

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
1888-1889

TABLE OF CONTENTS

July 1888

Foreword
Chronological Survey

Forlorn Hope
To Theosophists and Readers of "Lucifer"
Star-Angel Worship in the Roman Catholic Church
"L'Isis"
Christian Science
What is God?
Miscellaneous Notes
Psychologie de l'Égypte ancienne
Psychology of Ancient Egypt

August 1888

The Theosophical Society: Its Mission and Its Future
Our Christian XIXth Century Ethics
A Lesson
The "Chaste Tree"
Miscellaneous Notes

September 1888

Our Third Volume
Christian or Mental Science
From the Note Book of an Unpopular Philosopher
Miscellaneous Notes
Théosophie et Bouddhisme
Theosophy and Buddhism

October 1888

Lodges of Magic
Editorial Notice
Footnotes to "A Glance at Theosophy from Outside"
An Explanation Important to All Theosophists
The National Epic of Finland—Review

The Devil—Who is He?
Pertinent Queries
The Esoteric Section of The Theosophical Society
Miscellaneous Notes
[“The Secret Doctrine”—Compiler’s Note]

November 1888

Is Theosophy a Religion?
Footnotes to “A Buddhist Prince’s View of the Universe and the Nature of Man”
“Esoteric Buddhism” and “The Secret Doctrine”
Miscellaneous Notes
Casting Off

December 1888

[The Esoteric Section and William Quan Judge]
Is Denunciation a Duty?
The Dirge for the Dead in Life
The Dirge for the Dead (February, 1889)
Dialogue Between the Two Editors
Children Allowed to Train Themselves for Murder
The Devil, Who is He?
Literary Jottings
Miscellaneous Notes
The Secret Doctrine
Dreams

June, 1893, and April, 1894

Occult Vibrations
Conversations on Occultism with H. P. B.

January, 1889

The Year is Dead, Long Live the Year!
“The Empty Vessel Makes the Greatest Sound”
Lodges of Magic
Are All Russian Ladies Russian Agents?
Miscellaneous Notes

January, February, March, 1889

Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge of The Theosophical Society
APPENDIX:

Note on the Transliteration of Sanskrit

ILLUSTRATIONS:

Helena Petrovna Blavatsky
William Quan Judge
H.P. Blavatsky and Col. H.S. Olcott in London
Annie Besant
Colonel Henry Steel Olcott
Countess Constance Wachtmeister
William Kingsland

Facsimiles

A page from the MS of the *THE SECRET DOCTRINE*
Document appointing W.Q. Judge sole Representative
of the esoteric section in America

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**

FOREWORD TO VOLUME TEN

The material in the present Volume is in direct chronological sequence to the writings in Volume IX, and includes, besides a number of H.P.B.'s forceful editorials from *Lucifer*, the entire text of the *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge*, with its wealth of profound teachings.

The continued interest and helpful assistance of our collaborators and friends are gratefully acknowledged. The list of their names, as given in the Foreword to Volume VII, applies to the present Volume as well.

BORIS DE ZIRKOFF,
Compiler.

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, U.S.A.
March 21, 1960.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

July, 1888

FORLORN HOPE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. II, July, 1888, pp. 341-346]

Should a wise man utter vain knowledge, and fill his
belly with the east wind?

Eliphaz, in *Job*, xv, 2.

In days of far, far away Antiquity, namely, in 1886, a suggestive Theosophical Fable went the round of our circles, and found room in the March number of *The Theosophist* for that year.* Its subject was a Society named “Harmony,” born to investigate the music of the Spheres, and established in the far East. It had, ran the fable, a queer “instrument,” to attune which a great genius descended occasionally from the upper realms and made the instrument repeat the music of the spheres. It possessed also a president, who, in the great honesty and innocence of his heart, had been imprudent enough to boast of his possession, and had made the instrument sing to whomsoever came within the range of his vision: so much so, that finally the instrument was made quite cheap.

Then the *fabula* showed how the learned men of the West—who believed in neither genius, spheres nor the instrument—put their wise heads together, and finding that even if the instrument was no fiction, yet, as it was not built on any rules of the modern science of acoustics *known to them*, it had, therefore, no right to existence. Forthwith they concluded not to permit the music of the spheres to be played, least of all, believed in. So, goes on the fable, they “selected a smart boy, gave him a penny and asked him to go across the big water” and report upon what he would see in the “Harmonial Society.”

* [Vol. VII, No. 78, pp. 390-91, “A Theosophical Fable,” recently identified as being by Dr. Franz Hartmann. See Vol. VII, p. 53, in the present Series.—*Compiler*.]

The smart boy went and looked at the instrument, but when he came there it gave forth only discordant sounds, because his own soul was not in harmony with it. . . . The president then took out his book of incantations and tried all kinds of conjurations to force the Genius of the upper spheres to come and play a tune for the smart boy, but the genius would not come.

So the smart boy took his travelling bag and went home again and told his fathers in learning, that he did not see the great Genius and did not hear the music of the spheres, and the learned men stuck their heads together a second time. . . and the result was that they said the smart boy was wise and that the president of the Harmonial Society was—mistaken.

Or, in less polite, but still more untruthful words, the president, his society, and his

“instrument” especially, were all either fools, frauds or both. The charge of “humbug and imposture” against the “Harmonial” Society was thus proven, and became *un fait accompli*. Henceforth that idea was photographed in the shallow drums that public opinion mistakes for the heads of its leaders, and it became indelible.

From that time forward adjectives such as “fraud deception and imbecility” became attached to the “Harmonial” Society and followed it everywhere, like a tail follows its comet. The theory struck deep roots in the hearts and minds of many non-theosophists and became at last part of the very being of the British public. This proverbially “fair minded” body had heard one side of the question and—felt satisfied. Its pioneer-gossips, full of Christian charity and 5 o’clock tea, had ransacked the contents of the “smart boy’s” travelling bag. Having greedily fed themselves upon the adulterated food which was like heavenly manna for their insatiate stomachs, they differentiated, and then shared it with all who were hungry and thirsty for such celestial nourishment. Thus, Grundy’s cackle-twaddle was kept up in loud and authoritative tones for some three years, until gradually it succeeded in making “Theosophy” a byword synonymous with every kind of iniquity. Theosophy was set up as a target for daily slander, verbal and printed; it was proclaimed a fallen idol whose feet of clay had at last given way, and it was hourly advertised dead as a

FORLORN HOPE

3

door nail and buried for ever. But, lo and behold! a dark shadow has suddenly fallen across the face of this sweet and secure hope. . . .

It is quite touching to read certain jeremiads in the daily papers, to learn the pathetic regrets expressed with regard to the suspected instability of public opinion. The attitude of certain social circles is visibly changing, and something will have to be done once more to bring Theosophy into disrepute, if we would not see it resurrect like Lazarus out of his tomb. For, as time goes on, more than one enemy begins to express grave doubts. Some suspect that the theosophical Jezebel may, after all, have been merely a victim: Job, visited by permission of KARMA—or if so preferred, by that of the enthroned Almighty, granting to his Son-Satan full liberty to test the endurance of his “uprighteous servant” of the land of Ug (*Job*, ii, 1-8). Others perceived that though Satan-Grundy, using the venomous tongues of the multitudes, had covered “Job” with sore boils, yet the patient had never collapsed. Theosophy was neither knocked off its feet by the mighty wave of calumny and defamation, nor did it show any signs of agony. It was as firm on its legs as ever. *Mirabile dictu* and acme of impudence!—cried its enemies. Why here it is again, and it begins to raise its voice louder than ever! What does the creature say? Listen. . . .

“Aye, right honourable, as well as right dishonourable opponents and enemies. Your Mrs. Grundy has filled me with *wrinkles* as Satan filled Job, but these are witness only against herself. ‘He teareth me in his wrath, who hateth me’—but I hate no one and only pity my blind slanderers. ‘He gnasheth upon me with his teeth’—and I only smile back. ‘Mine enemy sharpeneth his eyes upon me,’ and I offer to lend him mine to allow him to see clearer. ‘They have gaped upon me with their mouth wide open’; and, like Jonas swallowed by the whale, I have found no uncomfortable quarters for philosophical

meditation inside my enemy, and have come out of his voracious stomach as sound as ever! What will you do next? Will you smite me ‘upon the

cheek reproachfully’? I shall not turn to you the other, lest you should hurt your hand and make it smart and burn still worse: but I shall tell you a story, and show you a panoramic view, to amuse you. . . .”

See how the enemies of the Theosophical Society and its leaders look disconcerted! Hear how in the bitterness of their heart, for sweet hopes frustrated, they writhe and have not even the decency to conceal their bad humour at what they foolishly regard as the *triumph of theosophy*. Truly has the east wind filled their—brains, and vain knowledge has disagreed most decidedly with the learned men of the West! For what do *they* do? Listen once more.

Fearing lest their appetite for devouring and assimilating the carrion food snatched from the beaks of the Bombay ravens by the “smart boy” should slacken, the wise men of learning have devised, it appears, a fresh little plan to strangle Theosophy. If one can believe the *Birmingham Post* (the very sincere *daily* which lets out the secret), the big-wigs of the very Christian “Victoria Institute” have not forgotten the fable of the “monkey and the cat.” The “monkeys” of science, had selected for some time past the paws of their ablest cat to draw the chestnuts for them out of the theosophical fires, and had hoped thereby to extinguish the hated light for ever. Read and judge for yourself the bit of interesting information contained in the above mentioned daily for June 15th of the present year of grace. Says the loquacious writer:

Even Science herself, generally so steadfast in her progress, so logical in her conclusions, so firm in her pursuit of a sure result, has been made to tremble on her lofty perch by the shock given her by the discourse of Sir Monier-Williams at the Victoria Institute, last Monday. Sir Monier-Williams is Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford, and regarded as the first Sanskrit scholar in the world. The announcement of the choice made by the learned professor of the subject of his discourse as being that of “Mystical Buddhism in Connection with the Yoga Philosophy of the Hindoos,” had created an immense degree of interest amongst the learned portion of the society of London. It was firmly believed that Sir Monier-Williams had chosen the subject for the express purpose of demolishing the errors and superstitions of a creed which has crept

in upon us by degrees from the intrigues of sundry impostors who have worked upon the love of the marvellous so inherent to human * nature to establish themselves as prophets of a new doctrine. This was the opinion of all learned men in general, and they had been watching with great eagerness for a refutation from the pen of Sir Monier-Williams of all the “sleight-of-hand principles,” as the experiments of the Theosophists were called. This refutation in writing had never come, and therefore it was with redoubled interest that the speech which would demolish the audacious pretensions of the conjuring philosophers was waited for. What, then, was the surprise of the assembly of wise men when Sir Monier-Williams, instead of denying, almost confirmed the truth of the assertions made by the Theosophists, and actually admitted that, although the

science of modern Theosophy was imperfect, yet there are grounds for belief which, instead of being neglected as they have been by students of philosophy, ought to be examined with the greatest care.

A wise man, for once in his generation, this newly-knighted lecturer! The greater the pity that this “first Sanskrit scholar in the world” (Professors Max Müller, Whitney, Weber and the *tutti quanti*, hide your diminished heads!) knows so little of Buddhism as to make the most ludicrous mistakes. Perchance, there was a *raison d’être* for making them. Both his lectures, at any rate those about which some fuss has been made, and one of which was noticed in the 8th number of LUCIFER—both these lectures were delivered before very Christian audiences at Edinburgh and before the “Philosophical Society of Great Britain,” whose members *have to be Christians*. Nevertheless, one fails to see why a little more correct information about the difference between *Raja-Yoga* and *Hatha-Yoga* should not have been offered to that audience? Or why again it should be told that, in the days of Gautama Buddha, Buddhism “set its face against all solitary asceticism,” and “had no occult, no esoteric system of doctrine which it withheld from ordinary men” —both of which statements are historically untrue. Worse still. For, having just mentioned at the opening of his lecture, that Gautama had been “reborn as Buddha,

* The writer in his grief seems to have forgotten his commas. The subject, also, to produce the desired effect should have been handled in more grammatical English. [H.P.B.]

the enlightened,” that he had reached *Parinibbâna* or the great, *highest Nirvana*; that he had passed through the highest states of *Samadhi*, the practice of which confers the “six transcendent faculties,” *i.e.*, clairvoyance, or “the power of seeing all that happens in every part of the world,” “knowledge of the thoughts of others, recollection of former existences. . . . and finally the supernatural powers called *Iddhi*,” the professor coolly asserted that it was never stated “that Gautama ever attained to the highest. . . . Yoga of Indian philosophy—union with the Supreme Spirit”! Such a statement may flatter the preconceptions of a few bigots among a Christian audience, but we question whether it is not one entirely unworthy of a true scholar, whose first duty is to be impartial in his statements, lest he should mislead his hearers.

While Theosophists should feel deeply thankful to Sir Monier-Williams for the excellent advertisement their society and philosophy have received at his hands, the Editors of *Lucifer* would fail in their duty were they to leave unnoticed several self-contradictions made in this lecture by “the greatest Sanskrit scholar in the world.” What kind of definite idea can an audience have on Buddhism when it hears the two following statements, which directly contradict each other:—

“He [Buddha] was ever careful to lay down a precept that the acquisition of transcendent human faculties was restricted to the perfected Saints, called Arhats.” This, after just stating that Buddha had never himself “attained to the highest yoga,” that he was no Spiritualist, no Spiritist,* but “a downright *Agnostic*”—he, the “Buddha,” or the

Enlightened!!!

The outcome of this extraordinary lecture is that Gautama Buddha had never reached even the powers of a simple modern Yogi. For such transcendent powers are allowed by the lecturer even in our present day to some Hindus. We quote again from the *Birmingham Post*:

* Let us fondly hope so; and that Allan Kardec will not be placed by Sir Monier-Williams one day on a higher level than Buddha.

FORLORN HOPE

7

The word Yoga, according to Sir Monier-Williams, literally means union, and the proper aim of every man who practises Yoga is the mystic union of his own spirit with the one eternal soul or spirit of the universe, and the acquisition of divine knowledge by that means. This was the higher Yoga. But the lower practice seeks to abstract the soul from the body and the mind, and isolate it in its own essence. So may be acquired the inner ear, or clairaudience, by which sounds and voices may be heard, however distant; the inner eye, or clairvoyance, the power of seeing all that happens in every part of the world, and a knowledge of the thoughts of others. These acquirements have become developed into demonology * and various spiritual phenomena connected with that esoteric Buddhism which every schoolgirl is studying in secret nowadays. Long and persevering study of the great science will lead to the practice of twisting the limbs, and of suppressing the breath, which latter faculty leads to the prolongation of existence under water or buried beneath the earth. Many Hindoo ascetics have submitted to interment under this influence. Colonel Meadows Taylor once assisted at the burial of a man who professed to be able to remain nine days beneath the earth without drawing breath during that time. Colonel Taylor, determined that no deception should be used, was present during the ceremony of interment, and, after seeing the man duly covered with earth, sowed seed upon the grave, which, being duly watered, sprang up with luxuriance long before the expiration of the nine days' † probation. More than this, the grave was watched day and night by two English sentinels, so that there really appears no reason to suppose that any deception could possibly be practised, the more so that Colonel Taylor himself had chosen the place of burial, which circumstance precludes all idea of subterranean passages, which had been suggested in other cases of the like nature. At the end of the nine days the grave was opened with all due solemnity. The buried man was found in the same position in which he had laid down, and when he opened his eyes his

* This is *entirely false*. Any one who would like to acquire the proofs that this statement is a gratuitous calumny has only to read theosophical literature, and even the last numbers of *Lucifer*. The methods described belong to *Hatha Yoga*, and are very injurious and dangerous; still, even this is no *demonology*, but simply a lower form of Yoga. The Theosophical Society has fought from the beginning against these methods. Its teachers went dead against it, and even against some forms of mediumship, such as sitting for materialisation —the necromancy of the Bengal Tantrikas!

† We have always believed the period to have been 40 days, and this is borne out by the planting of the seed. Surely for seed to sprout and grow “with luxuriance” in *nine* days would be almost as great a “nine days’ wonder” as the interment of the Yogi?

first enquiry was for his bowl of rice, adding that he felt hungry, and that he would be glad to eat. Professor Monier-Williams did not quote this example—he dwelt more lengthily upon the absorption of the mental faculties rather than on that of the physical powers. He went on to explain how internal self-concentration may lead to the acquisition of supernatural gifts, and enable a man to become invisible at will, to appear at any spot however apparently distant, to gain absolute power over himself and others, to bring the elements into subjection, and to suppress all desires. A Yogi, when thus befitted, can float in the air, fly through space, visit the planets and stars, create storms and earthquakes, understand the language of animals, ascertain what occurs in every part of the earth, and even enter into another man's body and make it his own. The Professor then related how a powerful Yogi had once entered into the dead body of a king, and had governed the country for three whole weeks. It is still believed that certain of the Eastern sages can eject the ethereal body through the pores of the skin, and render this phantasmal form visible in distant places. The effect produced by the Professor's discourse may readily be imagined. Here was justification in full of the theories, hitherto so scorned and abused, of Colonel Olcott, Mr. Sinnett, and Madame Blavatsky. Here was almost an avowal of belief in the possibility of the truth, if not in the truth itself, of the realisation of that recognition of the powers of darkness from which all Christian souls are taught to shrink with horror and dismay. The Professor seemed so well aware of the impression produced by his discourse that, as if feeling himself compelled to add a few words by way of excuse for the extreme lengths to which he had been led, he added by way of conclusion that he was induced to doubt whether the practices assumed to be possible to the Theosophists would stand the light of European science. "But nevertheless the subject must not be dismissed as unworthy of consideration. It furnishes," said Sir Monier-Williams in conclusion, "a highly interesting topic of enquiry, especially in its bearing on the so-called Spiritualism, neo-Buddhism, and Theosophy of the present day. The practices of magnetism, mesmerism, clairvoyance, etc., have their counterparts in the Yoga system of the Hindoos prevalent in India more than two thousand years ago." At the end of the lecture a vote of thanks was proposed by the Bishop of Dunedin, who undertook, as it were, the apology of the doctrine expounded (scarcely to the satisfaction of all present), and who thought it his duty to point out the distinction between Christianity and Buddhism—the former reliant upon God's mercy, the latter on the efforts of man to work out his self-deliverance from evil. I have dwelt thus long upon the subject of the great professor's discourse because the world of thought—of scientific research—having found at last a footing in London society, these things are talked of and examined with reflection, and without detriment to the flow of small-talk which used formerly to occupy the whole attention of the world of fashion.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

July, 1888

TO THEOSOPHISTS AND READERS OF *LUCIFER*

Thus ends the plaint of the Birmingham Jeremiah. It speaks for itself, and we thank the writer for letting, so naïvely, the cat out of the bag. The real “cat,” however, the one on which the “monkey” of the “Victoria Institute” and other scientific establishments had placed such optimistic hopes, has played its colleagues false. It has turned tail at the last moment, and has evidently declined the loan of its paw to draw from the fire the too hot chestnuts for the benefit of the scientific “researchers” of the day. Like Balaam, whom the King of Midian would willingly have bribed to curse the Israelites, Sir Monier Monier-Williams, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., LL.D., Boden Professor of Sanskrit at the University of Oxford (where, “for reasons of ill-health,” he can no longer lecture, but lectures for our benefit elsewhere)—has not cursed the Theosophists and their teachings—but has blessed them. Alas! Alas!

“Compelled to praise!” It cannot be
By prophet or by priest;
Balaam is dead? . . . yet don’t we see
And hear, perchance—his beast?

[The “Theosophical Fable” mentioned above by H.P.B. was written by Dr. Franz Hartmann, as appears from *The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky to A. P. Sinnett*, p. 158, wherein H.P.B. tells Sinnett: “You will read Hartmann’s ‘Theosophical Fable’ and our answer to it sent to you with a few more explanations.” The MS. of H.P.B.’s “our answer” published below has been recently discovered in the Adyar Archives, and is a fragment in her own handwriting. It is both a comment on Hartmann’s allegorical description of the situation in the T.S. in 1885-86, and a continuation and conclusion of the Fable, embodying some important statements about the T.S. On page 2 of the MS. H.P.B. appended this note: “Had no time to copy. Send this answer but better to H. His dear sister writes such a loving good letter swearing she ‘will attune her soul to the music of the Spheres.’ If I were you: I *would* publish his fable in the *Theosophist*.” The approximate date of this MS. is January, 1886.]

. “the keeper of the instrument sat down and wept bitterly . . .” So would the “Instrument” were it not so broken as to be unfit to emit even a sound

The fable is deeply significant and very profound. It is to the very point and the author of it *was inspired*—the mangled remains of the “Instrument” answer for it,

though *its* endorsements are now of little, if any use. The “Theosophical Fable” ought to be published in the *Theosophist*; and if it is not it will only speak the more against the obduracy of the ex-”keeper” of the “instrument,” and his unwillingness to confess publicly his great sin—for believing in human justice, in human benevolence, fairness and the gentlemanly feelings of “a Society of non-musical but learned men.” And the “fable” ought

to be read by every Theosophist, every member of the *never* “Harmonical Society” and meditated upon. For, besides the individual Karma of every member and the collective Karma of the “Harmonical Society” whose practice differed so widely from its rules and purposes—there is the great sin of its leading members and chiefs. They have *deseccrated* the name (and names) of the “Genius of the Spheres,” and the Genii descend no more. The present trouble has arisen in consequence of such desecration. The Maha-Chohan of the Genii has foretold it four years ago. The chief President was warned repeatedly in the beginning by the voice of his “instrument”; it protested in vain, and finally it was swept along itself with the current of enthusiasm, and added its own voice to proclaiming things holy in public, and throwing pearls before swine, and casting that which was sacred to the dogs: the swine are now treading upon the pearls and the dogs rending the givers. The light that shone in the Darkness which comprehended it not—is now out: Darkness has put its heavy extinguisher upon it.

This would have never happened had the light been sacredly preserved in its own birth-place and sphere—India. But the veneration of her sons for that light was laughed down to scorn; it was called “hero-worship,” mocked and finally represented as a screen to hide unholy practices. The names of the Genii are now dragged into publicity and figure in full in the *Report*. None of the *Presidents* would listen to the sage advice to keep their knowledge of the Genii secret; and the holy names were prostituted publicly by every scoffer. KARMA.

There now remains but one thing to be done, if the “Harmonical” Society would be kept alive.

Let its President do as the ex-Corresponding Secretary *has* done: depose himself before he is deposed by others,—and the Society will die a week later. But let the Society—now dishonoured because there never was real harmony in it but rather personal and individual selfishness—unite together at last and wait patiently and prepare thro’ *active* work for the advent of a *Paraclete* who may yet be drawn to, and sent to them before the end of the cycle in (1897).

The present “instrument” could never have been destroyed by any “learned” Society. It is the *unlearned* in things occult and spiritual, among the members of the Harmonical Society, who are now breaking it to atoms themselves; those for whom the old instrument has played itself to death, and that was the first to draw their attention and open their ears to the “music of the spheres” however poorly it may have rendered the heavenly melody itself. And now it lies broken into fragments shattered more every day by the kicks of those for whom it sang and laboured. . . .

But the “Genius of the Spheres” means to pick up the mangled pieces of the instrument once more and glue them together *as He alone can*. No violin is played better upon, none emits more musical sounds than that one which was broken and mended. The Paganini of the broken *Stradivarius* is still alive and He will play upon it again but only for those few who will “attune their souls indeed to the music of the Spheres.” The instrument will

belong to these and have no “Keeper.” How many such few will remain? Time will soon tell.

