiographical essays (1997) but in both his last two novels: *Thursbitch* (2003) and *Boneland* (2012).²⁰ In *Thursbitch* we have already met his geologist protagonist, Dr Sally Malley, questioning the sentience of landscape. She also hazards that Quantum Theory might somehow explain how she has the feeling that the landscape ‘knows we’re here’.²¹ In *Boneland*, the main character is Professor Colin Whisterfield, an aging survivor from his role as a twelve-year-old in Garner’s first two children’s books. Now an astro-physicist, struggling with a mental breakdown and living alone in a quarry within Alderley Edge, he explains to his therapist that to be able to ‘look after the Edge’:

I have to be able to see the Edge wherever I am’, said Colin; ‘in order to keep it. If something isn’t looked at it may go or change, or never be.’ [He goes on] ‘It’s more subtle now we have quantum mechanics. You must be aware that matter can be in two places and in two states at the same instant, as both a particle and a wave. Yes?... And if we look at it, if that matter is observed, it can change. The very act of observing makes it change. It’s not quite as simple as I am expressing it; but that’s why I have to guard the Edge: to keep it in balance.’²²

It is, of course, not quite as simple as that, but Garner seems to be acknowledging that in Western thought, Quantum Theory is the only model that we have to begin to approach the complexity he is tackling. He seems to be saying that at present it does not provide any kind of fulsome model but perhaps one day it can. Meanwhile, Garner has examined in detail that other celebrated model of time and space complexity founded in mythic landscape, the Dreamtime of the Australian Aborigine. He has explored this most specifically in his novel *Strandloper* (1996), in which an eighteenth century Cheshire man is transported to Australia, escapes captivity and lives for thirty-two years acculturated with Aborigines before being able to return to England.²³ This novel allows a pagan Cheshire world close to Alderley Edge to be integrated with Australian Dreamtime so that the two are seen to be one and the same.

Garner had speculated as much in an essay from 1983 in *The Voice that Thunders*.²⁴ He writes:

From myth came the totemism of the Aboriginal Australian, and an awareness that amounts to symbiosis with the land. For the Australian, the Ancestor exists at the same time under the earth; in ritual objects; in places such as rocks hills, springs, waterfalls; and as ‘spirit children’ waiting between death and rebirth; and most significantly, as the man in whom he is incarnate. It is a world view close to the one I discovered for myself, as a child of my family on Alderley Edge in Cheshire.

He goes on, clearly very personally identified with this theme:

Through the mediation of myth, the Aboriginal Australian, has not only a religious nobility of thought, but, coincident with the ‘real’ earth, a mystical earth, a mystical geography, a mystical sequence of Time, a mystical history, and, through the individual, a mystical and personal responsibility for the universe.

²⁰ The autobiographical essays are in Garner, A., *The Voice that Thunders* (London: Harvill Press, 1997).

²¹ Garner, A., *Thursbitch*, p. 87.

²² Garner, A., *Boneland*, p. 47.

²³ Garner, A., *Strandloper* (London: Harvill Press, 1996).

²⁴ Garner, A., ‘Achilles in Altjira’ in *The Voice that Thunders*, p. 57.

Careful reading reveals that all the themes outlined in these telling paragraphs are fleshed out and thoroughly explored in the novel *Boneland* in such a way that one has a real sense of entering quite literally into Dreamtime. In my perception Garner is doing his best to clarify reality.

However, Garner is not alone in contemplating mythic landscape as a prime source and influence over the lives of contemporary men and women. The Canadian scholar Sean Kane has presented a powerful synthesis of mythic cosmologies from cultures around the world.²⁵ In questioning the fundamentals of myth, Kane looks beyond the pantheon of Greek gods as myths we learn about at school to fasten upon the root of the word myth meaning simply 'story'. In his survey of cultures expressing myth, he finds that it is the land, the rocks and rivers, the mountains and valleys, the animals and plants, and most of all the mystical creator ancestors who underpin the most fundamental mythic themes and are the telling of the most basic stories. Such a land carries a certain living quality, what Kane refers to as a 'mentality'.