TO THEOSOPHISTS AND READERS OF *LUCIFER*

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 11, July, 1888, p. 347]

The Editors of *Lucifer* feel it right that this number, the first published at the new offices and by the actual owners of the magazine, should contain some statement as to the reasons which have led to this change being made.

12

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

The first reason was the desire to form a fresh centre of Theosophical work, a meeting place for students, and a mechanism for the publication and distribution of the literature of mysticism, which should be entirely free from all considerations of personal gain or profit.

That this has been the spirit animating the founders and proprietors of *Lucifer* throughout, is proved by the fact that, although nearly all the copies of the magazine printed have been sold, yet the first year's experience has shown that it is impossible to carry on the magazine at its present price without incurring considerable loss.

Therefore, in establishing these new offices, the editors and proprietors have been also influenced by the hope of effecting some reduction in the expense by taking the publication into their own hands, and they hope that their readers and subscribers will continue to give them their hearty support, in spite of the necessity which has arisen of raising the price of single numbers of the magazine to eighteen-pence and the annual subscription to fifteen shillings, commencing with the September number.

Our supporters may feel sure that their help will be used to further the cause of Theosophy, and will subserve no personal ends; for the proprietors have bound themselves to devote any eventual profits which may accrue to the furtherance of the cause in the interests of which *Lucifer* was founded.

The new offices, at No. 7, DUKE STREET, ADELPHI, will be open to members of the T.S. and the T.P.S. and their friends, as well as to all enquirers and persons desiring information about the Society or the subjects which it was founded to study, on TUESDAY and SUNDAY evenings from 8:30 to 10:30 p.m. and on FRIDAY afternoons from 3:30 till 6. These days have been chosen purposely, so as not to conflict with the Wednesday evenings—the meeting-days of the London Lodge of the Theosophical Society, at 15, York Street, Covent Garden.

It is hoped that many will avail themselves of these opportunities for meeting other students and for mutual instruction and discussion.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
July, 1888

STAR-ANGEL WORSHIP

13

**STAR ANGEL WORSHIP IN
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH**

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 11, July, 1888, pp. 355-365]

[Most of this material was originally incorporated by H.P.B. in the first draft of *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, which she sent to Adyar in 1886, in order to secure the editorial and scholastic help of T. Subba Row. For some reason or other, instead of using this material in the final draft of her monumental work, she published it in *Lucifer* just a few months before the appearance of *The Secret Doctrine*. A long introductory note, enclosed within square brackets, was added to the original essay.

Much of the material used by H.P.B. can be found in Eudes de Mirville's work entitled *Pneumatologie. Des Esprits et de leurs manifestations diverses*, mainly in Vol. II, pp. 351-360, although some of it is recast by her and interspersed with various comments and occult explanations.—*Compiler*.]

[The subject matter of the present article has not been chosen from any desire of “finding fault” with the Christian *religion*, as *Lucifer* is often accused of doing. No special animosity is felt towards popery any more than against any other existing dogmatic and ritualistic faith. We merely hold that “there is no higher religion than truth.” Hence, incessantly attacked by the Christians—among whom none are so bitter and *contemptuous* as the Romanists—who call us “idolaters” and “heathens,” and otherwise denounce us, it is necessary that at times something should be said in our defence, and truth reestablished.

The Theosophists are accused of believing in Astrology, and the *Devas* (Dhyan Chohans) of the Hindus and Northern Buddhists. A too impulsive missionary in the Central Provinces of India has actually called us “Astrolaters,” “Sabians” and “*devil-worshippers*.” This, as usual, is an unfounded calumny and a misrepresentation. No theosophist, no *Occultist* in the true sense of the word has ever *worshipped* Devas, Nats, Angels or even *planetary* spirits. Recognition of the *actual existence* of such Beings—which, however exalted, are still gradually evolved *creatures* and finite—and even reverence for some of them is not *worship*. The latter is an elastic word, one that has

been made threadbare by the poverty of the English tongue. We address a magistrate as his “worship,” but it can hardly be said that we pay to him *divine* honours. A mother often worships her children, a husband his wife, and *vice versa*, but none of these prays to the

object of his worship. But in neither case does it apply to the Occultists. An Occultist's reverence for certain high Spirits may be very great in some cases; aye, perhaps even as great as the reverence felt by some Christians for their Archangels Michael and Gabriel and their (St.) George of Cappadocia—the learned purveyor of Constantine's armies. But it stops there. For the Theosophists these planetary "angels" occupy no higher place than that which Virgil assigns them:

"They boast ethereal vigour and are form'd
From seeds of heavenly birth." *

as does also every mortal. Each and all are occult potencies having sway over certain attributes of nature. And, if once attracted to a mortal, they do help him in certain things. Yet, on the whole, the less one has to do with them the better.

Not so with the Roman Catholics, our pious detractors. The Papists worship them and have rendered to them *divine homage* from the beginning of Christianity to this day, and in the full acceptance of the italicised words, as this article will prove. Even for the Protestants, the Angels in general, if not the Seven Angels of the Stars particularly—are "Harbingers of the Most High" and "Ministering Spirits" to whose protection they appeal, and who have their distinct place in the *Book of Common Prayer*.

The fact that the Star and Planetary Angels are worshipped by the Papists is not generally known. The cult

* [These verses are from the *Aeneid*, Book VI, 730-31, although it is difficult to say what particular poetical translation is used by H.P.B. In the *Loeb Classical Series*, H. Rashton Fairclough translates the original text as: "fiery is their vigour and divine the source of those life-seeds. . ."—*Compiler*.]

had many vicissitudes. It was several times abolished, then again permitted. It is the short history of its growth, its last re-establishment and the recurrent efforts to proclaim this worship openly, of which a brief sketch is here attempted. This worship may be regarded for the last few years as *obsolete*, yet to this day it was never abolished. Therefore it will now be my pleasure to prove that if anyone deserves the name of "idolatrous," it is not the Theosophists, Occultists, Kabalists and Astrologers, but, indeed, most of the Christians; those Roman Catholics, who, besides the Star-angels, worship a Kyriel of more or less problematical saints and the Virgin Mary, of whom their Church has made a regular *goddess*.

The short bits of history that follow are extracted from various trustworthy sources, such as the Roman Catholics will find it rather difficult to gainsay or repudiate. For our authorities are: (a) various documents *in the archives of the Vatican*; (b) sundry works by pious and well-known Roman Catholic writers, Ultramontanes to the backbone—lay and

ecclesiastical authors; and finally (c), a Papal Bull, than which no better evidence could be found.]

In the middle of the VIIIth century of the Christian era the very notorious Archbishop Adalbert of Magdeburg, famous as few in the annals of magic, appeared before his judges. He was charged with, and ultimately convicted—by the second Council of Rome presided over by Pope Zacharias*—of using during his performances of ceremonial magic the names of the “seven Spirits”—then at the height of their power in the Church—among others, that of URIEL, with the help of whom he had succeeded in producing his greatest phenomena. As can

* [Zachary (Zacharias), Saint, birth date uncertain; d. March, 752; came from a Greek family living in Calabria, and succeeded Gregory III in the papal chair, Nov. 29, 741.—*Compiler*.]

be easily shown, *the church is not against magic proper*, but only against those magicians who fail to conform to her methods and rules of evocation. However, as the wonders wrought by the Right Reverend Sorcerer were not of a character that would permit of their classification among “miracles by the grace, and to the glory of God,” they were declared *unholy*. Moreover, the Archangel URIEL (*lux et ignis*) having been compromised by such exhibitions, his name had to be discredited. But, as such a disgrace upon one of the “Thrones” and “Messengers of the Most High” would have reduced the number of these Jewish *Saptarshis* to only six, and thus have thrown into confusion the whole celestial hierarchy, a very clever and crafty subterfuge was resorted to. It was, however, neither new, nor has it proved very convincing or efficacious.

It was declared that Bishop Adalbert’s Uriel, the “fire of God,” was not the Archangel mentioned in the second *Book of Esdras*; nor was he the glorious personage so often named in the magical books of Moses—especialy in the 6th and 7th. The sphere or planet of this original Uriel was said, by Michael Glycas the Byzantine, to be the Sun. How then could this exalted being—the friend and companion of Adam and Eve before his fall, and, later, the chum of Seth and Enoch, as all pious Christians know—how could he ever have given a helping hand to sorcery? Never, never! the idea alone was absurd.

Therefore, the Uriel so revered by the Fathers of the Church, remained as unassailable and as immaculate as ever. It was a *devil* of the same name—an obscure devil, one must think, since he is nowhere mentioned—who had to pay the penalty of Bishop Adalbert’s little transactions in black magic. This “*bad*” Uriel is, as a certain tonsured advocate has tried hard to insinuate, connected with a certain significant word of occult nature, used by and known only to Masons of a very high degree. Ignorant of the “word” itself, however,

the defender has most gloriously failed to prove his version.

Such whitewashing of the archangel's character was of course necessary in view of the special worship paid to

him. St. Ambrosius had chosen Uriel as a patron and paid him almost divine reverence. * Again the famous Father Gastaldi, † the Dominican monk, writer and Inquisitor, had proven in his curious work "On the Angels" (*De Angelis*) that the worship of the "Seven Spirits" by the Church had been and was *legal* in all the ages; and that it was necessary for the moral support and faith of the children of the (Roman) Church. In short that he who should neglect these gods was as bad as any "heathen" who did not.

Though sentenced and suspended, Bishop Adalbert had a formidable party in Germany, one that not only defended and supported the sorcerer himself, but also the disgraced Archangel. Hence, the name of Uriel was left in the missals after the trial, the "Throne" merely remaining "under suspicion." In accordance with her admirable policy the Church having declared that the "blessed Uriel," had nought to do with the "accursed Uriel" of the Kabalists, the matter rested there.

To show the great latitude offered to such subterfuges, the occult tenets about the celestial Hosts have only to be remembered. The world of Being begins with the Spiritual Fire (or Sun) and its seven "Flames" or Rays. These "Sons of Light," called the "multiple" because, allegorically speaking, they belong to, and lead a simultaneous existence in heaven and on earth, easily furnished a handle to the Church to hang her *dual* Uriel upon. Moreover, Devas, Dhyan-Chohans, Gods and Archangels are all identical and are made to change their Protean forms, names and positions, *ad libitum*. As the sidereal gods of the Sabians became the kabalistic and talmudistic angels of the Jews with their esoteric names unaltered, so they passed bag and baggage into the Christian Church as the archangels, exalted only in their office.

* *De Fide*, etc., lib. II, cap. iii, § 20, footnote.

† [Known also as Thomas Castaldus. See the Bio-Bibliogr. Index. —*Compiler*.]

These names are their "mystery" titles. So mysterious are they, indeed, that the Roman Catholics themselves are not sure of them, now that the Church, in her anxiety to hide their humble origin, has changed and altered them about a dozen times. This is what the pious de Mirville confesses:

To speak with precision and certainty” is we might like to, about everything in connection with their [the angels’] names and attributes is not an easy task. For when one has said that these Spirits are the *seven assistants* that surround the throne of the Lamb and form its *seven horns*; that the famous seven-branched candlestick of the Temple was their type and symbol. . . .when we have shown them figured in *Revelation* by the *seven stars* in the Saviour’s hand, or by the angels letting loose the *seven plagues*—we shall but have stated once more one of those incomplete truths which the commentators, developing these ideas, approach ordinarily with utmost caution.*

Here the author utters a great truth. He would have uttered one still greater, though, had he added that *no truth*, upon *any subject* whatever, has been ever made complete by the Church. Otherwise, where would be the mystery so absolutely necessary to the authority of the ever incomprehensible dogmas of the Holy “Bride”?

These “Spirits” are called *primarios principes*. But what these first Principles are in reality is not explained. In the first centuries of Christianity the Church would not do so; and in this one she knows of them no more than her faithful lay sons do. She has lost the secret.

The question concerning the definite adoption of names for these angels, de Mirville tells us—“has given rise to controversies that have lasted for centuries. To this day *these seven names are a mystery.*”

Yet they are found in certain missals and in the secret documents at the Vatican, along with the astrological names known to many. But as the Kabalists, and among others Bishop Adalbert, have used some of them, the Church will not accept these titles, though she worships

* De Mirville, *Des Esprits*, etc., Vol. II, pp. 351-52, chapter on “The Spirits before their Fall.”

the creatures. The usual names accepted are MIKAEL, the “*quis ut Deus*,” the “like unto God”; GABRIEL, the strength (or power) of God”; RAPHAEL, or “divine virtue”; URIEL, “God’s light and fire”; SAALTIEL, the “speech of God”; JEHUDIEL, the “praise of God” and BARACHIEL, the “blessing of God.” These “seven” are *absolutely canonical*, but they are not the true mystery names—the magical POTENCIES. And even among the “substitutes,” as just shown, Uriel has been greatly compromised and the three last enumerated are pronounced “suspicious.” Nevertheless, though nameless, they are still worshipped. Nor is it true to say that no trace of these three names—so “suspicious”—is anywhere found in the Bible, for they are mentioned in certain of the old Hebrew scrolls. One of them is named in Chapter xvi of *Genesis*—the angel who appears to Hagar; and all the three appear as “the Lord” (the Elohim) to Abraham in the plains of Mamre, as the “three men” who announced to Sarai the birth of Isaac (*Genesis*, xviii). “Jehudiel,” moreover, is distinctly named in Chapter xxiii of *Exodus*, as the angel in whom was “the name” (*praise* in the

original) of God (*Vide* verse 21). It is through their “divine attributes,” which have led to the formation of the names, that these archangels may be identified by an easy esoteric method of transmutation with the Chaldean great gods and even with the Seven Manus and the Seven Rishis of India.* They are the *Seven* Sabian Gods, and the *Seven* Seats (Thrones) and Virtues of the Kabalists; and now they have become with the Catholics, their “Seven Eyes of the Lord,” and the “Seven *Thrones*,” instead of “Seats.”

Both Kabalists and “Heathen” must feel quite flattered to thus see their Devas and Rishis become the “Ministers

* He who knows anything of the *Purânas* and their allegories, knows that the Rishis therein as well as the Manus are Sons of God, of Brahmâ, and themselves gods; that they become men and then, as Saptarishi, they turn into stars and constellations. Finally that they are first 7, then 10, then 14, and finally 21. The occult meaning is evident.

Plenipotentiary” of the Christian God. And now the narrative may be continued unbroken.

Until about the XVth century after the misadventure of Bishop Adalbert, the names of only the first three Archangels out of the seven stood in the Church in their full odour of sanctity. The other four remained ostracised—as *names*.

Whoever has been in Rome must have visited the privileged temple of the Seven Spirits, especially built for them by Michelangelo: the famous church known as “St. Mary of the Angels.” Its history is curious but very little known to the public that frequents it. It is worthy, however, of being recorded.

In 1460, there appeared in Rome a great “Saint,” named Amadaeus. He was a nobleman from Lusitania, who already in Portugal had become famous for his prophecies and beatific visions.* During one of such he had a revelation. The seven Archangels appeared to the holy man, so beloved by the Pope that Sixtus IV had actually permitted him to build on the site of St. Peter in *Montorio* a Franciscan monastery. And having appeared they revealed to him their genuine *bona fide* mystery names. The names used by the Church were substitutes, they said. So they were, and the “angels” spoke truthfully. Their business with Amadaeus was a modest request. They demanded to be legally recognised under their legitimate patronymics, to receive public worship and have a temple of their own. Now the Church in her great wisdom had declined these names from the first, as being those of Chaldean gods, and had substituted for them astrological *aliases*. This then could not be done, as “they were *names of demons*,” explains Baronius. But so were the “substitutes” in Chaldea before they were altered for a purpose in the Hebrew Angelology. And if they are *names of demons*, asks pertinently de Mirville, “why are they yet given to Christians and Roman Catholics at baptism?” The truth is that if the last four

* He died at Rome in 1482.

enumerated are demon-names, so must be those of Michael, Gabriel and Raphael.

But the “holy” visitors were a match for the Church in obstinacy. At the same hour that Amadaeus had his vision at Rome, in Sicily, at Palermo, another wonder was taking place. A miraculously-painted picture of the Seven Spirits, was as miraculously exhumed from under the ruins of an old chapel. On the painting *the same seven mystery names* that were being revealed at that hour to Amadaeus were also found *inscribed* “under the portrait of each angel,” * says the chronicler.

Whatever might be in this our age of unbelief the feelings of the great and learned leaders of various psychic and telepathic societies on this subject, Pope Sixtus IV † was greatly impressed by the *coincidence*. He believed in Amadaeus as implicitly as Mr. Brudenel believed in the Abyssinian prophet, “Herr Paulus.” ‡ But this was by no means the only “coincidence” of the day. The Holy Roman and Apostolic Church was built on such miracles, and continues to stand on them now as on the rock of Truth; for God has ever sent to her *timely miracles*.§

* De Mirville, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

† [Sixtus IV (Francesco della Rovere), b. near Abisola, July 21, 1414; d. Aug. 12, 1484. Elected Pope Aug. 9, 1471, succeeding Paul II.—*Compiler*.]

‡ “Herr Paulus”—the no less miraculous production of Mr. Walter Besant’s rather muddled and very one-sided fancy.

§ *En passant*—a remark may be made and a query propounded:

The “miracles” performed in the bosom of Mother Church—from the apostolic down to the ecclesiastical *miracles* at Lourdes—if not more remarkable than those attributed to “Herr Paulus,” are at any rate far more wide-reaching, hence more pernicious in their result upon the human mind. Either both kinds are possible, or both are due to fraud and *dangerous hypnotic and magnetic powers possessed* by some men. Now Mr. W. Besant evidently tries to impress upon his readers that his novel was written in the interests of that portion of society which is so easily befooled by the other. And if so, why then not have traced all such phenomena *to their original and primeval source. i.e., belief in the possibility of supernatural occurrences because of the inculcated belief in the MIRACLES in the Bible, and their continuation by the Church?* No Abyssinian

Therefore, when also, on that very same day, an old prophecy written in very archaic Latin, and referring to both the find and the revelation was *discovered* at Pisa— it produced quite a commotion among the faithful. The prophecy foretold, you see, *the revival of the*

“Planetary-Angel” worship for that period. Also that during the reign of Pope Clement VII,* the convent of St. François

prophet, as no “occult philosopher,” has ever made such large claims to “miracle” and *divine help*—and no Peter’s pence expected, either—as the “Bride of Christ”—she, of Rome. Why has not then our author, since he was so extremely anxious to save the millions of England from delusion, and so very eager to expose the pernicious means used—why has he not tried to first explode the greater humbug, before he ever touched the *minor* tricks—if any? Let him first explain to the British public the turning of water into wine and the resurrection of Lazarus on the half *hypnotic* and half *jugglery* and *fraud* hypothesis. For, if one set of *wonders* may be explained by blind belief and mesmerism, why not the other? Or is it because the Bible miracles believed in by every Protestant and Catholic (with the *divine* miracles at Lourdes thrown into the bargain by the latter) cannot be as easily handled by an author who desires to remain *popular*, as those of the “occult philosopher” and the spiritual medium? Indeed, no courage, no fearless defiance of the consequences are required to denounce the helpless and now very much scared *professional* medium. But all these qualifications and an ardent *love of truth into the bargain*, are absolutely necessary if one would beard Mrs. Grundy in her den. For this the traducers of the “Esoteric Buddhists” are too prudent and wily. They only seek cheap popularity with the scoffer and the materialist. Well sure they are, that no *professional* medium will ever dare call them wholesale slanderers to their faces, or seek redress from them so long as the law against palmistry is staring him in the face. As to the “Esoteric Buddhist” or “Occult Philosopher,” there is still less danger from this quarter. The contempt of the latter for all the would-be traducers is absolute and it requires more than the clumsy denunciations of a novelist to disturb them. And why should they feel annoyed? As they are neither *professional* prophets, nor do they benefit by St. Peter’s pence, the most malicious calumny can only make them laugh. Mr. Walter Besant, however, has said a great truth in his novel, a true pearl of foresight, dropped on a heap of mire: the “occult philosopher” does not propose to “*hide his light under a bushel*.”

* [Clement VII (Giulio de’ Medici), b. 1478; d. Sept. 25, 1534. Became Pope Nov. 18, 1523, following Adrian VI.—*Compiler*.]

de Paule would be raised on the emplacement of the little ruined chapel. “The event occurred as predicted,” boasts de Mirville, forgetting that the Church had made the prediction true herself, by following the command implied in it. Yet this is called a “prophecy” to this day.

But it was only in the XVIth century that the Church consented at last to comply on every point with the request of her “high-born” celestial petitioners.

At that time, though there was hardly a church or chapel in Italy without a copy of the *miraculous* picture in painting or mosaic, and that actually, in 1516, a splendid “temple to the seven spirits” had been raised and finished near the ruined chapel at Palermo—still the “angels” failed to be satisfied. In the words of their chronicler—“the blessed spirits were not contented with Sicily alone, and secret prayers. They wanted a world-wide worship and the whole Catholic world to recognise them publicly.”

Heavenly denizens themselves, as it seems, are not quite free from the ambition and the vanities of our material plane! This is what the ambitious “Rectors” devised to obtain that which they wanted.

Antonio Duca, another seer (in the annals of the Church of Rome) had been just appointed rector of the Palermo “temple of the seven spirits.” * About that period, he began to have the same beatific visions as Amadaeus had. The Archangels were now urging the Popes through him to recognise them, and to establish a regular and a universal worship in their *own names*, just as it was before Bishop Adalbert’s scandal. They insisted upon having a special temple built *for them alone*, and they wanted it upon the ancient site of the famous *Thermae* of Diocletian. To the erection of these *Thermae*, agreeably with tradition, 40,000 Christians and 10,000 martyrs had been condemned, and helped in this task by such famous “Saints” as Marcellus and Thrason. Since then, however,

* [*Vide Bio-Bibliogr. Index.—Compiler.*]

as stated in Bull LV by the Pope Pius IV,* “this den had remained set apart for the most profane usages and demon [magic?] rites.”

But as it appears from sundry documents, all did not go quite as smoothly as the “blessed spirits” would have liked, and the poor Duca had a hard time of it. Notwithstanding the strong protection of the Colonna families who used all their influence with Pope Paul III, † and the personal request of Marguerite of Austria, the daughter of Charles Vth, “the seven spirits” could not be satisfied, for the same mysterious (and to us very clear) reasons, though propitiated and otherwise honoured in every way. The difficult mission of Duca, in fact, was crowned with success only thirty-four years later. Ten years before, however, namely in 1551, the preparatory purification of the *Thermae* had been ordered by Pope Julius III, †† and a first church had been built under the name of “*St. Mary of the Angels*.” But the “Blessed Thrones,” feeling displeased with its name, brought on a war during which this temple was plundered and destroyed, as if instead of glorified Archangels they had been maleficent kabalistic *Spooks*.

After this, they went on appearing to seers and saints, with greater frequency than before, and clamoured even

* [Pius IV (Giovanni Angelo Medici), b. at Milan, March 31, 1499; d. in Rome, Dec. 9, 1565. Elected Pope Dec. 26, 1559, succeeding Paul IV. He was first buried in St. Peter’s, but on June 4, 1583, his remains were transferred to Michelangelo’s church of S. Maria degli Angeli, one of the most magnificent structures he had erected.—*Compiler.*]

† [Paul III (Alessandro Farnese), b. at Rome or Canino, Feb. 29, 1468; d. at Rome, Nov. 10, 1549. Elected Pope Oct. 12, 1534, succeeding Clement VII. His instincts and ambitions were those of a secular prince of the Renaissance, but circumstances forced him to become the patron of reform. He introduced the Inquisition into Italy, 1542; established the censorship and the Index, 1543, and gave his approval to the Society of Jesus, 1540.—*Compiler.*]

‡ [Julius III (Giovanni Maria del Monte), b. Sept. 10, 1487; d. March 23, 1555. Elected Pope Feb. 7,

1550, succeeding Paul III.—*Compiler.*]

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
July, 1888

more loudly for a special place of worship. They *demand*ed the re-erection on the same spot (the *Thermae*) of a temple which should be called the “Church of *the Seven Angels*.”

But there was the same difficulty as before. The Popes had pronounced the original titles demon-names, *i.e.*, those of Pagan gods, and to introduce them into the church service would have been fatal. The “mystery names” of the seven angels could not be given. True enough, when the old “miraculous” picture with the seven names on it had been found, these names had been freely used in the church services. But, at the period of the *Renaissance*, Pope Clement XI * had ordered a special report to be made on them as they stood on the picture. It was a famous astronomer of that day, a Jesuit, named Joseph Bianchini, who was entrusted with this delicate mission. The result to which the inquest led, was as unexpected as it was fatal to the worshippers of the seven Sabian gods; the Pope, while commanding that the picture should be preserved, ordered the seven angelic names to be *carefully rubbed out*. And “though these names are traditional,” and “although they have *naught to do with*,” and are “very different from the names used by Adalbert” (the Bishop-magician of Magdeburg), as the chronicler cunningly adds, yet even their mention was forbidden in the holy churches of Rome.

Thus affairs went on from 1527 till 1561; the Rector trying to satisfy the orders of his *seven* “guides,”—the church fearing to adopt even the Chaldean substitutes for the “mystery-names” as they had been so “desecrated by magical practices.” We are not told, however, why the mystery-names, far less known than their substitutes have ever been, should not have been given out if the blessed “Thrones” enjoyed the smallest confidence. But, it must have been “small” indeed, since one finds

* [Clement XI (Giovanni Francesco Albani), b. at Urbino, July 23, 1649; d. at Rome, March 19, 1721. Elected Pope Nov. 23, 1700, succeeding Innocentius XII.—*Compiler*.]

the “Seven Archangels” demanding their restitution for 34 years, and refusing positively to be called by any other name, and the church still deaf to their desires. The Occultists do not

conceal the reason why they have ceased to use them: *they are dangerously magical*. But why should the Church fear them? Have not the Apostles, and Peter pre-eminently, been told “whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven” [*Matt.*, xviii, 18], and were they not given power over every demon known and unknown? Nevertheless, some of the mystery-names may be still found along with their substitutes in old Roman missals printed in 1563. There is one in the Barberini library with the whole mass-service in it, and the forbidden truly Sabian names of the seven “great gods” flashing out ominously hither and thither.*

The “gods” lost patience once more. Acting in a truly Jehovistic spirit with their “stiff-necked” worshippers, they sent a plague. A terrible epidemic of *obsession* and *possession* broke out in 1553, “when almost all Rome found itself possessed by the devil,” says de Mirville (without explaining whether the clergy were included). Then only Duca’s wish was realized. His seven Inspirers were invoked in their own names, and “the epidemic ceased as by enchantment, the blessed ones,” adds the chronicler, “proving by the divine powers they possessed, once more, that they had nothing in common *with the demons of the same name*,”—*i.e.*, the Chaldean gods.†

* [Reference is made here to the *Missale Romanum*, bearing the imprint of: Venetiis apud Iunctas, MDLXIII. It is now deposited in the Vatican Library, and is catalogued under Stamp. Barb. B. IX. 34. The names of the Archangels, as appearing on page 320 of this richly illuminated Latin document, are: Saalthiel, orator; Eudiel, remunerator; Raphael, medicus; Michael, victoriosus; Gabriel, nuntius; Barachiel, adiutor; Uriel, fortis. The text of this document contains masses in honour of the various Archangels. —*Compiler.*]

† But they had proved their *power* earlier by sending the war, the destruction of the church, and finally the epidemic; and this does not look very *angelic*—to an Occultist.

“Then Michelangelo was summoned in all haste by Paul IV * to the Vatican.” His magnificent plan was accepted and the building of the former church began. Its construction lasted over three years. In the archives of this now celebrated edifice, one can read that: “the narrative of the miracles that occurred during that period could not be undertaken, as it was *one incessant miracle of three years’ duration*.” In the presence of all his cardinals, Pope Paul IV ordered that the seven names, as originally written on the picture, should be restored, and inscribed around the large copy of it that surmounts to this day the high altar.

The admirable temple was consecrated to the Seven Angels in 1561. The object of the Spirits was reached; three years later, nearly simultaneously, Michelangelo and Antonio Duca both died. They were no longer wanted.

Duca was the first person buried in the church for the erection of which he had fought the best part of his life and finally procured for his heavenly patrons. On his tomb the summary of the revelations obtained by him, as also the catalogue of the prayers and

invocations, of the penances and fasts used as means of getting the “blessed” revelations and more frequent visits from the “Seven”—are engraved. In the vestry a sight of the documents attesting to, and enumerating some of the phenomena of “the incessant miracle of three years’ duration” may be obtained for a small fee. The record of the “miracles” bears the *imprimatur* of a Pope and several Cardinals, but it still lacks that of the Society for Psychical Research. The “Seven Angels” must be needing the latter badly, as without it their triumph will never be complete. Let us hope that the learned Spookical Researchers will send their “smart boy” to Rome at an early day, and that the “blessed ones” may find at Cambridge—a Duca.

* [Paul IV (Giovanni Pietro Caraffa), b. near Benevento, June 28, 1476; d. Aug. 18, 1559. Elected Pope May 23, 1555, to succeed Marcellus II.—*Compiler*.]

But what became of the “mystery names” so cautiously used and what of the new ones? First of all came the substitution of the name of Eudiel for one of the Kabalistic names. Just one hundred years later, all the seven names suddenly disappeared, by order of the Cardinal Albizzi. In the old and venerable Church of *Santa Maria della Pietà* on the Piazza Colonna, the “miraculous” painting of the Seven Archangels may be still seen, but the names have been scratched out and the places repainted. *Sic transit gloria mundi*. A little while after that the mass and vesper services of the “Seven” were once more eliminated from the missals used, notwithstanding that “they are quite distinct” from those of the “planetary Spirits” who used to help Bishop Adalbert. But as “the robe does not really make the monk,” so the change of names cannot prevent the individuals that had them from being the same as they were before. They are still worshipped and this is all that my article aims to prove.

Will this be denied? In that case I have to remind the readers that so late as in 1825, a Spanish grandee supported by the Archbishop of Palermo made an attempt before Leo XII * for the simultaneous re-establishment of *the service and names*. The Pope granted the Church service but refused the permission to use the old names. †

“This service, perfected and amplified by order of Paul IV, the minutes of which exist to this day at the *Vatican* and the *Minerva*, remained in force during the whole pontificate of Leo X.” ‡ The Jesuits were those

* [Leo XII (Annibale Francesco Clemente Melchiorre Girolamo Nicola della Genga), b. at the Castello della Genga in the territory of Spoleto, Aug. 22, 1760; d. in Rome, Feb. 10, 1829. Elected Pope Sept., 28, 1823, succeeding Pius VII.—*Compiler*.]

† This is quoted from the volumes of the Marquis de Mirville, *Des Esprits*, etc., Vol. II, p. 358. A more rabid papist and ultramontane having never existed, his testimony can hardly be suspected. He seems to glory in this idolatry and is loud in demanding its *public* and universal restoration.

‡ [Leo X (Giovanni de' Medici), b. at Florence, Dec. II, 1475; died in Rome, Dec. 1, 1521. Elected Pope March 11, 1513, succeeding Julius II.—*Compiler.*]

who rejoiced the most at the resurrection of the old worship, in view of the prodigious help they received from it, as it ensured the success of their proselytizing efforts in the Philippine Islands. Pope Pius V * conceded the same “divine service” to Spain, saying in his Bull, that “one could never exalt too much *these seven Rectors* of the world, *figured by the SEVEN PLANETS*, and that. . . . “it looked consoling and augured well for this century, that by the grace of God, the cult of *these seven ardent lights*, and these seven stars, was regaining all its lustre in the Christian republic” †

The same “holy Pope permitted moreover to the nuns of *Matritensis* to establish the *fête* of JEHUDIEL the patron of their convent.” Whether another less pagan name has now been substituted for it we are not informed—nor does it in the least matter.

In 1832 the same demand in a petition to spread the worship of the “Seven Spirits of God,” was reiterated, endorsed this time by *eighty-seven bishops* and thousands of officials with high-sounding names in the Church of Rome. Again, in 1858, Cardinal Patrizi and King Ferdinand II in the name of *all the people of Italy* reiterated their petition; and again, finally, in 1862. Thus, the Church services in honour of the seven “Spirit-Stars” have never been abrogated since 1825. To this day they are in full vigour in Palermo, in Spain, and even in Rome at “St. Mary of the Angels” and the “*Gesù*”—though entirely suppressed everywhere else; all this “because of Adalbert’s *heresy*,” de Mirville and the other supporters of Star-Angel worship are pleased to say. In reality there is no reason but the one already disclosed for it. Even the seven substitutes, especially the last four, have been too openly connected with black magic and astrology.

* [Pius V (Michele Ghisleri), b. at Bosco, near Alexandria, in Lombardy, Jan. 17, 1504; d. May 1, 1572. Elected Pope Jan. 7, 1566, succeeding Pius IV. He was canonized by Clement XI, in 1712.—*Compiler.*]

† De Mirville, *op. cit.*, pp. 357-58.

Writers of the de Mirville type are in despair. Not daring to blame the Church, they vent their wrath upon the old Alchemists and Rosicrucians. They clamour for the restitution of a public worship notwithstanding; and the imposing association formed since 1862 in Italy, Bavaria, Spain and elsewhere for the re-establishment of the cult of the

Seven Spirits *in all its fullness* and in all Catholic Europe, gives hope that in a few years more the Seven Rishis of India now happily domiciled in the constellation of the Great Bear will become by the grace and will of some infallible Pontiff of Rome the legal and honoured divine patrons of Christendom.

And why not, since (St.) George is to this day “the patron Saint of not only Holy Russia, Protestant Germany, fairy Venice, but also of merry England, whose soldiers,” —says W. M. Braithwaite,*—“would uphold his prestige with their heart’s blood.” And surely our “Seven gods” cannot be worse than was the rascally George of Cappadocia during his lifetime!

Hence, with the courage of true believers, the Christian defenders of the Seven Star-Angels deny nothing, at any rate they keep silent whenever accused of rendering divine honours to Chaldean and other gods. They even admit the identity and proudly confess to the charge of star-worshipping. The accusation has been thrown many a time by the French Academicians into the teeth of their late leader, the Marquis de Mirville, and this is what he writes in reply:

We are accused of mistaking stars for angels. The charge is acquiring such a wide notoriety that we are forced to answer it very seriously. It is impossible that we should try to dissimulate it without failing in frankness and courage, since this *pretended mistake* is repeated incessantly in the Scriptures as in our theology. We shall examine. . . . this opinion hitherto so accredited, today discredited, and which attributes rightly to our SEVEN PRINCIPAL SPIRITS the ruler-ship, not of the seven known planets, with which we are reproached,

* “St. George for Merry England,” by W. M. Braithwaite. *Masonic Monthly*, No. 2.

but of the seven PRINCIPAL planets *—which is quite a different thing. †

And the author hastens to cite the authority of Babinet, the astronomer, who sought to prove in an able article of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (May, 1855), that in reality besides the earth we had only SEVEN big planets.

The “seven *principal* planets” is another confession to the acceptance of a purely occult tenet. Every planet according to the esoteric doctrine is in its composition a *Septenary* like man, in its principles. That is to say, *the visible planet is the physical body* of the sidereal being, the *Atma* or Spirit of which is the Angel, or Rishi, or Dhyan-Chohan, or Deva, or whatever we call it. This belief as the occultists will see (read in *Esoteric Buddhism* about the constitution of the planets) is thoroughly occult. It is a tenet of the Secret Doctrine—*minus* its idolatrous element—pure and simple. As taught in the Church and her rituals, however, and especially, as *practised*, it is ASTROLATRY as pure and as simple.

There is no need to show here the difference between teaching, or theory, and practice in the holy Roman Catholic Church. The words “Jesuit” and “Jesuitism” cover the whole ground. The Spirit of Truth has departed ages ago—if it has ever been near it—from the

Church of Rome. At this, the Protestant Church, so full of brotherly spirit and love for her sister Church, will say: *Amen*. The Dissenter, whose heart is as full of the love of Jesus as of hatred towards Ritualism and its mother Popery, will chuckle.

In the editorial of the *Times* for November 7, 1866, stands “A Terrible Indictment” against the Protestants, which says:

Under the influence of the Episcopal Bench, all the studies connected with theology have withered, until English Biblical critics are the

* These “principal planets” are the *mystery planets* of the pagan Initiates, but travestied by dogma and priestcraft.

† De Mirville, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 359-60.

scorn of foreign scholars. Whenever we take up the work of a theologian who is likely to be a Dean or a Bishop, we find, *not* an earnest inquirer setting forth the results of *honest research*, but merely an advocate, who, we can perceive, has begun his work with the fixed determination of *proving black white* in favour of his own traditional system.

If the Protestants do not recognise the “Seven Angels,” nor, while refusing them divine worship, do they feel ashamed and afraid of their names, as the Roman Catholics do, on the other hand they are guilty of “*Jesuitism*” of another kind, just as bad. For, while professing to believe the Scriptures a direct *Revelation* from God, not one sentence of which should be altered under the penalty of eternal damnation, they yet tremble and cower before the discoveries of science, and try to pander to their great enemy. Geology, Anthropology, Ethnology and Astronomy, are to them what Uriel, Saaltiel, Jehudiel and Barachiel are to the Roman Catholic Church. It is six of one and half a dozen of the other. And since neither one nor the other of the two religions will abstain from anathematizing, slandering and persecuting Magic, Occultism, and even Theosophy, it is but just and proper that in their turn the Students of the Sacred Science of old should retort at last, and keep on telling the truth fearlessly to the faces of both.

MAGNA EST VERITAS ET PREVALEBIT.

H. P. B.

[The subject of the Seven Mystery Names and their correlations was discussed at considerable length by Jakob Bonggren, one of the most serious students in the early days of the Movement. His essay may be found in *Lucifer*, Vol. IV, July, 1889, pp. 404-407, where it is followed by a comprehensive article from the pen of “Sepharial” (Walter R. Old), on pp. 407-415.—*Compiler*.]



HELENA PETROVNA BLAVATSKY

Photograph take by Enrico Resta in London, January 8, 1889. Originally printed in *The Path*, New York, Vol. IV, February, 1890. Reproduced here from the original glass plate in the Archives of the Theosophical Society in England.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
July, 1888

“L’Isis”

33

“L’ISIS”

BRANCHE FRANÇAISE, DE LA SOCIÉTÉ THÉOSOPHIQUE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 11, July, 1888, p. 365]

To the Editors of *Lucifer*.

Allow me to bring to the notice of those of your readers who may have received the pretended *Bulletin de l’Isis* the following facts:—

Of the three signatories of this bulletin one has been expelled from the Isis Lodge; the two others are not even members of the Theosophical Society.*

Thus neither M. Goyard, nor M. Encausse, nor M. Lejay, have henceforth any connection at all with Isis. Moreover, it is absolutely false that at the meeting, held by these gentlemen on June 23rd, a resolution was unanimously voted and accepted to the effect that an apology should be offered to M. Saint-Yves, called Marquis

* In the *bulletin* issued by the said gentlemen, it is questioned whether the President-Founder has the right to appoint officers *pro tem.* to vacant places. In the *Rules* of the T.S. may be found No. 7, which states: “The President-Founder has authority to designate any Fellow . . . to perform *pro tem.* the duties of any office vacated *by death* or resignation.” In the *Rules* of 1888, Art. 15 (*d*) declares that “in case of vacancies occurring during the year it shall be competent for the President, &c., &c. . .to nominate and appoint persons to fill such vacancies.” M. Louis Dramard, the late President and Founder of “Isis,” being dead, and confusion and disputes having arisen in consequence, it was expedient to set this rule in action, and nominate, *pro tem.*, in the name of the President-Founder, M. Gaboriau (a cofounder of the branch), as President “*de l’Isis*,” *subject to the approval* of the President in Council. Such nomination, even *pro tem.*, was forced by the despotic and illegal actions of three persons, two of whom were not even members, and who had, nevertheless, seizing the power in their hands, proclaimed themselves as sole proprietors and directors of the destinies of *l’Isis*.

d'Alveydre.* Some members formally opposed the resolution. But had it been even so, the Isis Lodge would have had no concern with it, these three gentlemen having no right to speak in the name of the Lodge. The gathering in the private rooms of M. Lejay has nothing in common with the meeting of the Isis Lodge, which took place at the same hour in the Salle Richefeu.

Yours fraternally,

F. K. Gaboriau,
President (*pro tem.*) of the Isis Lodge.

A. FROMENT.
(Hon. Secretary-Treasurer.)

* Who is M. Saint-Yves, Marquis d'Alveydre? He is not, nor ever was, a member of the Theosophical Society.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

July, 1888

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.†

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 11, July, 1888, pp. 410-414]

The object of this work, which is published in the form of twelve pamphlets, each averaging about twenty pages in length, is to prepare the reader for becoming a student of the Science of Healing by means of the Spirit, for this title (though somewhat lengthy) more accurately describes the so-called Science than the cognomen “Christian.” “Prepare the reader,” is also said advisedly; for the first ten of these pamphlets are chiefly occupied with the thesis that man’s beliefs with regard to the existence of matter being erroneous, he is thereby subject to certain illusions with regard to it, the chief of these being ill-health and disease. This is pure Berkeleyan philosophy, if not Platonism itself; Theosophists indeed, may claim for it a far older origin, for do not the early Brahmanic and Buddhist philosophies teach that all outward appearances, all phenomena, are illusion—Maya? However this

H. P. BLAVATSKY,
Corresponding Secretary of the T.S.

† *Statements of Christian Science. Comprised in eighteen lessons, and twelve sections.* By Ursula N. Gestefeld. Chicago, 1888.

may be, the application of the principle to the treatment of disease, if not actually new, is here presented to us in a novel form, and with a view to rendering its practice popular. It is philosophy reduced to its simplest expression. It is the physician’s highest art made common property. It is another claim to a “secret unveiled,” the secret of man’s being. And if, as the writer states, the present treatment of disease is the result of man’s belief in the reality of matter, it is doubtless necessary to begin by a somewhat lengthy chain of reasoning in order to convince him of his error, for man cannot understand what he really is so long as he pronounces upon himself as he sees only. “Not until he brings his higher powers into action, his discernment and perception, will he begin to perceive the truth about himself, which stands opposed to his own belief of himself. And never till he so perceives and understands will he reverse his decision upon himself. And never till he reverses it, will he grow into the consciousness of what he really is.” * He will remain, as the author puts it, in the Adam-state, subject to the law of matter, making to himself “graven images,” and falling down and worshipping them. And as “Adam is the model of

man as we see and know him to-day, Jesus is the model of what he is to become—consciously, as he is in reality—through his own work of regeneration and redemption.” . . . “It was this consciousness which was perfect realization, which gave him (Jesus) the power he manifested over sin, sickness and death, by which he healed the halt, the sick and the blind; by which he cast out devils and raised the dead.”† This consciousness is the chief point insisted upon in this stage of the work, for until this is realized, there is no possibility of the exercise of the healer’s power, except perhaps in a weak or partial manner. It is not therefore till we arrive at Section X that the treatment of disease is actually touched upon. In this section we are told that “what man in

* Section III, p. 18.

† Section VIII, p. 6.

his ignorance calls health is as much a belief as what he calls sickness,” and that “putting medicine into a stomach never yet changed a man’s conception of himself; but he has changed one conception or belief of his for another in consequence of his belief in the power of the medicine.” Conditions of ill-health are said to be nothing “but mental pictures which man creates for himself and believes in religiously.” We must therefore learn to dominate all those conditions to which we believe our bodies to be subject. Denial of the false, affirmation of the true, constantly in thought if not in word, is to be the first process for bringing about a change in man’s own body first, subsequently in that of others. If we deny sickness and suffering and all kinds of evil as no-things, nonexistent, not proceeding from the Infinite Mind, both as regards ourselves and all surrounding us, for all are parts of one Universal Whole (which is another purely Vedanto-Buddhistic tenet), we shall, by this transformation of the inward gradually act upon and cause a transformation of the outward, and overcome all discordant conditions, be they called sin, or suffering, or sickness. And as man is the creator of every form of sin and suffering, so is he also the transmitter of these through “Thought Transference”; diseases are communicated by this means “instead of through physical germs.” * The healer by means of “Christian Science” must attack the root of all disease, man’s belief about himself and others; he must treat the sufferer for his faults and for sin, of which his diseases are but the extreme expression, one disease being the same as another to a scientific healer. In treating little children, it is mainly the parents who have to be dealt with, their beliefs about the child, their fear and their anxiety.

The last section closes with some instructions as to the attitude and deportment of the healer towards his patient, but the whole treatment is to be spiritual, above and beyond the plane of material being.

* Section XI, p. 12.

Such is an imperfect digest of the teaching contained in Mrs. Gestefeld's twelve pamphlets. A candidate for "Christian Science" would have to study them in all their details; for it is only by dwelling and meditating on the principles therein set forth that one can arrive at the state of mind necessary for realizing the results to be attained. The Science of Being can be summed up in few words, but it cannot be so easily imparted, and many difficulties naturally occur to the student which require to be separately answered. A few of these must be stated at the outset.

To begin with, why premise by giving to a Science a qualification which does not belong to it? Why start with a *misnomer*? Why call it "Christian" rather than "Sufic," "Buddhist," or better than all, the "Yoga Science," the aim of which is preeminently to attain union with the Universal Spirit? We are told by the author, as also by several other professors of this new school, that it was through this *Science* that Jesus healed, and that it was this Science which he taught. We demur to the statement. There is nothing whatever in the New Testament to lead to such an idea or even suspicion; and there are no other documents known more authoritative to the Christians than the Gospels. The Sermon on the Mount, which is the very embodiment of Christ's teachings—Christianity in a nut-shell, so to say—is a code of preeminently *practical* as also impracticable rules of life, of daily observances, yet all on the plane of matter-of-fact earth-life. When you are told to turn your left cheek to him who smites you on the right, you are not commanded to *deny* the blow, but on the contrary to assert it by meekly bearing the offence; and in order not *to resist evil*, to turn (whether metaphorically or otherwise) your other cheek—*i.e.*, to invite your offender to repeat the action.

Again, when your "Son," or brother, or neighbour, asks of you bread, you are not invited to *deny* the hunger of him who asks, but to give him food; as otherwise you would indeed give him instead of fish "a serpent." Finally, sins, wickedness, diseases, etc., are not *denied* by Jesus, nor are their opposites, virtue, goodness and

health, anywhere *affirmed*. Otherwise, where would be the *raison d'être* for his alleged coming to save the world from the original sin? We know that "Christian Scientists" deny every theological dogma, from Eden downwards, as much as we do. Yet they affirm that which Jesus ever practically denied; and affirming (is it for the sake, and in view of the Christian majority in their audiences?), they are not in union with the Universal Spirit, which is—TRUTH.