Everything in myth says that this is so – mentality is prior; nature is like a playground of minds. Each entity sends out its energy-voice to mingle with all the others to create infinite layers of songs which humans drift through never hearing each detail consciously. Myths are cross-sections through the interweavings of nature where various points intersect or are amplified. Storytelling interprets these mental images of nature. And the normal state of these mentalities is Dream.²⁶

From his survey of myth in a range of cultures, Kane concludes: 'The proper subject of myth is the ideas and emotions of the earth'.²⁷ Drawing on the example of the Australian Dreamtime, he sees 'the Australian mythtellers joined their songs with vast, intangible vibrating fields of energy in which they could narrate the form – or one of the changing forms – of a particular supernatural being who could appear variously as human, plant, star, mountain or animal'.²⁸

Rather than trying to understand the mythic Dream in terms of 'conscious' or 'unconscious', Kane invites us to 'discard the terms altogether, and wonder instead at a universe that is everywhere and at all times mental. Such a universe enjoys through each of its beings a myriad of constantly changing modes of awareness – in each, a shifting of mental energy across a boundary, from Dream to a physical objectification in that dreaming, then back again to Dream'. He emphasises that 'These are all mental states – aspects of the shifting of thought between inward Dream and outward objectification'.²⁹

Kane finds again and again that

Wisdom about nature, that wisdom heard and told in animated pattern, that pattern rendered in such a way as to preserve a place whole and sacred, safe from human meddling; these are the concepts with which to begin an exploration of myth. Of these, the notion of the sanctity of place is vital. It anchors the other concepts.

The myth teaches us that these sacred places are to be respected for their own sake, not for what human beings can make of them. Myth, in its most ecologically discreet form, among

²⁵ Kane, S., *Wisdom of the Mythtellers* (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 1994).

²⁶ Kane, S., *Wisdom*, p. 131.

²⁷ Kane, S., *Wisdom*, p. 34.

²⁸ Kane, S., *Wisdom*, p. 34.

²⁹ Kane, S., *Wisdom*, p. 137.

people who live by hunting and fishing and gathering, *seems to be the song of the place to itself, which humans overhear*. [my italics]³⁰

The emphasis of myth as story and a product of a greater dreaming song of the earth is a theme taken up by the ecologist and philosopher David Abram, another contemporary North American writer. He writes:

For we are born of this animate earth, and our sensitive flesh is simply part of the dreaming body of the world. However much we may obscure this ancestral affinity, we cannot erase it, and the persistence of the old stories is the continuance of a way of speaking that blesses the sentience of things, binding our thoughts back into the depths of an imagination much vaster than our own.³¹

Abram clarifies this process:

To live in a storied world is to know that intelligence is not an exclusively human faculty located somewhere inside our skulls, but is rather a power of the animate earth itself, in which we humans, along with the hawks and the thrumming frogs, all participate. It is to know, further, that each land, each watershed, each community of plants and animals and soils, has its particular *style* of intelligence, its unique mind or imagination evident in the particular patterns that play out there, in the living stories that unfold in that valley, and that are told and retold by people of that place. Each ecology has its own psyche, and the local people bind their imaginations to the psyche of the place by letting the land dream its tales through them.³²

If we are to follow Abram's proposal that 'each ecology has its own psyche', we can easily translate this idea to the individual signs of the effigies of a landscape zodiac. Each sign of the landscape zodiac would carry its own spirit of place, its own psyche, or in Kane's words, its own 'mentality' or Dreamtime. Then in that place of the Dreamtime, that complex mentality or interweaving between Dream and objectification, local people 'bind their imaginations to the psyche of the place' by letting the land dream its tales through them. The people tell the stories, that is express the physical objectification of the zodiacal signs, and the history and the legends, but their actions are inseparable from the 'depths of an imagination much vaster than our own' as Abram puts it. It is in this emerging concept of Dreamtime that I believe I have found the best candidate to satisfy my ideas of Informational Coherence, Errors of Certainty and more significantly, the source of my 'ill-understood organising principle'.³³

In such a mythic landscape, causality is obscure and apparently unstable, synchrony abounds in a sea of interconnectedness, the sensation of conventional time is clouded and confused and the unity of human and other within the Dream can only be perceived by our limited sensorium as a form of dialogue with the land: we are singing our individual song as the land sings its song through us. We are living in a song, literally, in enchantment. This is the creative arena of the landscape zodiac.