Again, is it safe to entrust this occult power (for such it surely is) to the hands of the multitude? Did not Jesus, whom we are expressly told to take as our model, himself say:—"To you (who are disciples, initiates) it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven; but to others in parables"? Is there no danger that one who acquires this power of controlling the will and thoughts of others, and the conditions surrounding them, should fall from this high estate, and use his influence for bad purposes—in other words, that the *white* magic should become *black*? The very fact that Mrs. Gestefeld warns the healer never to give a treatment for any purpose but to make the Truth of Being manifest, "never for any personal gain," points to this possibility; she also warns, or I may say threatens, that if this should be attempted, the would-be healer will "descend at once to the plane of mortal mind." Perhaps this implies that the power will depart from him, but that this salutary consequence will accrue is scarcely made clear to the reader. She says, indeed, "You will be no Christian Scientist, but a mesmerist." But to certain people this would be no objection. Where then is the guarantee, the hall-mark, of the true Christian Scientist, by which he can be known to the unwary? If this, like other spiritual things, can only be "spiritually discerned," the patient must be equal to the healer, and will have no need of him.

Again, is it true that all our diseases are the result of wrong beliefs? The child, who has no belief, no knowledge or conception, true or false, on the subject of disease, catches scarlet fever through the transference of germs not through that of thought. One is tempted to ask,

like those of old, did the child sin or his parents? Will the answer of the Great Healer fit the case, *i.e.*, "Neither did this child sin nor his parents, but that the glory of God might be made manifest"? The "glory of the new *Christian Science*," then?—the "new" wine in very, very old bottles? And are there not among the renowned teachers of the new science, who are themselves afflicted by disease, often incurable, by pain and suffering? Will Mrs. Gestefeld, or some one nearer home, explain?

Then further, in the case of widespread epidemics, such as cholera, we know that to a certain extent these are the consequence of man's sin, his neglect of hygienic laws, of cleanliness and good drainage, and, in proportion as these laws are obeyed, to a certain extent preventable. But there are also climatic conditions, as in the last visitation of cholera in 1884, when the epidemic seemed confined to certain areas, following some law of atmospheric currents, or other undetected, but not undiscoverable, physical cause. Can these be overcome by Christian Science? How is it they do not yield to a whole nation's fervent prayers?—for prayer, when in earnest, is surely, at least, when accompanied by virtuous living, a *mode* of Christian Science, of intense WILL? And do we not see the holiest and the best, and those, too, not living in ignorance or in defiance of law, spiritual, moral, mental, or hygienic, fall victims to disease, and only able to preserve life at all with the utmost, almost abnormal, care and precaution?

But “Christian Science” goes further than that. At a lecture, in London, it was distinctly asserted that every physical disease arises from, and is the direct effect of, a mental disease or vice: *e.g.*, “Bright’s disease of the kidneys is always produced in persons who are untruthful, and who practise deception.” Query, Would not, in this case, the whole black fraternity of Loyola, every diplomat, advocate and lawyer, as the majority of tradesmen and merchants, be incurably afflicted with this terrible evil? Shall we be next told that cancer on the tongue or in the throat is produced by those who backbite and slander their fellow men? It would be well-deserved

Karma, were it so. Unfortunately, some recent cases of this dreadful disease, carrying off two of the best, most noble-hearted and truthful men living, would give a glaring denial to such an assertion.

“Christian” (or mental) *Scientists* assert, furthermore, that the healer can work on a patient (even one whom he has never seen) as easily thousands of miles away, as a few yards off. Were this so, and the practice to become universal, it would hardly be a pleasant thing to know that wherever one might be, occult currents are directed towards one from unknown well-wishers at a distance, whether one wants them or not. If, on the one hand, it is rather agreeable, and even useful, in this age of slander to have other people *denying* your faults and vices, and thus saving you from telling lies yourself; on the other hand, it would cut from under one’s feet every possibility of amending one’s nature through personal exertion, and would deprive one at the same time of every personal merit in the matter. Karma would hardly be satisfied with such an easy arrangement.

This world would witness strange sights and the next one (a reincarnationist would say “the next rebirth”) terrible disappointments. Whether viewed from the standpoint of theists, Christians, or the followers of Eastern philosophy, such an arrangement would satisfy very few minds. Disease, mental characteristics and shortcomings, are always effects produced by causes: the natural effect of Karma, the unerring Law of Retribution, as we would say; and one gets into a curious jumble when trying to work along certain given lines of this “Christian Science” theory. Will its teachers give us more definite statements as to the general workings of their theories?

In conclusion, were these theories to prove true, their practice would only be our old friend magnetism, or *hypnotism* rather, with all its undeniable dangers, only on a gigantic universal scale; hence a thousand times more dangerous for the human family at large, than is the former. For no magnetizer can work upon a person whom he has never seen or come in contact with—and this is one blessing, at any rate. And this is not the case

with mental or “Christian” Science, since we are distinctly told that we can work on perfect strangers, those we *have never met*, and who are thousands of miles away from us. In such case, and as a first benefit, our civilized centres would do well to have their clergy and Christian communities learn the “Science.” This would save millions of pounds sterling now scraped off the bones of the starving multitudes and sunk into the insatiable digestive organs of missionary funds. Missionaries, in fact, would become useless—and this would become blessing number two. For henceforth they would have but to meet in small groups and send currents of Will beyond the “black waters” to obtain all they are striving for. Let them *deny* that the heathens are not Christians, and *affirm* that they are baptized, even without contact. Thus the whole world would be saved, and private capital likewise.

Of course it may so happen that our “heathen” brethren who have had the now called “Christian” science at their finger ends ever since the days of Kapila and Patañjali, may take it into their heads to reverse the current and set it in motion in an opposite direction. They may *deny* in their turn that their Christian persecutors have one- iota of Christianity in them. They may *affirm* that the whole of Christendom is eaten through to the backbone with diseases resulting from the seven capital sins; that millions drink themselves to death and other millions (governments included) force them to do so by building two public houses to every church, a fact which even a Christian Scientist could hardly make away with if he denied it till the next pralaya. Thus the heathen would have an advantage over the Christian Scientist in his denials and affirmations, inasmuch as he would only be telling the truth; while, by denying disease and evil, his Western colleague is simply flying into the face of fact and encouraging the unwary mystic to *ignore* instead of *killing* his sinful nature.

The present criticism may be a mistaken one, and we may have misunderstood the “Science” under analysis, in which, however, we recognise a very old acquaintance,

namely, Dhyâna, “abstract meditation.” But so much the greater the necessity for a definite explanation. For these are questions we would fain have answered, precisely in the interest of that *old* Science reborn under a new mask, and because it must be the desire of every true follower of Eastern Theosophy to see the doctrine of self-oblivion and altruism, as against selfishness and personality, more widely understood and practised than at present.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

July, 1887

WHAT IS GOD?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 11, July, 1888, pp. 417-420]

[All the footnotes in this article, signed "Ed.," are by H.P.B.]

I wish to thank you for reply to my former communication. I find I agree to an extent with your thought, but not wholly. With your permission I will open out my thought on this great subject a little more, if useful.

I have no conception of Infinite and Boundless as positive existence. The Eternal or Absolute Void may be said to be Infinite and Boundless, but this Void is nothing, and of which nothing can be predicated; so that Infinite or Boundless and Absolute in this respect are nonexistent.* You seem to identify Deity with the Original Nothing, the absolute Negation. But such Deity has nothing to do with what we call the Something or the Real, and existence is quite independent of it.† If Deity or God is the same as Absolute Nothing, and all things came from Him or It, then something has come from nothing,

* To some minds, very likely. In the opinion of a Vedantin or an Eastern Occultist this "Boundless" is the one deity and the one reality in this universe of Maya, and it is the one *everlasting and uncreated* principle—everything else being illusionary, because finite, conditioned and transitory.—ED.

† It cannot be *independent*, since "existence" is precisely that Deity which we call "Absolute Existence," of which nothing can be "independent."

WHAT IS GOD?

43

which, philosophy declares, cannot be.* The real, as opposed to the unreal, can alone produce that which is real, whatever kind of reality it be, divine, spiritual or natural. In plain words nothing can produce nothing. Something only can produce itself in varied differentiations.† Nothing is the Infinite. The Something (universal reality or the all) is the Finite; but (if you like) Infinite in this sense that, being all-inclusive, it is bounded by nothing beyond it. If Deity has originated form, size, number and motion as attributes of the concrete—spiritual or nature ‡—how could He (allow me to use this pronoun) so have done unless these in some way are in Himself. As He has originated *all* conditions, He surely possesses in Himself the original of these conditions; and though He is not conditioned by anything beyond or greater than himself, yet He is Himself the sum total of conditions. That is, He is the *all* of conditions.§ As I take it, Deity is the All of the Universe in its first, original or originating form, and what we call the evolved universe is Deity in his last or ultimate form. It is as if Deity out-breathed Himself forth into vastitude, then in-breathed Himself back into minitude.|| He

* Which philosophy? Not Eastern philosophy and metaphysics—the oldest of all.

Nothing cannot come out of or from another nothing—if the latter word is accepted in our finite sense. All comes from Nothing, or NO-THING, En-Soph, the Boundless (to us) *nothingness!* but on the plane of Spirit the noumenon of ALL.—ED.

† Our correspondent is very little acquainted, we see, with occult Eastern ideas and true metaphysics. The deity he calls “Nothing” and we “No-thing” can produce nothing, for the simple reason that IT is in itself ALL, the Infinite, Boundless and Absolute, and that even IT *could never produce anything outside of itself*, since whatever manifests is ITSELF.—ED.

‡ Lightning is produced by electricity, and is an *aspect* of the concealed Cause. And because that Cause originates the phenomenon shall we call it “lightning” and a “He”?—ED.

§ And why not “She,” the ALL? Just as natural one as the other, and, in our opinion, quite as incongruous.—ED.

|| Say, at once, “itself,” instead of “Himself,” and do not make it a personal (on our plane) *conscious* action and you will be nearer the mark of our occult teachings.

is thus the all of substance as to Being, and the all of Form and of motions as to Truth. It is an alternation of states, the one the state of concentration, the other the state of diffusion or expansion. The Alpha and Omega, making true the saying “the first shall be the last, and the last shall be the first.” The Microcosm becomes the Macrocosm [?!] and this again resolves itself back into the Microcosmic form and state. The going forth of Deity from the self to the not-self and back again to the self constitutes in the motions the Age of ages or Eternity, and is the all of Truth, the all of cosmic and universal history.*

Of course the evolved, universal form, being a result, as to state, is not absolute or personal Deity, but only his image or reflection the shadow of the real as it were, an administration of the Original Being. I may here be expressing the same as you mean, when you call phenomena Maya or illusion, not being absolutely permanent. Yes, yet phenomena are real as appearances. The Mayavic World is real while it is Mayavic, just as a snowflake is until it melts.

I have said that the All, as the *little* Universe evolves itself into the form and state of the vast universe; but in the process it exhausts its potencies, and at this stage the evolution begins to cease, and involution begins; and Deity the *little* is recuperated by re-absorbing the substances and forms of the Mayavic Universe, which thus in the process of ages ceases to be, returning to the Nirvanic state of Deific concentrated. Now—a Vedantist would say—Brahm sleeps on the lotus, and will awake anew to create another Mayavic Universe. †

* This is Kabalistic and, on the whole, correct, but too indefinite for esoteric philosophy. Does our critic mean to say that it is the microcosm which becomes the Macrocosm, instead of the reverse? (See Editors’ *Notes* at the end).—ED.

† Aye, Brahmâ “sleeps” on the lotus during the “nights,” and between the “days” of Brahma (neuter). But Brahmâ, the Creator, *dies* and *disappears* when his age is at an end, and the hour for the MAHA PRALAYA strikes. Then NO-THING reigns supreme and alone in Boundless Infinitude and that No-thing is non-differentiated space which is no-space, and the ABSOLUTE, “The most excellent *male* is worshipped by men, but the soul of wisdom, THAT in *which there are no attributes of name or form* is worshipped by Sages (*Yogins*)”

(*Vishnu-Purana*). This, then, is the point of difference with your correspondent.

The imperfect attempts at statement are but general, and do exclude all that can be conceived and known of the manifold planes and ranks of intelligent beings that exist in the manifold universe. You seem to think I am very materialistic in thought. But mystical thought that denies form to Spirit and thus to Deity, is no proof of superiority or spirituality of intelligence.*

You will perceive the point toward which my line of thought strains. The beings on the highest ranges of the Universe are far more glorious in form than those on the lower ranges. Those on the terrestrial globes, such as ourselves, are the most shadowy, as to our outer forms. He who centres the myriadal hosts of His children, must be the most and all-glorious.† But surely this is because He must be the most *concentrated* in substance and the most *complex* in his form, inconceivably so. The human forms of the Elohim are as floating shadows compared to Him. His form, as to organization and shape, is the Human, the dual human. [!] The infinitesimal cells in His body are the germ points of Solar Systems, to be realized during the ages in the Mayavic expanses.‡

Each plane of existence is organic, and the most refined is the most dense and vital and potential. All Spirits are human forms, all the Elohim (if you like)—male and female—or two in one—are human forms. In fact, existence is form, Life is form, Intelligence, Love and the human affections are based upon and held in the continent of the human organization, and all lesser or fragmentary formations of mineral, vegetable, animal or sphered world, are its production. It is the one Truth, the eternal, the uncreated and

* None whatever. It only denotes better knowledge of metaphysics. That which *has form cannot be absolute*. That which is conditioned or bounded by either space, time, or any limitation of human conception and growth—cannot be INFINITE, still less ETERNAL.—ED.

† Undeniably so, “He who centres the myriadal hosts” is not ABSOLUTE DEITY, not even its LOGOS, *Aja* (the unborn), but at best Adam-Kadmon, the *Tetragrammaton* of the Greeks, and the Brahma-Vishnu on the Lotus of Space, the HE which disappears with the “Age of Brahm.”—ED.

‡ Just so, and this is Adam-Kadmon, the heavenly man, the “male-female” or the symbol of the material manifested Universe, whose 10 limbs (or 10 Sephiroth, the numbers) correspond to the zones of the universe, the 3 in 1 of the upper and the 7 of the lower planes.—ED.

unimagined, the continent of universal particulars, The All Father-Mother in whom we and all things live and move and have our being.—Respectfully yours,

EDITORS' NOTE.—The writer seems a little confused in his ideas. He launches in one place into verbal pantheism and then uses language embodying the most curious anthropomorphic conceptions. Deity, for instance, is regarded as “outbreathing Himself into vastitude,” and as the “*all* of substance as to Being, and the *all* of Form and motions, as to Truth.” Later on “he” is described as an apparently gigantic organism: “His form. . . . is *the Human*, the *dual human*.” The “*all* of Forms” and conditions, merely an enormous hermaphrodite? Why not a monkey or elephant, or, still better, a mosaic pieced together out of all the different organic types? It is unphilosophical to regard such a *thing* as the “*All of forms*,” if it only reproduces the *human* organization, though it may be strictly *theological*.

In another place the writer speaks of this anomalous creature—the “All Father-Mother”—as “unimaginable.” After allusions to the function of its organic cells, its human organization, its substance and relation to the Universe, etc., this epithet appears sufficiently bewildering. We are also assured that “what we call the evolved universe is Deity in his last or ultimate form.” Has Deity, then, several forms or states? Obviously so, if our critic is identifying him with plane after plane in this summary fashion. Such an interpretation would, however, result in the dethronement of the big Hermaphrodite, the only form Deity patronizes, according to his present biographer.

All argument based on the idea of reading such qualities as “form, size, number and motion,” etc., into Deity is necessarily worthless. It utterly ignores the distinction between Substance and Attribute. Notice, also, such obvious objections as the following:—(1) If Deity is a *form*, he cannot be Infinite because form implies a boundary line somewhere. (2) If Deity can be *numbered*, polytheism is a truth. (3) If it possesses *size*, it is no

longer Absolute, size being a relative notion derived from phenomena. (4) *Motion* again involves limitation, inasmuch as it only means the passage *through space* of an object. Deity if infinite can have nothing to traverse, and like contradictions.

Our critic objects to being classed among materialistic thinkers; unfortunately for him it is his own writings that denounce him as such. For a Deity in form, obviously possesses *all the qualities which make up matter*, viz., extension in space, form, size, etc. He must even possess that of colour, to be distinguishable from other objects of perception according to him! Where then are we to stop?

Mr. Hunter's conceptions are, in fact, so extremely unspiritual, that they far outvie in “materialism” the utterances of the most “advanced” agnostics, who, at least, grasp one fact, viz:—that the realm of matter and the realm of mind cannot be jumbled up at random.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

July, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 11, July, 1888, pp. 393, 415]

Abhiñña—the six transcendent faculties obtained by the Yogis or Arhats, after which come the *Iddhi*, the supernatural powers.

[in reference to a writer's statement that the Devachanic state “. . . is purely a state of bliss, in which man receives compensation for the undeserved misery of his past life.”]

Quite correct; but it is not the *injustice* or *mistakes* of Karma which are the causes of such “undeserved misery,” but other causes, independent of the past Karma of either the producer or the innocent victim of their effects, new *actions* generated by the wickedness of men and circumstances; and which arouse Karmic law to fresh activity, *i.e.*, the punishment of those who caused these new *Nidânas* (or causal connections), and the reward of him who suffered from them undeservedly.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

July, 1888

48

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

PSYCHOLOGIE DE L'ÉGYPTE ANCIENNE

(Notes importantes)

[*Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. III, No. 16, juillet 1888, pp. 202-206]

Dans le No. 14 du *Lotus* [mai, 1888, p. 105] se trouve un article de Franz Lambert traduit du *Sphinx*, contenant le passage suivant, transcription d'une tablette qui représente l'arrivée du défunt:

On y voit le défunt labourant *les Champs-Élysées*, les semant et récoltant. Le froment y a 7 aunes de hauteur, les épis en ont 3 et la paille 4. Sur la moisson il prélève une offrande pour *Hapi, le dieu de l'abondance*, etc.

J'ai souligné les erreurs, et voici pourquoi: dans le *Livre des Morts*, chap. CIX, versets 4 et 5, le défunt s'exprime ainsi:

Je connais ce champ d'Aanrou à enceinte de fer, dont le froment a sept coudées de hauteur: son épi a trois coudées, sa tige en a quatre, etc.

Hapi n'est pas le dieu de l'abondance. Lorsqu'on le trouve dans une cérémonie où la momie joue le rôle principal, c'est un des *Génies funéraires*. *Hapi* personnifie l'eau terrestre ou le Nil dans son rôle primordial, comme *Noun* personnifie l'eau céleste. C'est un des «Sept Lumineux» * qui accompagnent *Osiris-Soleil*. Au chapitre XVII [versets 38 et 39] du *Livre des Morts* il est dit: «Les Sept Lumineux, ce sont *Amsset, Hapi, Tiaumaufef, Kebhsennouf, Maa-tef-f, Ker-bek-f, Har-khent-an-mer-ti*; *Anubis* les a placés en protecteurs du sarcophage d'*Osiris* [le Soleil pendant l'éclipse et la nuit]». *Hapi*, comme *Amsset* qui le précède, est un génie psychopompe (*Mercur*e), qui reçoit sept dons d'*Osiris-Soleil*, peut-être bien parce que *Mercur*e reçoit sept fois plus de lumière du Soleil que la Terre.

* Les Sept Esprits planétaires.

Dans la hiérarchie céleste des Archanges de la présence, ou «les Sept yeux du Seigneur», Hapi et Amset correspondent à Gabriel, le Messager, et à Michel, le patron de tous les golfes et promontoires, qui tous deux personnifient l'eau terrestre ainsi que Hapi. Quelques-uns de nos pieux amis se récrieront ici. Ils diront: Gabriel et Michel ne sont pas des dieux psychopompe; ce dernier est l'*Archistrategus*, le général en chef de l'armée du Seigneur, le Vainqueur du Dragon-Satan, le *Victor diaboli*, tandis que Gabriel est le «*Fortitudo Dei*» et son Messager. Parfaitement. J'ajouterai même que Michel est le *Quis ut Deus*, si cela leur fait plaisir. Cela n'empêche pas qu'ils sont tous les deux notre Hapi et notre Amset égyptiens à tour de rôle. Car cet Hapi, cet «œil du soleil», sa flamme, est le chef «des divins chefs», qui avec six autres accompagne Osiris-Soleil «pour brûler les âmes de ses ennemis» * et qui tue le grand Ennemi, l'ombre de Typhon-Set, autrement dit le Dragon. L'Église catholique appelle ce septénaire *NL8"6\J0l*, gardien vigilant, parce que c'est précisément son nom dans le *Livre des Morts*, les «Sept Lumineux» étant les gardiens du sarcophage d'Osiris. Voyez plutôt le marquis de Mirvillè qui s'en vante dans son *Mémoire à l'Académie*.

Mais il ne s'agit pas précisément ici d'Amset ou d'Hapi, et nous pouvons laisser un instant Gabriel et Michel sur leurs planètes respectives. Ce dont il est question, c'est des notes intéressantes de Ch. Barlet. Il attire l'attention du lecteur sur «les innombrables concordances» que présente le susdit article avec les doctrines des théosophes. Il donne quelques exemples, mais il en laisse passer un des plus remarquables. Je veux parler des versets cités du *Livre des Morts*, concernant le défunt au champ d'Aanrou. Ce chapitre est la plus éclatante corroboration des sept principes de l'homme que l'on puisse trouver dans la religion ésotérique de la vieille Égypte.

Le lecteur est prévenu de ne pas chercher ces analogies ou concordances entre les deux systèmes ésotérique et

* *Livre des Mork*, chap. XVII, verset 37,

exotérique dans les traductions de nos orientalistes. Car ces Messieurs ont pour habitude de mettre plus de fantaisie que de vérité dans leurs interprétations. Adressons-nous plutôt à la Cabbale. Là le système septénaire nous offre la table suivante:

Les Sept mondes ou plans du kosmos visible

1 ^{er} MONDE	* * *	Ararita	אֲרַרִיטָא	Asher Eheich	אֲשֶׁר־עִיִּיךְ	* * *	* * *	Les 7 lettres du Nom divin
2 ^e MONDE	Zadkiel	Uriel	Samael	Raphael	Haniel	Gabriel	Mikael	Les 7 anges de la Présence
3 ^e MONDE	Saturne	Jupiter	Mars	Soleil	Vénus	Mercure	Lune	Les 7 planètes

Le reste est inutile. Je ne donne que les trois premiers mondes avec leurs Anges et leurs Planètes correspondant aux sept lettres divines. Les noms des Anges, à part les deux premiers, sont des substituts; ils s'interchangent d'ailleurs entre eux et avec les planètes. Il n'y a que Gabriel qui soient resté fidèle à son Mercure, bien que, pour des raisons fort connues,* l'Église donne aujourd'hui à Gabriel, Jupiter pour planète. Michel balance entre le Soleil et la Lune. Mais comme ces deux planètes étaient, dans l'ésotérisme égyptien, les yeux du Seigneur—le Soleil étant l'œil d'Osiris pendant le jour, et la Lune, l'œil d'Osiris pendant la nuit—elles sont interchangeables.

Partant de là, il sera facile de comprendre le reste. Le champ d'Aanrou est le *Devachan*. Le froment semé et récolté par le défunt et qui a sept coudées de hauteur représente le karma semé et récolté par les sept principes

* Le petit scandale produit au VIII^e siècle par le sorcier-évêque Adalbert de Bavière qui compromit ce pauvre Uriel.


du mort durant sa vie. L'épi qui a trois coudées est le trinaire supérieur (*Atma, Buddhi* et l'arome de *Manas*), ou le triangle supérieur.*



Les quatre coudées (la tige ou la paille), sont les quatre principes inférieurs (*kama rupa*, le corps astral, le principe vital, l' vital), représentés par le carré.




Or, l'homme a toujours été figuré dans les symboles géométriques, ainsi:



* Les lecteurs qui ont suivi attentivement l'enseignement donné par *Le Lotus* comprendront aisément toutes ces choses et celles qui suivent; quant aux autres, nous ne pouvons leur donner que le conseil de lire *Le Lotus* depuis le commencement (*N. de la Direction*).

En Égypte c'était le *tau* symbolique, la *croix ansée*:



Ceci est la représentation de l'*homme*. Le cercle ou l'anse qui surmonte le *tau* est une tête humaine. C'est l'*homme crucifié dans l'espace* de Platon, ou le *Wittoba* des Indous (Voir Moor's *Hindoo Pantheon*). En hébreu le mot *homme* se rend par *Anosh*, et comme le dit Seyffarth, ce signe

«représente, je crois, le crâne avec le cerveau, siège de l'âme, et les nerfs s'étendant vers l'épine dorsale, le dos, les yeux ou les oreilles. En effet, la pierre Tanis le traduit constamment par *anthropos* (homme), et ce mot écrit alphabétiquement en égyptien est *ank*. En copte c'est également *ank*, *vita*, ou mieux *anima*, ce qui

correspond à l'*anosh*, **:&1!**, des Hébreux, signifiant précisément *anima*. **:&1!** est le primitif **+&1!** pour *****1!** (le pronom personnel «je»). *Anki*, en égyptien, se traduit: *mon âme*».

Il est intéressant que Seyffarth traduit numériquement * *Anosh*, cet équivalent hébreu pour l'*homme*, par 365—1, ce qui pourrait signifier 365+1=366, ou bien 365—1=364, ou les phases des temps de l'année solaire, montrant ainsi ses relations astronomiques.†

* Rappelons aux lecteurs qu'en cabbale on doit tenir compte de la valeur numérique des lettres: **:** ou *sh* vaut 3; **&** ou *o* vaut 6, etc.

Nous demandons pardon aux cabbalistes de cette note un peu naïve, mais nous faisons notre possible pour être clair vis-à-vis des lecteurs qui sont novices en ces choses (*N. de la Direction*).

† J. Ralston Skinner, *Source of Measures*, p. 53.

Nous voyons donc que l'année solaire, ou plutôt le nombre de ses jours, se trouve correspondre à l'homme septénaire, ou *deux fois* septénaire, car nous avons l'homme psychique aux sept principes ou plans éthérés et l'homme physique dont la division est la même, ce qui fait 14 et correspond aux trois chiffres 3, 6, 5,=14. Voyons si l'œil nocturne d'Osiris, la lune ou le symbole duJéhovah hébreu, y correspond. Il est dit dans un manuscrit non publié et for cabbalistique:

Les anciens ont toujours fait un usage mystérieux des nombres 3 et 4, composants du nombre 7. Une des principales propriétés de ce chiffre ainsi divisé, c'est que, si nous multiplions 20612* par 4/3, le produit nous donnera une base pour la détermination de la révolution moyenne de la lune et si nous multiplions encore ce produit par 4/3 nous aurons une base pour trouver la période exacte de l'année solaire moyenne.†

Maintenant, examinez bien la croix anséc ésotérique des Égyptiens. La croix c'est le cube déployé dont les six faces nous donnent le septénaire, car nous avons 4 en ligne verticale et 3 en ligne horizontale, ce qui fait 7, la cellule du milieu étant commune aux deux lignes. Le 4 et le 3 sont les nombres les plus ésotériques, car 7 est le nombre de la vie, le nombre de la nature même, comme il est aisé de le prouver en se reportant aux règnes végétal et minéral. 3 est l'esprit; 4 est la matière. Mais dans le symbole en question qui est purement phallique, puisqu'il représente l'homme vivant et septénaire, c'est le 4 qui correspond à la ligne mâle; c'est, en effet, le *Tétragrammaton*, le *Tétraktys* sur le plan inférieur, «l'Homme céleste» ou AdamKadmon, le mâle-femelle (c'est-à-dire Jah-vah ou

* Ce nombre est le numérateur de 20612/6561 d'où l'on tire le nombre 7r, rapport du diamètre à la circonférence (*N. de la Direction*).

† [From an hitherto unpublished MS of J. Ralston Skinner in the Adyar Archives, comprehensive information about which may be found in Vol. VIII, pp. 219-20 (Note 6) in the present Series. —*Compiler.*]

Jéhovah); ou bien encore Chochma et Binah (la Sagesse et l'Intelligence, le divin Hermaphrodite), sur notre plan cosmique et terrestre. La ligne horizontale des trois surfaces du cube est le principe féminin. C'est *Jéhovah-Ève* de la race pré-Adamique, qui, comme Brahmâ-Vâch, se sépare en deux sexes. Cette Ève, qui fut la *Sophia* ou le Saint-Esprit * des Gnostiques, donna naissance à Caïn-Abel, le mâle et la femelle sur terre dans la race d'Adam (Voir dans *The Secret Doctrine*, mes Notes sur Caïn et Abel).

Une fois dans l'autre monde, les principes constitutifs du défunt se séparent de la manière suivante: 1, le principe vital quitte le corps; 2, le corps se dissout; l'esprit astral s'évapore avec le dernier atome physique. Il reste du *quaternaire* inférieur le *Kama rupa*, c'est-à-dire le périsprit de l'homme animal. Quant au *ternaire* supérieur, il quitte le quaternaire inférieur; et l'Esprit avec son véhicule l'Âme divine, accompagnés de l'*arome spirituel* du *manas*, réunis dans l'Unité de l'Ego immortel, se trouvent dans l'état heureux de *Devachan*. Le périsprit (âme animale) ne conserve de la partie inférieur de *manas* (âme humaine) que juste assez d'instinct pour rechercher des médiums à vampiriser. Sa destinée est de s'évaporer un jour. En attendant, il ne vit que de la vie et de l'intelligence des vivants (médiums et croyants), qui sont assez faibles pour se laisser posséder: c'est donc une misérable vie d'emprunt.

Et voilà ce que veulent dire les 3 coudées des épis et les 4 coudées de la tige du froment qui croit dans les Champs d'Aanrou.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

* Voyez «l'Évangile apocryphe (?) des Hébreux» où l'auteur fait dire à Jésus: «Ma Mère, le Saint-Esprit, me prit par un cheveu de la tête et me transporta sur le mont Thabor». Je traduis l'original.

[This passage is quoted by Origen in his *Comm. in Evang. Joannis*, tom. II, p. 64, thus: "Modo accepit me Mater mea Sanctus Spiritus, uno capillorum meorum, et me in montem magnum Thabor portavit."—*Compiler.*]

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
July, 1888

PSYCHOLOGY OF ANCIENT EGYPT

55

PSYCHOLOGY OF ANCIENT EGYPT

(*Important Notes*)

[*Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. III, No. 16, July, 1888, pp. 202-206]

[*Translation of the foregoing original French text.*]

In No. 14 of *Le Lotus* [May, 1888, p. 105] an article will be found by Franz Lambert translated from the *Sphinx* containing the following passage, a transcription of a tablet representing the arrival of the deceased

“Here we see the deceased working in *the Elysian Fields*, sowing and reaping them. The barley therein is 7 ells high, the ears 3, and the straw 4. From the harvest he sets aside an offering for *Hapi, the god of abundance*, etc.” *

I have underlined the errors, and for this reason: in the *Book of the Dead*, Chap. CIX, verses 4 and 5, the deceased expresses himself as follows:

“I know this field of Aanru with an iron enclosure; its barley is seven cubits high: its ear is *three* cubits, its stalk is *four*, etc.” †

Hapi is not the god of abundance. When he is found in a ceremony where the mummy plays the chief part he is one of the *funerary Genii*. Hapi personifies the

* [This passage is quoted from the second instalment of an essay by Franz Lambert on the “Psychology of Ancient Egypt,” which originally appeared in German in the pages of the *Sphinx*, a magazine published in Leipzig, Germany, by Dr. William Hübbe-Schleiden. Its original title was “Die altägyptische Seelenlehre,” and a French translation thereof appeared in *Le Lotus*, the monthly Journal of the “Isis” Branch of the T.S. in Paris, and may be found in Vol. III, April, May and June, 1888. It contains, among other subjects of great interest, a comparison of the Egyptian and the Kabalistic divisions of man’s constitution.—*Compiler*.]

† [There seems to be some uncertainty about the verses of Chapter CIX which H.P.B. refers to in making her quotation. In Sir E. A. Wallis Budge’s English translation of the Theban Recension of *The Book of the Dead* (2nd ed., rev. and enl., 3rd impression, London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., and New York, E.P. Dutton & Co., 1928), this subject is treated of in verses 7 and 8 of Chapter CIX (page 318 of the work). We quote Budge’s text, for the benefit of the students:

terrestrial water, or the Nile in its primordial aspect, as Nun personifies the celestial water. He is one of the “Seven Luminous Ones” * who accompany Osiris-Sun. In Chap. XVII, verses 38 and 39, of the *Book of the Dead*, it says: “The Seven Luminous Ones are Amset, Hapi, Tiaumauf, Kebhsennouf, Maa-tef-f, Ker-bek-f, Harkhent-an-mer-ti; Anubis placed them as protectors of the sarcophagus of Osiris [the Sun during eclipse and at night].” Hapi, like Amset who precedes him, is a psychopompic genius (Mercury), who receives seven gifts from Osiris-Sun, perhaps really *because Mercury receives seven times more light from the Sun than does the Earth*.

In the celestial hierarchy of the Archangels of the presence, or “the Seven Eyes of the Lord,” Hapi and Amset correspond to Gabriel, the Messenger, and to Michael, the patron of all gulfs and promontories, who both like Hapi, personify the terrestrial water. Some of our pious friends will protest at this. They will say: Gabriel and Michael are not psychopompic gods; the latter is the *Archistrategus*, the commander-in-chief of the army of the Lord, the Conqueror of the Dragon-Satan, the *Victor diaboli*, while Gabriel is the “*Fortitudo Dei*” and his Messenger. Precisely. I will even add that Michael is the *Quis ut Deus*, if that makes them happy. That does not prevent them both from being our Egyptian Hapi and Amset in turn. Because this Hapi, this “Eye of the Sun,” its flame, is the chief “of the divine chiefs” who with six others accompanies Osiris-Sun “to burn the souls of his enemies” † and who kills the great Enemy,

“ . . . I, even I, know the Sekhet-Aarru of (7) Ra, the walls of which are of iron. The height of the wheat therein is five cubits, of the ears thereof two cubits, and of the stalks thereof three cubits. (8) The barley therein is [in height] seven cubits, the ears thereof are three cubits, and the stalks thereof are four cubits. . . .” There is no mention of Hapi in this Recension. It is therefore possible that another Recension, such as the Saitic, may have been meant.—*Compiler*.]

* The Seven Planetary Spirits.

† *The Book of the Dead*, Chap. XVII, verse 37.

the shadow of Typhon-Set; in other words, the Dragon. The Catholic Church calls this septenary *NL8"6J0I*, vigilant guardian, because that is precisely its name in the *Book of the Dead*, the “Seven Luminous Ones” being the guardians of the Sarcophagus of Osiris. Look for yourself in the Marquis de Mirville’s *Mémoire à l’Académie*, where he boasts of it.

But the point at issue is not exactly Amset or Hapi, and we may leave Gabriel and Michael on their respective planets for a moment. The real question bears on some interesting notes by Charles Barlet. He draws the attention of the reader to “the innumerable concordances” which the aforesaid article presents with the doctrines of the Theosophists. He gives some examples but he leaves out one of the most remarkable ones. I have in mind the verses quoted from the *Book of the Dead*, concerning the deceased in

the field of Aanru. This chapter is the most brilliant corroboration of the seven principles of man that can be found in the esoteric religion of ancient Egypt.

The reader is warned not to seek these analogies or concordances between the two systems, esoteric and exoteric, in the translations of our Orientalists. For these gentlemen are accustomed to put more fancy than truth into their interpretations. Let us rather refer to the Kabala. The septenary system in it offers us the following table:

The Seven worlds or planes of the visible kosmos

1st WORLD	* * *	Ararita	אֲרַרִיטָא	Asher Eheich	אֲשֵׁר־עֵיִיךָ	* * *	* * *	<i>The 7 letters of the Divine Name</i>
2nd WORLD	Zadkiel	Uriel	Samael	Raphael	Haniel	Gabriel	Mikael	<i>The 7 angels of the Presence</i>
3rd WORLD	Saturn	Jupiter	Mars	Sun	Venus	Mercury	Moon	<i>The 7 Planets</i>

The rest is useless. I give only the first three worlds with their Angels and their Planets corresponding to the seven divine letters. The names of the Angels, aside from the first two, are substitutes; they are, moreover, interchangeable among themselves and with the planets. Gabriel alone has remained faithful to his Mercury, although for very well-known reasons * the Church gives Jupiter to Gabriel for his planet today. Michael balances between the Sun and the Moon. But as these two planets were, in Egyptian esotericism, the Eyes of the Lord—the Sun being the eye of Osiris by day, and the Moon the eye of Osiris by night—they are interchangeable.


Starting from this, the rest will be easy to understand. The field of Aanru is *Devachan*. The wheat sown and reaped by the defunct, and which is seven cubits tall, represents the *karma* sown and reaped by the seven principles of the dead during his life. The ear of three cubits is the upper triad (*Ātman*, *Buddhi*, and the aroma of *Manas*) or the upper triangle: †



* The little scandal produced in the VIIIth Century by the Sorcerer-Bishop Adalbert of Bavaria who compromised that poor Uriel.

† Readers who have carefully followed the teaching given in *Le Lotus* will easily comprehend all these things and those to follow; as for others we may advise them to read *Le Lotus* from the beginning (Editor, *Le Lotus*).


The four cubits (the stalk or straw) are the four lower principles (*kâma-rûpa*, the astral body, the vital principle, the vital man), represented by the square.



For man has always been shown thus in geometrical symbols:



In Egypt it was the symbolic *tau*, the *ansated cross*:



This is the representation of *man*. The circle or handle which surmounts the *tau* is a human head. It is the *man crucified in space* of Plato, or the *Wittoba* of the Hindus (See

Edward Moor's *Hindoo Pantheon*). * In Hebrew the word *man* is rendered by *Anosh*, and, as Seyffarth says:

“It represents, as I now believe, the skull with the brains, the seat of the soul, and with the nerves extending to the spine, back, and eyes or ears. For the Tanis stone translates it repeatedly by *anthropos* (man), and this very word is alphabetically written (Egyptian) *ank*. Hence we have the Coptic *ank*, vita, properly *anima*, which corresponds with the Hebrew :**\$1!**, *anosh*, properly meaning *anima*. This :**&1!** is the primitive +**&1!** for ***1!** (the personal pronoun I). The Egyptian *Anki* signifies *my soul*.”

It is curious that this Hebrew equivalent, *Anosh*, for “man,” by Mr. Seyffarth, reads numerically † 365—1, which could be intended to mean either 365 + 1=366, or 365—1=364, or the time phases of the solar year, thus shadowing forth the astronomical connection.‡

We see, then, that the solar year, or rather the number of its days, is found to correspond with the septenary man, or *twice* septenary, for we have the psychic man of seven principles or etheric planes, and the physical man whose division is the same. This makes 14 and corresponds to the three digits 3, 6, 5=14. Let us see if the nocturnal eye of Osiris, the Moon or the symbol of the Hebrew Jehovah, corresponds to that. It is said in an unpublished and very Kabalistic manuscript:

“The Ancients have always made mysterious use of the numbers 3 and 4, composing the number 7. One of the chief properties of this number thus divided, is that, if we multiply 20612§ by 4/3 the product will give us a base for the determination of the mean revolution of the Moon, and if we multiply this product again

* [The Plate in Edward Moor's work referred to is reproduced in Volume VII, p. 296, of the present Series.—*Compiler*.]

† We remind our readers that in the Kabala we have to take notice of the numerical value of the letters: **sh** equals 3, **&** or **o** equals 6, etc.

We ask pardon from Kabalists for this rather naïve note, but we are doing our best to make it clear to readers who are novices in such matters (Editor, *Le Lotus*).

‡ [J. R. Skinner, *Source of Measures*, p. 53.]

§ This number is the numerator of 20612/6561 which gives **B**, the relation of the diameter to the circumference (*Editor, Le Lotus*).

by J we shall have a base to find the exact period of the mean solar year.” *

Now, examine well the esoteric ansated cross of the Egyptians. The cross is the

unfolded cube whose six faces give us the septenary, for we have 4 on a vertical and 3 on a horizontal line, which makes 7, the middle space being common to both lines. The 4 and the 3 are the most esoteric numbers, because 7 is the number of life, the number of nature herself, as it is easy to prove in relation to the vegetable and animal kingdoms. 3 is spirit; 4 is matter. But in the symbol in question which is purely phallic, since it represents living and septenary man, it is the 4 which corresponds to the male line; it is, in fact, the *Tetragrammaton*, the *Tetraktys* on the lower plane, “the heavenly Man” or Adam-Kadmon, the male-female (*i.e.*, Jah-vah or Jehovah); or again Chochma and Binah (wisdom and intelligence, the divine Hermaphrodite), on our cosmic and terrestrial plane. The horizontal line of the three faces of the cube is the feminine principle. It is *Jehovah-Eve* of the pre-Adamic race, which, like Brahmâ-Vâch, is separated into two sexes. This Eve which was the *Sophia* or Holy Ghost † of the Gnostics, gave birth to Cain-Abel, the male and the female on earth of the race of Adam. (See my notes on Cain and Abel in *The Secret Doctrine*.) ‡

* [From an hitherto unpublished MS of J. Ralston Skinner in the Adyar Archives, comprehensive information about which may be found in Vol. VIII, pp. 219-20 (Note 6) in the present Series. —*Compiler*.]

† See “The Apocryphal (?) Gospel of the Hebrews,” where the author makes Jesus say: “My Mother, the Holy Ghost, took me by a hair of my head and transported me unto Mount Thabor.” I translate from the original. [*Vide Compiler*’s footnote on p. 54.]

‡ [It is somewhat uncertain what particular passages in her *magnum opus* H.P.B. had in mind in making this statement. It should be borne in mind that when this article was written, *The Secret Doctrine* had not yet been published, and it may well be that further changes were made in the MSS of this work after July, 1888. However, the latter portion of page 127, in Volume II of *The Secret Doctrine* bears a close analogy to the subject under discussion. Consult the Index of this work for the many other references to Cain and Abel.—*Compiler*.]

Once in the other world, the principles constituting the defunct separate thus: 1, the vital principle leaves the body; 2, the body dissolves; the astral spirit evaporates with the last physical atom. Of the lower *quaternary*, there remains the *Kâma-rûpa*, *i.e.*, the *périsprit* of the human animal. As for the upper *triad*, it leaves the lower quaternary; and the Spirit with its vehicle, the divine Soul, accompanied by the *Spiritual aroma* of *manas*, reunited in the Unity of the immortal Ego, are found in the happy state of *Devachan*. Of the inferior part of the *manas* (human soul), the *périsprit* (animal soul) preserves just enough instinct to seek out and vampirize mediums. Its destiny is to evaporate later on. Until then, it exists merely on the life and intelligence of the living (mediums and believers) who are weak enough to allow themselves to be possessed; it is thus but a miserable borrowed life.

And this is what is meant by the 3 cubits of the ear and the 4 cubits of the stalk of the

wheat that grows in the Fields of Aanru.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

[Most valuable information, not otherwise easily accessible, concerning occult sciences in ancient Egypt, may be found in two other essays from the pen of Franz Lambert: "Hypnotismus und Electricität im alten Ägypten" (*Sphinx*, Vol. V, January, 1888; trans. into English in *The Theosophist*, Vol. XIV, December, 1892, pp. 161-171, with interesting drawings), and "Weisheit der Ägypter" (*ibid.*, Vol. VII, Jan., Feb., April and June, 1889). The article of Georgia Louise Leonard, in the *Open Court* (September and October, 1887), on "The Occult Sciences in the Temples of Ancient Egypt," is also full of interesting data.—*Compiler.*]

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
August, 1888

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

63

**THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY: ITS MISSION
AND ITS FUTURE**

AS EXPLAINED BY M. ÉMILE BURNOUF, THE FRENCH
ORIENTALIST *

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 12, August, 1888, pp. 421-433]

It is another's fault if he be ungrateful; but it is mine
if I do not give. To find one thankful man I will oblige
many who are not.

SENECA.

. The veil is rent
Which blinded me! I am as all these men
Who cry upon their gods and are not heard,
Or are not heeded—yet there must be aid!
For them and me and all there must be help!
Perchance the gods have need of help themselves,
Being so feeble that when sad lips cry
They cannot save! I would not let one cry
Whom I could save!”

The Light of Asia, end of Book III.

It has seldom been the good fortune of the Theosophical Society to meet with such courteous and even sympathetic treatment as it has received at the hands of Émile Burnouf, the well-known Sanskritist, in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Vol. 88, July 15, 1888)—“Le Bouddhisme en Occident.”

* [Curiously enough, Émile Burnouf's remarks on The Theosophical Society and its work in the world were translated into English and published by Col. H. S. Olcott as the leading article in the October number of *The Theosophist*, almost at the same time when H.P.B. was inserting her own essay in the pages of *Lucifer*. In reviewing the August, 1888, issue of *Lucifer*, the Colonel said: “By a curious coincidence the number under review commences, as does our own Magazine of this month, with a translation of part of É. Burnouf's courteous and sympathetic article on the Theosophical Society. Had not the earlier portion of our issue been in type before the arrival of *Lucifer*, we should have added some of Madame Blavatsky's comments in the form of foot-notes for the benefit of our readers; but that being now impossible, we append a few of the more important remarks in

Such an article proves that the Society has at last taken its rightful place in the thought-life of the XIXth century. It marks the dawn of a new era in its history, and, as such, deserves the most careful consideration of all those who are devoting their energies to its work. Émile Burnouf's position in the world of Eastern scholarship entitles his opinions to respect; while his name, that of one of the first and most justly honoured of Sanskrit scholars (the late Eugène Burnouf), renders it more than probable that a man bearing such a name will make no hasty statements and draw no premature conclusions, but that his deductions will be founded on careful and accurate study.

His article is devoted to a triple subject: the origins of three religions or associations, whose fundamental doctrines É. Burnouf regards as identical, whose aim is the same, and which are derived from a common source. These are Buddhism, Christianity, and—the Theosophical Society.

As he writes, page 341:—

. . . . This source, which is Oriental, was hitherto contested; to-day it has been fully brought to light by scientific research, notably by the English scientists and the publication of original texts. Amongst these sagacious scrutinizers it is sufficient to name Sayce, Poole, Beal, Rhys-David, Spence Hardy, Bunsen. It is a long time, indeed, since they were struck with resemblances, let us say, rather, identical elements, offered by the Christian religion and that of Buddha. . . . During the last century these analogies were explained by a pretended Nestorian influence; but since then the Oriental chronology has been established, and it was shown that Buddha was anterior by several centuries to Nestorius, and even to Jesus Christ. . . . The problem remained an open one down to the recent day when the paths followed by Buddhism were recognised, and the stages traced on its way, finally to reach Jerusalem. . . . And now we see

this place" (*The Theosophist*, Vol. X, October, 1888, p. 66). In a footnote appended to the translation, Col. Olcott says also: ". . . the appearance of such an article by such a man and in such a magazine undoubtedly shows that the Theosophical Society has already attained a position in the world of Western thought which its most ardent supporters could hardly yet have expected, considering the tremendous forces against which it has to struggle."—*Compiler*.]

born under our eyes a new association, created for the propagation in the world of the Buddhistic dogmas. It is of this triple subject that we shall treat.