³⁰ Kane, S., *Wisdom*, p. 50.

³¹ Abram, D., 'Storytelling and Wonder: on the rejuvenation of oral culture' at (http://www.wildethics.org/essays/storytelling_and_wonder.html) [accessed 12.12.2012].

³² Abram, D., 'Storytelling', p. 4.

³³ The best ideas are rarely new ones and I acknowledge here the poem 'On Terrestrial Zodiacs' by the spiritual traveller and poet, Jill Smith, who made the connection between Dreamtime and zodiacs in 1984. See Smith, J., *The Gypsy Switch* (Llanelli: P. V. Cozens Ltd., 1985) p. 20.

So we can consider the Glastonbury Zodiac as a 'Cloud of Knowing' where all aspects of its existence, primal source and contemporary realisation through Maltwood and subsequent discovery, are all present at once in a tissue of synchrony. It is not fixed like a layered archaeological site to be analysed through excavation, but is mobile, organic and ever-changing, always surprising us with its novelty and new developments, dancing between past, present and future all in the one. We can enter this Cloud, this ultimate Dreamscape, only through persistence and commitment. Casual or diffident contact will not gain us entry and the resultant experience will be sparse and superficial. Deeper entry through passionate commitment and focussed intent whether through the written word, artistic expression or simply repeatedly walking the effigies on the land will lead to remarkable experience where the Zodiacal Dreamtime will be found to respond to our desire and cleave to our attention. The personal reward and level of discovery through this process will be profound but we may find as we come out of the Dream experience that we are seriously limited by conventional temporal causality as how to best express the subtleties of our discovery. This causal limitation, a most human kind of handicap and perhaps an ultimate blessing in disguise preventing us from literally losing our mind, continually frustrates our attempts at a perfectly clear explanation. We can find the experience of reality in the Dreamtime to be just about accessible but perpetually elusive if we attempt to share it with others.

So the Zodiac carries its own psyche, and we can only catch tantalising glimpses of its order and rationale. The distinction between our own psyche and personality and the scope for our own development as a person become inextricably interwoven with the characteristics and energies of the zodiacal signs themselves. Just like the totemic animal of the Australian Aborigine in his Dreamtime, we can identify with the totem of our Sun Sign, Pisces in my case, and find our sign speaking to us and imparting deep knowledge and wisdom. We can then enter the mystery of the other eleven signs in the dance of the zodiacal year and find that the Zodiac can be the most profound teacher of wisdom and common sense that we might ever encounter.³⁴

In conclusion, to understand the mystery of the landscape zodiac phenomenon and its effect on ourselves and countless others over the centuries who have been drawn into its timeless realm, I contend that we are seriously confronted with contemplating the idea of Zodiacal Dreamtime and perhaps clarifying and refining its riches in the light of our own contemporary culture and personal experience. And although the promise of Quantum Theory may one day satisfy our need for a clearer picture, perhaps for the moment the complexities of Zodiacal Dreamtime with its paradoxical dance and the caprice of its expression in our experience ultimately defy any form of absolute clarity of understanding and simply allow us to live within its song and celebrate its mystery.

Chapter in *Signs and Secrets of the Glastonbury Zodiac: An Anthology from the Maltwood Moot*, Edited by Yuri Leitch, (Glastonbury: Avalon Aeon Publications, 2013), pp.308-327.

January 2013

³⁴ See for example the opportunity of The Alchemical Journey at <http://www.thealchemicaljourney.co.uk.html> .