It is on this, to a degree erroneous, conception of the aims and object of the Theosophical Society that É. Burnouf's article, and the remarks and opinions that ensue therefrom, are based. He strikes a false note from the beginning, and proceeds on this line.

The T.S. was not created to propagate any dogma of any exoteric, ritualistic church, whether Buddhist, Brahmanical, or Christian. This idea is a wide-spread and general mistake; and that of the eminent Sanskritist is due to a self-evident source which misled him. É. Burnouf has read in *Le Lotus*, the journal of the Theosophical Society of Paris, a polemical correspondence between one of the Editors of *Lucifer* and the Abbé Roca. The latter persisting—very unwisely—in connecting theosophy with Papism and the Roman Catholic Church—which, of all the dogmatic world religions, is the one his correspondent loathes the most—the philosophy and ethics of Gautama Buddha, not his later church, whether northern or southern, were therein prominently brought forward. The said Editor is undeniably a Buddhist—*i.e.*, a follower of the esoteric school of the great “Light of Asia,” and so is the President of the Theosophical Society, Colonel H.S. Olcott. But this does not pin the theosophical body as a whole to ecclesiastical Buddhism. The Society was founded to become the Brotherhood of Humanity—a centre, philosophical and religious, common to all—not as a propaganda for Buddhism merely. Its first steps were directed toward the same great aim that É. Burnouf ascribes to Buddha Bākyaṃuni, who “opened his church to all men, without distinction of origin, caste, nation, colour, or sex” (*Vide* Art. I in the *Rules* of the T.S.), adding, “My law is a law of Grace for all.” In the same way the Theosophical Society is open to all, without distinction of “origin, caste, nation, colour, or sex,” and what is more—of creed.

The introductory paragraphs of this article show how truly the author has grasped, with this exception, within

the compass of a few lines, the idea that all religions have a common basis and spring from a single root. After devoting a few pages to Buddhism, the religion and the association of men founded by the Prince of Kapilavastu; to Manichaeism, miscalled a “heresy,” in its relation to both Buddhism and Christianity, he winds up his article with—the Theosophical Society. He leads up to the latter by tracing (*a*) the life of Buddha, too well known to an English speaking public through Sir Edwin Arnold’s magnificent poem to need recapitulation; (*b*) by showing in a few brief words that Nirvana is *not annihilation*; * and (*c*) that the Greeks, Romans and even the Brahmans regarded the *priest* as the intermediary between men and God, an idea which involves the conception of a *personal God*, distributing his favours according to his own good pleasure—a sovereign of the universe, in short.

The few lines about Nirvana must find place here before the last proposition is discussed. Says the author:

It is not my task here to discuss the nature of nirvāna. I will only say that the idea of annihilation is absolutely foreign to India, that the Buddha’s object was to deliver humanity from the miseries of earth life and its successive reincarnations; that, finally, he passed his long existence in battling against Māra and his angels, whom he himself called Death and the army of death. The word *nirvāna* means, it is true, extinction, for instance, that of a lamp blown out but it means also the absence of wind. I think, therefore, that *nirvana* is

nothing else but that *requies aeterna*, that *lux perpetua* which Christians also desire for their dead. . . [p. 343.]

With regard to the conception of the priestly office the author shows it entirely absent from Buddhism. Buddha is no God, but a *man* who has reached the supreme degree of wisdom and virtue. “Therefore Buddhist metaphysics conceives the absolute Principle of all things which other

* The fact that Nirvana does *not* mean *annihilation* was repeatedly asserted in *Isis Unveiled*, where its author discussed its etymological meaning as given by Max Müller and others and showed that the “blowing out of a lamp” does not even imply the idea that Nirvana is the “extinction of consciousness.” (See Vol. I, p. 290, and Vol. II, pp. 116-117, 286, 320, 566, etc.)

religions call God, in a totally different manner and does not make of it a being separate from the universe.” [p. 345.]

The writer then points out that the equality of all men among themselves is one of the fundamental conceptions of Buddhism.

He adds moreover and demonstrates that it was from Buddhism that the Jews derived their doctrine of a *Messiah*.

The Essenes, the Therapeuts and the Gnostics are identified as a result of this fusion of Indian and Semitic thought, and it is shown that, on comparing the lives of Jesus and Buddha, both biographies fall into two parts: the ideal legend and the real facts. Of these the legendary part is identical in both; as indeed must be the case from the theosophical standpoint, since both are based on the Initiatory cycle. Finally this “legendary” part is contrasted with the corresponding feature in other religions, notably with the Vedic story of Viṣvakarman.* According to his view, it was only at the council of Nicea that Christianity broke officially with the ecclesiastical Buddhism, though he regards the Nicene Creed as simply the development of the formula: “the Buddha, the Law, the Church” (Buddha, Dharma, Sangha).

The Manicheans were originally *Samanas* or *Bramanas*, Buddhist ascetics whose presence at Rome in the third century is recorded by St. Hyppolitus. É. Burnouf explains their dualism as referring to the double nature of man—good and evil—the evil principle being the *Mâra* of Buddhist legend. He shows that the Manicheans derived their doctrines more immediately from Buddhism than did Christianity and consequently a life and death

* This identity between the *Logoi* of various religions and in particular the identity between the legends of Buddha and Jesus Christ, was again proven years ago in *Isis Unveiled*, and the legend of Viṣvakarman more recently in *Le Lotus* and other Theosophical publications. The whole story is analysed at length in *The Secret Doctrine*, in some chapters which were written more than two years ago.

[The most likely passage meant occurs in Vol. II, p. 559, although no lengthy analysis of this subject can

be traced anywhere.—*Compiler.*]

struggle arose between the two, when the Christian Church became a body which claimed to be the sole and exclusive possessor of Truth. This idea is in direct contradiction to the most fundamental conceptions of Buddhism and therefore its professors could not but be bitterly opposed to the Manicheans. It was thus the Jewish spirit of exclusiveness which armed against the Manicheans the secular arm of the Christian states.

Having thus traced the evolution of Buddhist thought from India to Palestine and Europe, É. Burnouf points out that the Albigenses on the one hand, and the Pauline school (whose influence is traceable in Protestantism) on the other, are the two latest survivals of this influence. He then continues:—

Analysis shows us in contemporary society two essential elements: the idea of a *personal God* among believers and, among the philosophers, the almost complete disappearance of charity. The Jewish element has regained the upper hand, and the Buddhistic element in Christianity has been obscured.

Thus one of the most interesting, if not the most unexpected, phenomena of our day is the attempt which is now being made to revive and create in the world a new society, resting on the same foundations as Buddhism. Although only in its beginnings, its growth is so rapid that our readers will be glad to have their attention called to this subject. This society is still in some measure in the condition of a mission, and its spread is accomplished noiselessly and without violence. It has not even a definitive name, its members grouping themselves under eastern names, placed as titles to their publications: *Isis, Lotus, Sphinx, Lucifer*. The name common to all which predominates among them for the moment is that of *Theosophical Society*. [p. 366.]

After giving a very accurate account of the formation and history of the Society—even to the number of its working branches in India, namely, 135—he then continues:—

The society is very young, nevertheless it has already its history . . . It has neither money nor patrons; it acts solely with its own eventual resources. It contains no worldly element. . . . It flatters no private or public interest. It has set itself a moral ideal of great elevation, it combats vice and egoism. It tends towards the unification of religions, which it considers as identical in their philosophical origin; but it recognises the supremacy of truth. . . .

THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY

With these principles, and in the time in which we live, the society could hardly impose on itself more trying conditions of existence. Still it has grown with astonishing rapidity. . . . [p. 367.]

Having summarised the history of the development of the T.S. and the growth of its

organisation, the writer asks “What is the spirit which animates it?” To this he replies by quoting the three objects of the Society, remarking in reference to the second and third of these (the study of literatures, religions and sciences of the Aryan nations and the investigation of latent psychic faculties, &c.), that, although these might seem to give the Society a sort of academic colouring, remote from the affairs of actual life, yet in reality this is not the case; and he quotes the following passage from the close of the Editorial in *Lucifer*, Vol. I, November 1887, p. 169:—

“He who does not practise altruism; he who is not prepared to share his last morsel with a weaker or a poorer than himself; he who neglects to help his brother man, of whatever race, nation, or creed, whenever and wherever he meets suffering, and who turns a deaf ear to the cry of human misery; he who hears an innocent person slandered, whether a brother Theosophist or not, and does not undertake his defence as he would undertake his own—is no Theosophist.”

. . . . This declaration [continues É. Burnouf] is not Christian because it takes no account of belief, because it does not proselytise for any communion, and because, in fact, the Christians have usually made use of calumny against their adversaries, for example, the Manicheans, Protestants and Jews.* It is even less Mussulman or Brahmanical. It is purely Buddhistic: the practical publications of the Society are either translations of Buddhist books, or original works inspired by the teaching of Buddha. Therefore the Society has a Buddhist character.

Against this it protests a little, fearing to take on an exclusive and sectarian character. It is mistaken: the true and original Buddhism

* And—the author forgets to add—“the Theosophists.” No Society has ever been more ferociously calumniated and persecuted by the *odium theologicum* since the Christian Churches are reduced to use their tongues as their sole weapon—than the Theosophical Association and its Founders.—Editor, *Lucifer*.

is not a sect, it is hardly a religion. It is rather a moral and intellectual reform, which excludes no belief, but adopts none. This is what is done by the Theosophical Society. . . . [p. 369.]

We have given our reasons for protesting. We are pinned to no faith. In stating that the T.S. is “Buddhist,” É. Burnouf is quite right, however, from one point of view. It has a Buddhist colouring simply because that religion, or rather philosophy, approaches more nearly to the TRUTH (the secret wisdom) than does any other exoteric form of belief. Hence the close connexion between the two. But on the other hand the T.S. is perfectly right in protesting against being mistaken for a merely Buddhist propaganda, for the reasons given by us at the beginning of the present article, and by our critic himself. For although in complete agreement with him as to the *true* nature and character of primitive Buddhism, yet the Buddhism of to-day is none the less a rather dogmatic religion, split into many and heterogeneous sects. We follow the Buddha alone. Therefore, once it becomes

necessary to go behind the actually existing form, and who will deny this necessity in respect to Buddhism?—once this is done, is it not infinitely better to go back to the pure and unadulterated source of Buddhism itself, rather than halt at an intermediate stage? Such a half and half reform was tried when Protestantism broke away from the elder Church, and are the results satisfactory?

Such then is the simple and very natural reason why the T.S. does not raise the standard of exoteric Buddhism and proclaim itself a follower of the *Church* of the Lord Buddha. It desires too sincerely to remain within that *unadulterated* “light” to allow itself to be absorbed by its distorted shadow. This is well understood by É. Burnouf, since he expresses as much in the following passage:—

. . . From the doctrinal point of creed, Buddhism has no mysteries Buddha preached in parables; but a parable is a developed simile and has nothing symbolical in it. The Theosophists have seen very clearly that, in religions, there have always been two teachings; the one very simple in appearance and full of images or fables which are

put forward as realities; this is the public teaching, called exoteric; the other, esoteric or inner, reserved for the more educated and discreet adepts, the initiates of the second degree. There is, finally a sort of science, which may formerly have been cultivated in the secrecy of the sanctuaries, a science called *hermetism*, which gives the final explanation of the symbols. When this science is applied to various religions, we see that their symbolisms, though in appearance different, yet rest upon the same stock of ideas, and are traceable to one single manner of interpreting nature.

The characteristic feature of Buddhism is precisely the absence of this hermetism, the exiguity of its symbolism, and the fact that it presents to men, in their ordinary language, the truth without a veil. . . . This it is which the Theosophical Society is repeating . . . [pp. 369-70.]

And no better model could the Society follow: but this is not all. It is true that no *mysteries* or esotericism exists in the two chief Buddhist Churches, the Southern and the Northern. Buddhists may well be content with the dead letter of Siddhârtha Buddha’s teachings, as fortunately no higher or nobler ones in their effects upon the ethics of the masses exist, to this day. But herein lies the great mistake of all the Orientalists. There is an esoteric doctrine, a soul-ennobling philosophy, behind the outward body of ecclesiastical Buddhism. The latter, pure, chaste and immaculate as the virgin snow on the ice-capped crests of the Himalayan ranges, is, however, as cold and desolate as they with regard to the *postmortem* condition of man. This secret system was taught to the *Arhats* alone, generally in the Saptaparna (*Mahavamāsa’s Sattapani*) cave, known to Fa-hien as the *Cheta* cave near the Mount Baibhâr (in Pali, *Webhâra*), in Rajagriha, the ancient capital of Magadha, by the Lord’ Buddha himself, between the hours of *Dhyana* (or mystic contemplation). It is from this cave—called in the days of Bâkyamuni, Saraswati or “Bamboo-cave”—that the Arhats initiated into the Secret Wisdom carried away their learning and knowledge beyond the Himalayan range, wherein the Secret Doctrine is taught to this day. Had not the South Indian invaders of Ceylon “heaped into piles as high as the top of the cocoanut trees” the *ollas* of the Buddhists, and burnt them, as the

and the Initiates, Orientalists would have the proof of it, and there would have been no need of asserting now this well-known fact.

Having fallen into the common error, É. Burnouf continues:

Many will say: It is a chimerical enterprise; it has no more a future before it than has the *New Jerusalem* of the Rue Thouin, and no more *raison d'être* than the *Salvation Army*. This may be so; it is to be observed, however, that these two groups of people are *Biblical Societies*, retaining all the paraphernalia of the expiring religions. The Theosophical Society is the direct opposite; it does away with figures, it neglects or relegates them to the background, putting in the foreground Science, as we understand it to-day, and the moral reformation, of which our old world stands in such need. What, then, are to-day the social elements which may be for or against it? I shall state them in all frankness. [p. 370.]

In brief, É. Burnouf sees in the public *indifference* the first obstacle in the Society's way. "Indifference is born from weariness; weariness of the inability of religions to improve social life, and of the ceaseless spectacle of rites and ceremonies that the laity does not understand and which the priest never explains." Men demand to-day "scientific formulae stating laws of nature, whether physical or moral. . . ." And this indifference the Society must encounter; "its name, also, adding to its difficulties: for the word *theosophy* has no meaning for the people. . . . and, at best, a very vague one for the learned." "It seems to imply a personal god," É. Burnouf thinks, adding: "Whoever says personal god, says creation and miracle," and he concludes that "the Society would do better to become frankly Buddhist or to cease to exist." [pp. 370-71.]

With this advice of our friendly critic it is rather difficult to agree. He has evidently grasped the lofty ideal of primitive Buddhism, and rightly sees that this ideal is identical with that of the T.S. But he has not yet learned the lesson of its history, nor perceived that to graft a young and healthy shoot on to a branch which has lost—less than any other, yet much of—its inner vitality, could not but be fatal to the new growth. The very essence of the position taken up by the T.S. is that it asserts and

maintains the truth common to all religions; the truth which is true and undefiled by the concretions of ages of human passions and needs. But though Theosophy means Divine Wisdom, it implies nothing resembling belief in a personal god. It is *not* "the wisdom of God," but *divine* wisdom. The Theosophists of the Alexandrian Neo-Platonic school believed in "gods" and "demons" and in one *impersonal* ABSOLUTE DEITY. To continue:—

Our contemporary habits of life [says É. Burnouf] are not severe; they tend year by year to grow more gentle, but also more boneless. The moral stamina of the men of to-day is very feeble; the ideas of good and evil are not, perhaps, obscured, but the *will* to act rightly lacks energy. What men seek above all is pleasure and that somnolent state of existence called comfort. Try to preach the sacrifice of one's possessions and of oneself to men who have entered on this path of selfishness! You will not convert many. Do we not see the doctrine of the "struggle for life" applied to every function of human life? This formula has become for our contemporaries a sort of revelation, whose pontiffs they blindly follow and glorify. One may say to them, but in vain, that one must share one's last morsel of bread with the hungry; they will smile and reply by the formula: "the struggle for life." They will go further: they will say that in advancing a contrary theory, you are yourself struggling for your existence and are not disinterested. How can one escape from this sophism, of which all men are full to-day?

This doctrine is certainly the worst adversary of Theosophy for it is the most perfect formula of egoism. It seems to be based on scientific observation, and it sums up the moral tendencies of our day Those who accept it and invoke justice are in contradiction with themselves, those who practise it and who put God on their side are blasphemers. But those who disregard it and preach charity are considered wanting in intelligence, their kindness of heart leading them into folly. If the Theosophical Society succeeds in refuting this pretended law of the struggle for life and in extirpating it from men's minds, it will have done in our day a miracle greater than those of @akyamuni and of Jesus. [pp. 371-72.]

And this miracle the Theosophical Society *will* perform. It will do this, not by disproving the relative existence of the law in question, but by assigning to it its due place in the harmonious order of the universe; by unveiling its true meaning and nature and by showing that this *pseudo-law* is a "pretended" law indeed, as far as the human family is concerned, and a fiction of the most dangerous

kind. "Self-preservation," on these lines, is indeed and in truth a sure, if a slow, suicide, for it is a policy of mutual homicide, because men by descending to its practical application among themselves, merge more and more by a retrograde reinvolution into the animal kingdom. This is what the "struggle for life" is in reality, even on the purely materialistic lines of political economy. Once that this axiomatic truth is proved to all men; the same instinct of self-preservation only directed into its true channel will make them turn to *altruism*—as their surest policy of salvation.

It is just because the real founders of the Society have ever recognised the wisdom of truth embodied in one of the concluding paragraphs of Mr. Burnouf's excellent article, that they have provided against that terrible emergency in their fundamental teachings. The "struggle for existence" applies only to the physical, never to the moral plane of being. Therefore when the author warns us in the awfully truthful words:

Universal charity will appear out of date, the rich will keep their wealth and will go on accumulating more; the poor will become impoverished in proportion, until the day when, propelled by hunger, they will demand bread, not of theosophy but of revolution. Theosophy shall be swept away by the hurricane. . . . [p. 371.]

The Theosophical Society replies: "*It surely will, were we to follow out his*

well-meaning advice, yet one which is concerned but with the lower plane.” It is not the policy of self-preservation, not the welfare of one or another personality in its finite and physical form that will or can ever secure the desired object and screen the Society from the effects of the social “hurricane” to come; but only the weakening of the feeling of separateness in the units which compose its chief element. And such a weakening can only be achieved by a process of *inner enlightenment*. It is not violence that can ever insure bread and comfort for all; nor is the kingdom of peace and love, of mutual help and charity and “food for all,” to be conquered by a cold, reasoning, diplomatic policy. It is only by the close brotherly union of men’s inner SELVES, of soul-solidarity, of the growth and development of that feeling

which makes one suffer when one thinks of the suffering of others, that the reign of Justice and equality for all can ever be inaugurated. This is the first of the three fundamental objects for which the Theosophical Society was established, and called the “Universal Brotherhood of Man,” without distinction of *race, colour or creed*.

When men will begin to realise that it is precisely that ferocious personal selfishness, the chief motor in the “struggle for life,” that lies at the very bottom and is the one sole cause of human starvation; that it is that other—national egoism and vanity, which stirs up the States and rich individuals to bury enormous capitals in the unproductive erection of gorgeous churches and temples and the support of a swarm of social drones called Cardinals and Bishops, the true parasites on the bodies of their subordinates and their flocks—then they will try to remedy this universal evil by a healthy change of policy. And this salutary revolution can be *peacefully* accomplished only by the Theosophical Society and its teachings.

This is little understood by Mr. Burnouf, it seems, since while striking the true key-note of the situation elsewhere he ends by saying:

The Society will find allies, if it knows how to take its place in the civilised world to-day. Since it will have against it all the positive cults, with the exception perhaps of a few dissenters and bold priests, the only other course open to it is to place itself in accord with the men of science. If its dogma of charity is a complementary doctrine which it furnishes to science, the society will be obliged to establish it on scientific data, under pain of remaining in the regions of sentimentality. The oft-repeated formula of the struggle for life is true, but not universal; it is true for the plants; it is less true for the animals in proportion as we climb the steps of the ladder, for the law of sacrifice is seen to appear and to grow in importance; in man, these two laws counter-balance one another, and the law of sacrifice, which is that of charity, tends to assume the upper hand, through the empire of the reason. It is reason which, in our societies, is the source of right, of justice, and of charity; through it we escape the inevitableness of the struggle for life, moral slavery, egoism and barbarism, in one word, that we escape from what @akyamuni poetically called the power and the army of Mâra. [p. 372.]

And yet our critic does not seem satisfied with this state of things but advises us by adding as follows:—

If the Theosophical Society enters into this order of ideas and knows how to make them its fulcrum, it will quit the limbus of inchoate thought and will find its place in the modern world; remaining none the less faithful to its Indian origin and to its principles. It may find allies; for if men are weary of the symbolical cults, unintelligible to their own teachers, yet men of heart (and they are many) are weary also and terrified at the egoism and the corruption, which tend to engulf our civilisation and to replace it by a learned barbarism. Pure Buddhism possesses all the breadth that can be claimed from a doctrine at once religious and scientific. Its tolerance is the cause why it can excite the jealousy of none. At bottom, it is but the proclamation of the supremacy of reason and of its empire over the animal instincts, of which it is the regulator and the restrainer. Finally it has itself summed up its character in two words which admirably formulate the law of humanity: science and virtue. [p. 372.]

And this formula the society has expanded by adopting that still more admirable axiom: “*There is no religion higher than truth.*”

At this juncture we shall take leave of our learned, and perhaps, too kind critic, to address a few words to Theosophists in general.

Has our Society, as a whole, deserved the flattering words and notice bestowed upon it by Mr. Burnouf? How many of its individual members, how many of its branches, have carried out the precepts contained in the noble words of a Master of Wisdom, as quoted by our author from No. 3 of *Lucifer*? “He who does not practise” this and the other “*is no Theosophist,*” says the quotation. Nevertheless, those who have never shared even their superfluous—let alone their last morsel—with the poor; those who continue to make a difference in their hearts between a coloured and a white brother; as all those to whom malicious remarks against their neighbours, uncharitable gossip and even slander under the slightest provocation, are like heavenly dew on their parched lips—call and regard themselves as *Theosophists*!

It is certainly not the fault of the minority of *true* Theosophists, who do try to follow *the path* and who make desperate efforts to reach it, if the majority of their fellow members do not. It is not to them therefore that this is addressed, but to those who, in their fierce love of Self and their vanity, instead of trying to carry out the original programme to the best of their ability, sow broadcast among the members the seeds of dissension; to those whose personal vanity, discontentment and love of power, often ending in ostentation, give the lie to the original programme and to the Society’s motto.

Indeed, these original aims of the FIRST SECTION of the Theosophical Society under whose advice and guidance the second and third merged into one were first founded, can never be too often recalled to the minds of our members.* The Spirit of these aims is clearly embodied in a letter from one of the Masters quoted in the *Occult World*, on pages 71 and 73. Those Theosophists then, who in the course of time and events would, or have, departed from those original aims, and instead of complying with them have suggested new policies of administration from the depths of their inner consciousness, *are not true to their pledges*.

“But we have always worked on the lines originally traced to us”—some of them proudly assert.

“You have not “comes the reply from those who know more of the true Founders of the T.S. *behind the scenes* than they do—or ever will if they go on working in this mood of self-illusion and self-sufficiency.

What are the lines traced by the “Masters”? Listen to the authentic words written by one of them in 1880 to the author of the *Occult World*:

. . . To our minds, then, these motives, sincere and worthy of every serious consideration *from the worldly standpoint*, appear *selfish* . . . They are selfish, because you must be aware that the chief object of the Theosophical Society is *not so much to gratify individual aspirations as to serve our fellow men* . . . in our view the highest aspirations for

* *Vide* Rules in the 1st Vol. of *The Theosophist*, pp. 179-180.

the welfare of humanity become tainted with selfishness, if, in the mind of the philanthropist, there lurks the shadow of a desire *for self-benefit*, or a *tendency to do injustice, even where these exist unconsciously to himself*. Yet you have ever discussed, but to put down, the idea of a Universal Brotherhood, questioned its usefulness, and advised to remodel the Theosophical Society on the principle of a college for the special study of occultism. . . *

But another letter was written, also in 1880, which is not only a direct reproof to Theosophists who neglect the main idea of Brotherhood, but also an anticipated answer to Monsieur Émile Burnouf’s chief argument. Here are a few extracts from it. † It was addressed again to those

* A.P. Sinnett, *The Occult World*, p. 72 [p. 104, American edition].

[This passage may be found on pp. 6-7 in *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, transcribed from the original letter of Master K.H., now in the British Museum. As there are slight differences, especially in the use of italics and punctuation, we transcribe below the text, direct from the microfilm of the original letter:

“To our minds then, these motives, sincere and worthy of every serious consideration from the worldly standpoint, appear—*selfish*. (You have to pardon me what you might view as crudeness of

language, if your desire really is, that which you profess—to learn truth and get instruction from us—who belong to quite a different world from the one you move in.) They are selfish because you must be aware that the chief object of the T.S. is not so much to gratify individual aspirations as to serve our fellow men: and the real value of this term ‘selfish,’ which may jar upon your ear, has a peculiar significance with us which it cannot have with you therefore, and to begin with, you must not accept it otherwise, than in the former sense. Perhaps, you will better appreciate our meaning when told that in our view the highest aspirations for the welfare of humanity become tainted with selfishness if, in the mind of the philanthropist there lurks the shadow of desire for self benefit or a tendency to do injustice, even when these exist unconsciously to himself. Yet, you have ever discussed but to put down the idea of a universal Brotherhood, questioned its usefulness, and advised to remodel the T.S. on the principle of a college for the special study of occultism. This, my respected and esteemed friend and Brother—will never do!”

—*Compiler.*]

† [The letter from which H.P.B. quotes a number of passages, is perhaps the most important one ever received from the Adept-Brothers. As pointed out by Master K.H. in an introductory note

who sought to make away with the “sentimental title,” and make of the Society but an arena for “cup-growing and astral bell-ringing”:—

“ . . . In view of the ever-increasing triumph and, at the same time, misuse of freethought and liberty, how is the combative natural instinct of man to be restrained from inflicting hitherto unheard-of cruelties, enormities, tyranny, injustice, if not through the soothing

of a few lines which he appends to it, this letter is “an abridged version of the view of the Chohan on the T.S. from his own words as given last night.” Thus it appears that this communication is not exactly a letter written by the Mahâ Chohan himself, but rather a report of a conversation between him and K.H. on the subject of which it treats. Both A.P. Sinnett and Allan O. Hume were greatly fascinated with the phenomenal aspect of occultism, and never fully understood the basic need for the idea of Universal Brotherhood and of its application in genuine Theosophical work. This attitude strikes any serious student who reads the Letters addressed by Masters M. and K.H. to Hume and Sinnett. It is most probable that the words of the Mahâ Chohan embodied in the communication under review were solicited by K.H. at a time when the situation had become somewhat critical in these respects.

It is very curious that the original Letter to Sinnett, recording the observations of the Mahâ Chohan, is nowhere to be found. It is not included among the originals of *The Mahatma Letters* collection, which are now in the British Museum. Copies were made at the time either of the entire communication, or of portions of it (which fact is difficult to ascertain), to be sent to certain selected persons, one such copy being among the papers of C.W. Leadbeater, while another is among the papers of Miss Francesca Arundale. It is from these copies that the text of this communication was published by C. Jinarâjadâsa in his *Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*, First Series (1st ed., Adyar, 1919; 4th ed., 1948; Letter No. I, with explanatory Notes).

C. Jinarâjadâsa, in commenting upon this Letter, points out that H.P.B. speaks of it as having been written in 1880, while the Mahâ Chohan speaks of “1881 years ago,” which would indicate that this communication was received sometime in 1881. It is probable that this is quite correct as far as those copies which C. Jinarâjadâsa had before him are concerned. However, in the text as quoted by H.P.B., with slight modifications, in the present article, the Mahâ Chohan is made to speak of “1880 years ago.” Thus, we are

still uncertain as to the exact date of this important communication received through the intermediary of Master K.H.—*Compiler.*]

influence of a Brotherhood, and of the practical application of Buddha's esoteric doctrines? . . . Buddhism is the surest path to lead men towards the one esoteric truth. As we find the world now, whether Christian, Mussulman, or Pagan, justice is disregarded and honour and mercy both flung to the winds. In a word, how, seeing that the main objects of the Theosophical Society are misinterpreted by those who are most willing to serve us personally, are we to deal with the rest of mankind, with that curse known as 'the struggle for life,' which is the real and most prolific parent of most woes and sorrows, and all crimes? Why has that struggle become the almost universal scheme of the universe? We answer: because no religion, with the exception of Buddhism has hitherto taught a practical contempt for this earthly life, while each of them, always with that one solitary exception, has through its hells and damnations inculcated the greatest dread of death. Therefore do we find that 'struggle for life' raging most fiercely in Christian countries, most prevalent in Europe and America. It weakens in the pagan lands, and is nearly unknown among Buddhist populations. . . . Teach the people to see that life on this earth, even the happiest, is but a burden and an illusion, that it is but our own Karma, the cause producing the effect, that is our own judge, our saviour in future lives—and the great struggle for life will soon lose its intensity. . . . The world in general and Christendom especially left for two thousand years to the regime of a personal God, as well as its political and social systems based on that idea, has now proved a failure. If Theosophists say: 'We have nothing to do with all this, the lower classes and the inferior races (those of India for instance, in the conception of the British) cannot concern us and must manage as they can,' what becomes of our fine professions of benevolence, reform, etc.? Are these professions a mockery? And, if a mockery, can ours be the true path? . . . Should we devote ourselves to teaching a few Europeans, fed on the fat of the land, many of them loaded with the gifts of blind fortune, the rationale of bell-ringing, cup-growing, spiritual telephone, etc., etc., and leave the teeming millions of the ignorant, of the poor and the despised, the lowly and the oppressed, to take care of themselves, and of their hereafter, the best they know how? Never! Perish rather the Theosophical Society. . . . than that we should permit it to become no better than an academy of magic and a hall of Occultism. That we, the devoted followers of the spirit incarnate of absolute self-sacrifice, of philanthropy and divine kindness as of all the highest virtues attainable on this earth of sorrow, the man of men, Gautama Buddha, should ever allow the Theosophical Society to represent the embodiment of selfishness, to become the refuge of the few with no thought in them for the many, is a strange idea. . . . And it is we, the humble disciples of the perfect Lamas, who are expected to permit the Theosophical Society to drop its noblest title, that of the Brotherhood of Humanity, to become a simple school of Psychology. No! No! our brothers, you have been labouring under the mistake too

long already. Let us understand each other. He who does not feel competent enough to grasp the noble idea sufficiently to work for it, need not undertake a task too heavy for him. . . .

"To be true, religion and philosophy must offer the solution of every problem. That the world is in such a bad condition morally is a conclusive evidence that none of its religions and philosophies—those of the civilized races less than any other—have ever possessed the TRUTH. The right and logical explanations on the subject of the problems of the great dual principles, right and wrong, good and evil, liberty and

despotism, pain and pleasure, egotism and altruism, are as impossible to them now as they were 1880 years ago. They are as far from the solution as they ever were, but. . . .

“To these there must be somewhere a consistent solution, and if our doctrines will show their competence to offer it, then the world will be the first one to confess, that ours must be the true philosophy, the true religion, the true light, which gives truth and nothing but the TRUTH. . . .

And this TRUTH is not Buddhism, but esoteric BUDDHISM.

“He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. . . .”

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
August, 1888

OUR CHRISTIAN NINETEENTH CENTURY ETHICS

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 12, August, 1888, pp. 482-484]

As civilization progresses, moral darkness pervades the alleged light of Christianity. The chosen symbol of our boasted civilization ought to be a huge boa constrictor. Like that monstrous ophidian, with its velvety black and brilliant golden-hued spots, and its graceful motions, civilization proceeds insidiously, but as surely, to crush in its deadly coils every high aspiration, every noble feeling, aye, even to the very discrimination of right and wrong.

Conscience, "God's vicegerent in the soul," speaks no longer in man; for the whispers of the still small voice within are stifled by the ever-increasing din and roar of Selfishness.

But—"our shops, our horses' legs, our boots. . . . have all benefited by the introduction" of the "macadam of civilization," says Dickens. Yea; but have not our hearts turned, on the other hand, to stone also? Have they not been *macadamized* in their steady petrification with this rapid spread of civilization? Highwaymen may, or may not, have disappeared with more perfect highways, yet it is certain that they have reappeared since in every class of life and trade, and that highway robbery is now taking place on still deadlier, if improved and legalized principles. "Crawling beggars and dirty inns" offend our esthetic feelings no longer; but starving beggars have found their numbers increasing tenfold and are multiplying at a rate in proportion to the extortionate charges of white-washed inns, now turned into palace-hotels. And if—still according to Dickens—"much of the ribbonism, landlord-stalking from behind hedges, and Skibbereen starvation of Ireland may be attributed to the baleful roads of bygone days," to what shall we attribute the same evils, only on a more gigantic scale, in the Emerald Island to-day?

Politics does not enter into the programme of our magazine's activity. Yet as everything under the sun now seems to have become connected with politics, which appear to have become little else but a legal permission to break the ten commandments, a regular government license to the rich for the commission of all the sins which, when perpetrated by the poor, land the criminal in jail, or hoist him upon the gallows—it becomes difficult to avoid touching upon politics. There are cases which, emanating directly from the realm

of political and diplomatic action, cry loudly to the common ethics of humanity for exposure and punishment. Such is the recent event which must now be mentioned.

It is a truism of too long standing, a policy acted upon by every civilized nation from antiquity, that the prosperity of every state is based upon the orderly establishment of family principles. Nor is anyone likely to deny that social ethics depend largely upon the early education received by the growing-up generations. On whom does the duty devolve of guiding that education from early childhood? Who can do so better than a loving mother, once that her moral worth is recognised by all, and that no evil report has ever sullied her fame? The youth and his later intellectual training may well be left to the firmer hand of the father: the care of his childhood belongs by all divine and human rights to the mother alone; the parent who gave her offspring not only a part of her flesh and blood, but a portion likewise of her immortal soul—that which shall create hereafter the real man, the true EGO. This is the A B C of the life-duties of mankind; and it is the first duty of those in power to guard the sacred maternal rights against any brutal violation.

How then shall we characterise the unparalleled act of violence, perpetrated on the modern principle that “might is right,” which has been offered in the face of all the world by a crowned husband to his innocent wife, and by the first statesman in Europe to an unprotected Queen—a *woman*? Has Queen Nathalie of Servia played false to her country, was she a faithless wife, or a bad mother? No; most decidedly not. Has she in any way deserved the insult dealt her at the hands of these two men, in the European scandal which has now disgraced the King, her husband, and the country to whose honour and protection she trusted herself? Once more, and a thousand times, no. All those who knew Milan Obrenovitch’s life, his low moral standard, his family relations for the last years, and especially his small intrinsic value as King, patriot and man, will deny emphatically any accusation against Queen Nathalie. On the other hand many are those who knew her personally from her

birth and throughout her girlhood. A good daughter cannot be a bad mother. A pure, noble-minded woman can hardly be a guilty wife.

Why then should she be so cruelly treated? Why should she have been forced to drain to the last drop the contents of the bitter cup of insult and moral agony for crimes that were

not her own? It is a measure of political necessity, we are told. The Christian clergy of the land is forced to sanction it, and Christian law is thus made to act in defiance of every moral and divine law! Most undeservedly and brutally insulted in all her most sacred rights, the honest woman, the faithful wife of a faithless man and husband, is now doomed to be sacrificed to the Moloch of politics! She must remain separated from her only child, and witness, passive, helpless and powerless, year after year, the virus of moral depravity being inoculated in her boy's nature by such a father! She, the legitimate wife and Queen, has to submit to be treated like a discharged *courtisane* and suffer another woman and women, fully deserving of that epithet, to take her place in the palace, perhaps to assume authority over her innocent son. "Politics" doom a future king to witness from his childhood daily scenes that seem copied from those which must have taken place in the palaces of Messalina and those of the Popes Borgia!

Therefore every honest man and woman has a right to say that no more brutal, heartless, unqualifiable act has ever been perpetrated in the political dramas of this century of the greatest civilisation. Such an act committed by a *Milan* of Servia, the salaried *bravo* of Austria, could hardly astonish anyone. But that the deed should be sanctioned by one who had just proclaimed in the hearing of all Europe, that he "feared God alone," is incomprehensible. We are far, it seems, from the barbarous Middle Ages, when the German *Ritter* fought and died to protect a woman. We are in the age of civilisation and politics. Poor, unhappy Nathalie Keshko! Who of

those who knew her hardly a dozen years ago, the beautiful, happy, innocent girl, the ornament of the high social circles of Odessa, would have ever dreamt of such a fate for her? Left early an orphan, she was brought up by her guardian as a beloved daughter. Love, wealth and happiness smiled upon her from her very cradle, until that unfortunate marriage of hers—a true *mésalliance*—with the unworthy nephew of the martyr-Hospodar, Michael Obrenovitch. The descendant of the swine-herdsmen of Servia has since become an *opéra-comique* King, who now dishonours the nation which chose him for its ruler. It was not her beauty that attracted him; but her millions. The noble uprighteousness of her character and her true womanly moral qualities must have made him dread her from the first; and while these repelled the profligate husband, the millions of Nathalie Keshko consoled him, by permitting him to enlarge his harem, and make his mistresses share the same palace with the virtuous legitimate wife. And now, having filled the life of the unfortunate young Queen with gall, he gives her the last deadly blow by depriving her of her only child, making of her a Rachel weeping and refusing to be comforted.

Why? For what crime and by what right? The last word of the mystery is in the safe keeping of Prince Bismarck and King Milan. The proud Imperial Chancellor might have defeated the ends of that puppet-King with one word; but he preferred to help him. Before the Prince, all male Europe bows. But no woman can fail to rise in righteous indignation against the politics of the “Iron Chancellor” and proclaim it to his face. The loud blame of millions of women, and of every mother in Christendom, are so many implied curses that must for once fall upon the head of the man they are addressed to. And what mother will fail to sympathise with this other bereaved and wronged mother? There is a law of Retribution, however, and it is this which gives us the

liberty to ask: What, or who, gives you the right and audacity to so insult all law, divine and human? Is it in the name of Christianity that you perpetrate an act which would disgrace any “heathen” potentate and State?

Ye, unrighteous judges who fear neither moral law, nor do you feel ashamed before the open censure of the teeming millions of those who openly blame you; it is posterity which will render to you your just dues, and thus avenge the memory of this martyred Queen and mother. That day must come, when, passing into history, your *political* action will be read with disgust and horror even by the descendants of those who now keep silent, instead of raising their voices in the defence of that innocent woman.

But while whole nations of private individuals can do nothing except protest, sincerely and as vainly; all those who could do so effectually, will not lift a finger on behalf of Queen Nathalie. The public is willing, but powerless; the Sovereigns and potentates all-powerful, but evidently unwilling. But, O, ye Crowned women, mothers, and wives of Europe! Unless you join your voices in one mighty cry of indignation and protest against such an infamous act of despotism and undeserved cruelty, you have small right indeed to call yourselves Christians or to represent the religion of your Christ in the eyes of the masses. Although might is *really* right in our age of dissembling and of unexampled Selfishness, there may be something worse in store for those who fail to do the right thing by an oppressed sister. That which is now being done to the legitimate Queen of an insignificant little Kingdom, may be done to any of you—when the hour of just retributive justice strikes. Arise then and protest in the name of human rights while you are still in power. For who knows how long that power may yet last? Verily, in view of the rapid spread of *civilization* and the despotism of *such* politics, the day when that hour will strike is only a question of time and of expediency. . . .

ADVERSA.

[A few explanatory notes may be of help in connection with the above. Milan Obrenovich IV, King of Serbia, was born at Jassy, Rumania, Aug. 22, 1854, a son of Miloš Obrenovich (1829-61), and Maria Katardži, a Moldavian. Left an orphan early in life, Milan was adopted by his cousin Michael, educated at Bukarest and Paris, and placed on the throne under a regency, in 1868, on the assassination of Michael. He proclaimed himself King in 1882. His Austrophile policy was very unpopular, and his private life was most unsavoury. In 1875 he had married Natalie, the 16-year old daughter of a wealthy Bessarabian landowner of Moldavian origin, named Keshko, who was a Colonel in the Russian army. Her mother belonged to the Sturza family and was of Moldavian origin also. Natalie was born May 14, 1859, in Florence, Italy, where she was educated. Relations between Milan and Natalie became strained soon after the birth of their son Alexander in 1876. Natalie supported the political parties which were opposed to her husband, and had a tendency to interfere in the affairs of state. In 1885, Milan embarked upon an ill-judged campaign against Bulgaria, and was saved from disaster by Austria.

The marital unfaithfulness of Milan came to light around that time, though Natalie had hidden the facts for a considerable period of time. Milan entered into a formal agreement with her, on the strength of which their son was to be educated in Germany and France, under the supervision of his mother, who was permitted to visit Serbia only during the summer months. Natalie went with her son to Wiesbaden, Germany, but neither of them adhered strictly to the signed arrangement. The Queen continued various political activities and found support in Serbia, being quite popular among the people. Milan offered a new agreement, but Natalie proudly refused to accept it. In 1888, Milan sent General Protich to Wiesbaden, where, with the assistance of the German police, he abducted Alexander, on the basis of paternal rights, and returned to Serbia with him. At the same time, Milan circulated scandalous tales about his wife and finally extorted a divorce, which was illegal according to the Greek-Orthodox Church, by forcing Metropolitan Theodosius to declare, on his own initiative, the marriage dissolved. This took place in October, 1888. On March 6, 1889, after a brief attempt to regain prestige by means of a liberal constitution, Milan abdicated in favour of his son Alexander, and retired to Paris. He went so far as to renounce his Serbian nationality in 1892.

Milan's abdication spurred the hopes of Natalie, and she attempted to regain her rights as Queen-Mother. She returned to Serbia in 1889, but found that the Regency was placing obstacles in the way of her contact with her son. She outlined the history of her marriage in a document presented to the

authorities, with the result that the Synod annulled the act of Theodosius, and denied to both parents the right of entry into Serbia until Alexander became of age. Natalie refused to obey this order, and was forcibly sent abroad, a circumstance which gave rise to violent outbreaks in the streets of the capital.

In 1893, Alexander restored her rights to Natalie. In January, 1894, Milan reappeared in Belgrade and became nominally reconciled to Natalie, who returned in 1895. Appointed commander-in-chief of the Serbian army, Milan inaugurated a cruel persecution of Russophiles and Radicals. This was brought to a sudden end by the marriage of Alexander, in July, 1900. Milan resigned his post and returned to Vienna, where he died rather unexpectedly, February 11, 1901.

After Milan's death, Natalie became a Roman Catholic and lived in retirement in Paris and Biarritz. She died in 1941.

In connection with the erratic conduct of Milan, and especially his sudden abdication, certain peculiar circumstances have come to light. It would appear on good authority that Milan under the hypnotism of Madame Artemisia Christich resigned his crown. This woman, whose influence over the King had long been unaccountable to his friends, had been for some time carrying on hypnotic and mesmeric experiments, using the King as her subject. His manner on the day of his abdication has been described by several eye-witnesses in the contemporary press, such as the London *Standard*, for instance. The impression of these people was that the King behaved like one hypnotized, and in a different state of consciousness from his ordinary one.

Natalie wrote a work entitled *Mother* (Russian trans., St. Petersburg, 1891), in which she outlines her

painful experiences, but somewhat strains the facts of the story. She also published a book of *Memoirs* (Paris, 1891). A brilliant description of her character may be found in a letter addressed to her from Ristich, and partially translated in the *Russkiya Vyedomosti*, No. 27, 1891.—*Compiler.*]

Collected Writings VOLUME X
August, 1888

A LESSON

89

A LESSON

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 12, August, 1888, pp.497-98]

Regarding the first rule of Practical Occultism in the April number of your journal, it may not be known to many of your readers that in most of our (Hindu) rites and ceremonies, we have to use the “five coloured powders.” These are prepared in a particular way and then spread, one after the other, over a certain Yantsa. The arrangements of these colours are however different in Tantric and Vedic rites. Pundit Kalibar Vedantabagish, the renowned Vedantist of Bengal, has promised to give me a detailed account of these colours, but I doubt whether he will allow me to publish it.

Your note on Ultimate Philosophy (the last lines on page 141 of the April number) is not quite correct. According to our Shastras “the tortoise does NOT wag its tail in absolute void,” the whole is supported by Ananta Naga, which means, *one who is endless and motionless*. The Elephants (not one) are the *Elephants of Space* (Dig Gaza), and the tortoise is a particular manifestation of Vishnu.

It is hardly fair to condemn Sir Monier-Williams on account of his taking the “Boar’s flesh” in a literal sense, and then ridicule the Puranic allegories.

H. P. MUKERJI.

Berhampur (Bengal), 12th May, 1888.

EDITORS’ NOTE—It would indeed be very “unfair,” had the editor ever meant to “ridicule” the Purânic allegories. We are painfully alive to the fact,—if our critic, who, like most Hindus, can rarely see a joke, is not—that had we *ridiculed a little more, and exalted a little less*, the philosophy of the Purânic and other non-Christian Scriptures, we might have avoided being so much hated and pelted with printed mud as we have been for the last twelve years. The “note” in question was surely never meant to convey the accurate meaning, but simply the absurd image as perceived by some imaginative padris. We are sorry to see that even those whose religion and philosophies we have constantly defended against every unjust attack, misunderstand us more than most of our enemies. Let our severe Bengal critic know that though we have never either sought or expected any gratitude, yet we were sanguine enough to expect some show of justice—from the Hindus, at any rate. Our forthcoming work, *The Secret Doctrine*, will show whether we “ridicule” the *Purnas*.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
August, 1888

90

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

THE “CHASTE TREE”

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 12, August, 1888, p. 498]

Will you tell me the botanical name of the “*Agnus Castus*” plant, also what authority there is for supposing Christ was crowned with Acanthus, and if so are any of that family indigenous to Syria?

Paliurus australis (Christ’s Thorn) is spoken of by Loudon as the probable plant, of the order Rhamni. He adds, Hasselquist thought it was a kind of Rhamnus (Buckthorn), called by Linnaeus “*Spina Christi*.” The latter I have received from Syria, where it is common, and bears a small yellow berry.

W. N. GALE.

EDITOR’S NOTE.—Loudon describes the *Agnus Castus* as “a species of *Vitex*—the chaste tree,” from $\alpha\gamma\nu\sigma$, a willow-like tree. This Greek term being similar to the word $\chi\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, “chaste,” it was surnamed the “chaste tree.” We do not know of any “authority” except *probability* that it was the *Acanthus* which was used for the “crown of thorns,” as it is a genus of herbaceous prickly plant, with thorns protruding from it, most common in Palestine and Asia Minor, though as common in India. It was used there and also in Syria and elsewhere as belonging to the paraphernalia of initiation during the MYSTERIES.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
August, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 12, August, 1888, pp. 472, 497]

[. . . the light of Creative Thought from THAT, reservoir of all thought] In Indian philosophy this absolute Deity is always referred to as “THAT” (TAD) and “IT.” It is “the reservoir of all thought” because it is *absolute* thought; which having no relation to the finite and the conditioned, cannot be premised as something individual or separate from the universal mind, and minds. It is the causeless cause of every manifesting intellection, the eternal Source of ALL.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

91

[The Logos thinks] Because the Logos is manifested; but the ever-concealed Deity *does not*, since It is ABSOLUTE THOUGHT and cannot be spoken of as we would of an individual *personal Thinker*. But then the Logos in the East is the synthesis, the collective aggregate of all the Gods or Powers in the manifested Universe.

[this thought, in its grosser form called Ether] And in its highest it is AKA@A.

[Rev. T. G. Headley writes on the doctrine of Atonement, the false conception underlying the Mass, and the corruption of priests. He feels the name of Jesus should be rehabilitated. H.P.B. appends the following Editorial Note:]

Amen! It is quite true that there are not a few such illogical persons who seek to dethrone Romanism and Protestantism by destroying the innocent cause of these—Jesus. But no theosophist is among that class. Theosophists, even those who are no longer, as those who never were, Christians, regard, nevertheless, Jesus, or Jehoshua as an Initiate. It is not, therefore, against the “bearer” of that name—in whom they see one of the *Masters of Wisdom*—that they protest, but against that name as travestied by pseudo-Christian fancy and clad in the pagan robes borrowed from heathen gods, that they have set their hearts. It is those “priests” whom our reverend correspondent denounces as “murderers” and “devils” —at the risk of finding himself confounded with them in the ungodly crowd he himself belongs to—that every true theosophist ought to be ever ready to rise against. Few of them refuse to see in Jesus *a Son of God*, as well as *Chrêstos* having reached by suffering the *Christos* condition. All they reject is, the modern travesty of the very, very old dogma of the Son becoming one with the Father; or that this “father” had ever anything

to do with the Hebrew androgyne called Jehovah. It is not Jesus' "father," who "will have mercy, and not sacrifice," in whose nostrils the blood of even a slain animal used as a burnt offering could have ever smelt sweet. How then

could the human sacrifice offered by the allegorical Christ, and described in the Epistle to the *Ephesians* [v, 2] as one that had "a sweet smelling savour," be regarded otherwise than with horror? Theosophists can discriminate—to say the least, as much as the reverend gentleman who signs himself T.G. Headley.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**

September, 1888

OUR THIRD VOLUME

[*Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 13, September, 1888, pp. 1-3]

With the present number our magazine enters the second year of its career, and the torch of our Flame-Bearer is lighting the second mile-stone of our progress. The path has been devious and difficult—at times, skirting as well the verge of precipices, as running over smooth levels; yet, always in the direction of its declared objective point.

It would be the height of folly to say that all readers have been equally satisfied: the editor who attempts to cater to every taste, ends by satisfying none, least of all himself. We have received protests almost as liberally as compliments. We have sometimes thought it would be an amusing experiment to send the former letters to the dissident third parties, that each might see how the articles they praise excite the ire of fellow-readers, and those they condemn are regarded by others as most interesting and meritorious. It is one of the stock-situations of the dramatist to thus contrive that letters shall fall into the wrong hands. But we have not yet heard of the joke being played by an editor, though the temptation to do so must be sometimes great. We think it may be fairly claimed that *Lucifer* has proved itself consistent to its originally declared policy. It has been the reverse of boneless. To the extent of its ability it has struck fairly and from the shoulder at the obstacles in the way. The aim it set itself was to shed light upon questions of deep moment affecting man and the constitution of

Society, which had become thoroughly obscured. Making no pretence to float a single new idea in philosophy, religion, or science, but only to revive and popularize the knowledge of the ancients upon these major human problems, it has played the part of the interpreter, not that of the iconoclast. Absolutely tolerant with respect to the several faiths of Humanity, its equal endeavour has been to uncover the ruin-encumbered universal foundation of religion upon which all rest alike.

Toward Science its feeling has been and ever shall be reverent, in the degree of the right of the latter to homage. At the same time, the hatred and antagonism of the Founders of our magazine have been unqualified against scientific and sectarian dogmatism and intolerance. *Lucifer* began by waving its torch before the windows of Lambeth Palace, not because of any personal feeling against His Grace of Canterbury, as an individual, but against the officialism he represents, which is at once selfish and un-Christian to the last degree. And so, if *Lucifer* has sometimes lit with its celestial flame the laboratory fires

behind the back of the scientific obscurantists, it was under the inspiration of a fervent loyalty to that true scientific research whose axiom of impartiality and courageous quest throughout nature was formulated axiomatically by Arago in his famous apothegm that outside of pure mathematics the word “impossible” must never be pronounced.

We have not the vanity to suppose that we have done even a tithe of what was possible within the editorial field of our chosen labour. We have doubtless in many cases failed to expound our subjects clearly and exhaustively; perhaps, too, our sins of commission may have been as grievous as those of omission. But asking indulgence for all shortcomings, we appeal to that inborn love of fair play, which is the boast of our times, to give us credit for good intent and fearless defence of our ideals.

The most mischievous tendency of society is to confound general principles with individual merit, and to excuse oneself for disloyalty to these ideals on the score of shortcomings in individual representatives of those aspirations.

In no movement of modern times has this been more viciously evident than in that which *Lucifer* and its sister-magazines represent. Frequently the aims and objects of the Theosophical movement have been quite ignored when it was a question of the merit or demerit of its conductors. Of course it would be but a waste of time to point out the inconsistency of those who would stretch it upon this bed of Procrustes, while ready to protest indignantly against the same test being applied to religious movements and scientific advancement. The immorality or virtue of a theosophical leader no more affects the truth of theosophical ideas, than the mendaciousness and dishonesty of Francis, Lord Bacon, do the intellectual value of the contents of his *opus magnum*. Theosophists are all aware of the fact that the birth and development of our Society trace back to alleged hidden springs of influence and surveillance. Yet the vitality of such a source neither adds to, nor depreciates in the smallest degree the value of the ideas, principles and facts which have been spread throughout the world within the past fifteen years through various literary channels, of which *Lucifer* is one. That our magazine has not been partial, is shown in the fact that as occasion required we have criticized our own colleagues and co-members. In fact one of our editors has not hesitated to censure the policy of the *ad interim* conductors of her own magazine, *The Theosophist* of Madras.

If she has not held the torch nearer to certain American French, English, German and Hindu members of the Society, it is because the sweet spirit of theosophical charity demands that time should be given to these well-wishers but weak-doers to discover their ignorance and cleanse themselves of the ferocious selfishness, narrow-mindedness and conceit which have made their playing at “the higher life” an almost comical travesty. With time and experience, most of the Pharisaism of our worthy colleagues, the self-appointed censors of contemporary morals, will fade out, and they will acquire safer standards by which to judge outsiders and especially their own colleagues.

If there is one thing that *Lucifer* proposes to preach and enforce throughout the next year, more than any other subject, it is—CHARITY; unrelenting charity toward the shortcomings of one's neighbour, untiring charity with regard to the wants of one poorer than oneself. Charity is the scope of all theosophical teachings, the synthesis of all and every virtue. A person who exercises charity under this dual aspect, cannot be a bad man or woman, do what he may. We think with a certain philosopher that "it is proper that charity should flow out of a little purse, as well as out of a great sack," and with another writer, that one ought not to defer his charities till death. For "He who does so is rather liberal of another man's substance than his own," says Bacon. And how true and great these words of the eminent American poet, Joaquin Miller:

"ALL YOU CAN HOLD IN YOUR COLD DEAD HAND,
IS WHAT YOU HAVE GIVEN AWAY. . . ."

Apart from this—the future lines of *Lucifer* will be but a prolongation of those of the Past. We do not wish to persuade a single additional subscriber to register himself under any promise of occult teaching that is barred by the rules of mystical training. We shall not utter the last or even the penultimate word of mystery, nor give any pocket *Vade Mecum* which shall serve as a super-terrestrial Bradshaw to excursionists in the Astral Light. Whosoever would

". . . . trace
The secrets of that starry race"

—must travel first along the lines of true Theosophy; and then only can he expect to break through the region of Mystery and the Supreme Knowledge.

We stand at the parting of the ways, where the one path leads down the acclivity to the dark valley of ignorance, and the other climbs upward toward the pure celestial level of being. For us, it is to utter the cry of warning and the word of encouragement; *he that hath ears to hear, let him hear*—AND BE WISE.

Collected Writings VOLUME X
September, 1888

96

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

CHRISTIAN OR MENTAL SCIENCE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 13, September, 1888, p. 72]

[Reginald Birney explains the basic precepts of Mental Science and its distinction from Christian Science. He refers to the review of Ursula N. Gestefeld's *Statement of Christian Science*, which appeared in *Lucifer*, Vol. II, No. 11, July, 1888. He says: "You ask where is the guarantee—the hall-mark by which the true Mental (or so-called Christian) Scientist may be known. '*By their fruits ye shall know them.*'" To this, H.P.B. appends the following footnote:]

Just so. And it is precisely because we find these fruits abortive, by reason of the ever-failing attempts—as far as we have seen and heard—to cure a really serious disease by such means, that we permit ourselves to doubt the efficacy of Mental (or Christian) Science, in its modern garb and practice. It is not mental *Science* itself—thousands of years old—that we doubt, but the Scientists, whether Mental or Christian. We doubt as little the existence of such a Science in days of old, and the possibility of its revival in our age, as we do Theosophy, and the Wisdom-Religion, of which both Theosophy and Mind-Cure are part and parcel. But what we do say is that "many are the called and (very) few are the chosen." Neither the Mental Scientist, nor the Theosophist, are such by the saying "*by their fruits ye shall know them.*" Two-thirds of the Mental (or Christian) Scientists and Theosophists are, we fear, but bad wine corked in good bottles.

[He speaks of the safety of entrusting such powers to the multitude, and of the possible intervention of higher Powers protecting mankind from the misuse of various forces. To this, H.P.B. says:]

It is this pernicious doctrine of ever relying upon extraneous help that leads to the collapse—physical, mental, moral, and spiritual—of well-meaning, but weak and unbalanced minds. It slays the patient of the mesmeriser and the mental healer, the neophyte of the sorcerer, and the *dilettante* of Reform. Neither success nor safety is to be found outside self-development.



WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE

Originally published in *Theosophy*, New York,
Vol. XI, June, 1896

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
September, 1888

AN UNPOPULAR PHILOSOPHER

97

**FROM THE NOTE BOOK OF AN UNPOPULAR
PHILOSOPHER**

THOUGHTS ON THE BIRTHDAY OF LUCIFER

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 13, September, 1888, pp. 84-88]

Ever Onward.

In its ceaseless and, also, too rapid flight along the path of Eternity, Time has taken one mighty stride more: a step of twelve months' duration toward the last day of our present age; also of the lives of many of us within, and of all of us beyond—the ultimate frontier of our senile century. In twelve years more the curtain will have dropped, shutting out the footlights from the actors and all the latter from the public view

It is only then that many a scene enacted in the sad drama of life, and many an hitherto misunderstood attitude of some of the chief actors in that Mystery of the Age called Theosophy and its Societies, will appear in its true light.

The Verdict of Posterity.

In those days of the forthcoming age Solomon shall sit in judgment over David. The century that shall be born shall pass its sentence over the century which is now fast dying. And, the grandchildren of the modern theosophists will have to find a verdict for, or against their sires. What shall it be? Perhaps, there are those who know, but who of them shall tell! Those who can see into the womb of futurity and could prophesy, keep aloof from the sneers of the Philistines. In our days of Iconoclasm and prosaic realism he is no philosopher—not even an “unpopular” one—who dabbles in things unseen. Let us abstain, since Theosophists are denied the privileges

the full homage due to the eminent virtues which characterize our age. How glaringly its bright image falls on the dark screen of the Past! What a contrast between its Christian purity, fortitude, charity, chastity and unselfishness, and the vices and dissipation of—say—its long departed predecessor, the age of the Imperial and Pagan Rome! This is affirmed in scores of works, preached from thousands of pulpits. What will be the *impartial* opinion of Century XX about its predecessor is easy to see. Our historians are the sons and descendants of those patristic biographers who made of the Emperor Julian an apostate, and of Constantine a Saint. Fear not then the verdict of thy immediate posterity, O Century XIX. Blessed shall be the fruit of thy womb, in any case. For, whether that fruit be green or over-ripe, godly or diabolical, so long as thy rotten civilisation goes on producing historians, so long shall thy policy of plunder and bloodshed be called civic and military virtues, and sham, lie and hypocrisy stand proclaimed as Sparto-Christian ethics.

Our "Morning Star."

Lucifer is one year old this month. The child is growing and waxing strong in Spirit—if not altogether as much in wisdom, as one might like it. Its temper is often complained of, and it has made enemies. But its friends are many, and in certain parts of the world it is petted and even spoiled—temper notwithstanding. Our baby is teething, in truth, and therefore subject at times to fits of pessimism and biting. But its humour will soften down with age; and as material for its food is gradually collecting for the second year, it may yet be proved, even to its enemies, a precocious and well-informed, if even an unwelcome child.

A Wicked Charge.

Meanwhile some subscribers have thought fit to throw a shadow on his second birthday. *Lucifer*, they say, does not live up to its promises; *i.e.*, it does not sufficiently “bring to light the hidden things of darkness” concerning the Book of God and the “friends of God,” the Jewish Patriarchs. Payne Knight and Inman have done so far more fully and efficiently, etc., etc.

Respected Subscribers! *Lucifer* is Venus only in astronomy; nor have its editors ever bargained to equal, far less surpass, in the exposition of phallic mysteries, Inman and Payne Knight, or even their miniature “*bijou*” edition, Hargrave Jennings. The methods used by these gentlemen are, no doubt, very scientific; but, they are too realistic and too crude and too one-sided for us to follow. If people will have truth, then, of course, the “hidden things of darkness” in the Sinaitic Symbology have to be unveiled. Let us then *re-reveal* Revelation by all means.

But why should we go out of our way to use the Bible as a colonial store of spices with which to flavour our Western viands, or turn *Lucifer* into a Scotland Yard detective staff for patriarchal delinquents? The amorous debates of the *dramatis personae* in Pentateuchal esotericism, are very well in archaeological works of research, but entirely out of place in a theosophical magazine. *Lucifer* is intended to review and preach modern, not ancient ethics, and metaphysical as against materialistic philosophy. The *faux pas* of Lot and David, “the friends of God,” belong, together with the poetical glyphs of “fish,” “heel” and “thigh,” to scriptural symbology. It was an archaic attempt at feline cleanliness, and speaks rather in favour than to the detriment of the authors of the revealed book. Those who prefer naked sincerity of language, are asked to turn to the Prophets.

The Age of Ovid or Hosea?

The word of the “Lord” unto Hosea, the son of Beer, was surely addressed to our age of civilization. The latter is truly the reincarnation of the docile prophet, who, acting upon the advice of his God, loves “a woman beloved of her friends, yet an adulteress,” looks to many gods and loves “flagons of wine.”

What have we to envy in the “stiff-necked” people of Israel? From its Sodom and Gomorrah, its worship of the Golden Calf, the innocent pastimes of King Solomon, down to the practice and policy of those whom the Christian Saviour addressed as “the generation of vipers,” we are the worthy followers of the “chosen people.” We have made of the “upper ten” our high places wherein we worship, and the symbology of modern society is of as concealing a nature as that of the Biblical writers. Their symbology pales before ours. The magic wand of our century transforms in its astuteness everything under the sun into something else, in social, political and daily life. The hideous marks of moral leprosy are made to appear as glorious scars from wounds received on the battlefield of honour; black tresses are changed into yellow hair, and the adipose tissue of carrion metamorphosed into the poor man’s butter. We live in days of a moral (alias immoral) *féerie*, in which every Mr. Hyde puts on the mask of Dr. Jekyll. It is the latter who is the symbolism of our age, and the former its ever more and more irrepressible tendency. Thus the cloak of esotericism, which modern society, the representative and key-note of the average population in every nation, throws over its sins of commission and omission, is as thick as Biblical symbolism. Only the two have changed and inverted their *rôles*; it is the external cloak of ancient symbolism which has become the inner life and true aspirations of modern Mrs. Grundy.

Then and Now.

To the adept versed in the modern society-symbolism the allegories of old become like unto a transparent artifice of an innocent infant when confronted with and brought face to face with the Machiavellistic craft and cunning of what we know as Society-ways. The two symbols of modern culture respectively referred to as RELIGIOUS CANT and drawing room PROPRIETY have reached a practical perfection under their mask, undreamt of by the Rebekahs and Jezebels, the Jacobs and even Solomons of old. They have become the two exotic, gigantic plants of modern culture. Therefore is it that *Lucifer* refuses to follow in the footsteps of our modern Symbologists. He believes that the muddy water of the “Rivers of (modern) Life,” ought to receive more attention than the “Rivers of (ancient) Life.” The modern revealer of the archaic “things of darkness” is too much coloured with the general tendency of the age to be more than one-sided, and therefore he can hardly be correct in the interpretation of its symbolism. He sees in the smooth dark waters of these “Rivers” the reflection of his own century, when he does not actually mirror himself personally, in them. Hence, he perceives everywhere phallic worship; and primitive symbolism can represent to his distorted fancy nought but what he would find in it. Why give preference to imagined, over real events? The Ahabs and Jezebels who kill the prophets are as plentiful in our day as in the days of old. The modern Mrs. Potiphar, finding no Joseph to offend her, expends her slanderous energies to the detriment of her best “lady friends.” Sweet are her whispers into the greedy ear of Janus-faced Grundy, who, nodding her venerable head, listens to them drinking slander like heavenly dew. The modern Lot requires not to be made drunk with wine to give a mother to Moab; the XIXth century Epopees repeat on a grander scale the adventures of Helen and Sita. Only Homer and Valmiki have now made room for Zola, and the modern literature of the realistic school in France, puts to blush by the sincerity of its language all

the private dialogues of the “Lord” with his prophet Hosea. What have we to envy in the ancients?

Where are we going to?

Ahimé! We live in strange and weird times. Ours are the days of Sheffield plating on the moral plane. True silver has almost gone out of use and has fallen, like the Indian rupees, far below par. This is not a time for golden rules, for people prefer moral pinchbeck. Nature, as well as man, seems to crack on all her seven seams, and the universal screws have assuredly got loose somewhere, if not everywhere, on their hinges,

after the fashion of this earth. Paradox flourishes and axioms are running to seed. Nature and man vie with each other in shams. The Lord God of our state religions is proclaimed a god of mercy, of peace and love, and at the same time he is a “man of war”; “the Lord our God” who “fights for Israel.” “Thou shalt not kill,” says the commandment; and on this principle improvements in murderous, man-killing engines are being invented by the “humble” servants of the said Power—for a consideration. Rev F. Bosworth, a *man of God and peace*, has just been rewarded by the paternal Government with a premium of £2,000, for “the advancement of gunnery science.”

Esoterically explained, this “advancement” means, I suppose, in political symbology a cannon possessing a ten-fold greater power and rapidity for killing the bodies of one’s enemies, than the fulmination of Church canons for killing their enemies’ souls. Hence, the reward to ingenious parsons. Every Christian nation is busy now with preparing guns and rifles superior to those possessed by its neighbours. Duels fought between two nations seem to be judged by a different code of honour from those between two individuals. Battles won by *trickery*, are laid down to “military genius” and regarded as “the poetical and imaginative side of the war.” (*Fort-nightly Review*, Lord Wolseley.) Trickery in commercial

or private business is punished with hard labour. In the former case, the cunning and unexpected employment of weapons of superior murderousness and devilish cruelty are lauded and their successful use made to bring the highest military honours; whereas the private antagonist who uses an unequal weapon or takes an unfair advantage in any way is counted a murderer and a felon. So, statesmen who “lie for their country’s good” and derive benefits for it by foul deception have promotion and honours; while their less culpable imitator who plays with marked cards and loaded dice, or “pulls” a race, is scourged out of decent company. So chronic and congenital is our obtuseness, that we have never yet been able to distinguish the one moral baseness from the other. But to a reflective philosopher, the difference between such a modern statesman or general and a modern blackleg and a coward is imperceptible.

Still more puzzling!

And what of the inventive and Reverend “Bosworths”? Have they become so familiarized with the Salvation Army motto of “blood and fire” as to be led to pass by an easy transition to their actual shedding and use on the physical plane? They pray and repent and glorify their Lord and therefore fear nought for themselves. They are the modern Ahabs of whom the word of the Lord came to Elijah, the Tishbite, saying:—“Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me? *because he humbleth himself before me, I will not bring, the evil in his days: but in his [innocent] son’s days will I bring the evil upon his house*” (*I Kings*, xxi, 29).

Therefore do the Reverend “Bosworths” snap their fingers at *Karma* and say:—“*Après moi le deluge.*”

Why, then, should any one object to help toward the glory of one’s country through human butchery and rivers of blood? What harm can befall any one through it, provided he only *humble* himself before the “Lord” like Ahab? And do not both the belligerent armies pray?

Does any such human slaughter on a battle field begin without that Lord being almost simultaneously addressed and implored for help by both parties?.

Query:—Does the kind and merciful Father in Heaven—one with Him, we are taught, who said that “all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword”—listen to both sides, or to one? And can even He, to whom all is possible, perform the miracle of sending victory to both his humble petitioners? To which of the two does the good God listen? Is it to the weakest of the two, or to the strongest? O, Problems of the Age! Who can solve them save his grace the Archbishop of Canterbury? But he will hardly pay any attention to an “unpopular philosopher” who is not even a conservative member of Parliament. What great general was it who said that Providence was always on the side of the heaviest battalions?

By their Fruits shall ye know them.

What is the difference between a devout Christian and an Atheist? The problem was philosophically solved by a little girl in the United States. The anecdote is told by one who heard it himself—“our mutual friend,”—the very popular American, Edmund Russell.

On the day before the funeral of Peter Cooper—the late millionaire and philanthropist—at New York, Mr. Russell went to a “bakeshop.” Three little girls were serving behind the counter. It was a holiday in the city, as every one was preparing to honour the memory of one of the people’s benefactors by following the procession.

“Only to think!” reflectively said one of the girls. “He” (meaning Peter Cooper) “owned a whole pew in church and never went inside one.”

“Well,” replied another, “he was perhaps a Unitarian?”

“No, he was not,” put in the third girl. “He was a philanthropist.”

“Oh dear no,” groaned the first who had spoken. “He was an Atheist.”

To which the youngest of all the three begged to be informed of the meaning of that term. “Well, and what is an Atheist anyhow?” she asked.

“An Atheist,” gravely explained the eldest—“means a man *who believes in doing all the good he can in this world and taking his chance in the next.*”

Uncanny Signs.

The outlook for the British Isles is hopelessly depressing. *La boule à cancan* (“Gossip ball”), as Anatole France calls our mother earth, is losing her spin, and the Cosmic dynamo is emptying itself. The worst of all is, that we do not know whom to hold responsible. What ails the divine COSMOCRATORES? India is exporting her superfluous “*monsoon* clouds” to Europe *via* Port Said, and the rain-God seems to have permanently established his sprinkling machine over Great Britain. Siberia sends her hyperborean frosts to the southwards, and herself flirts with the tropics. Kangaroos have appeared in Surrey; and parrots may soon be heard warbling their saw-filing *staccato*, and birds of paradise sun their jewelled plumes on palm trees in Archangel. Everything evidently is upside down, the times are out of joint, and the screws of the Cosmic “Carpenter” are working loose. In vain our men of Science waste their Greek and Latin over the problem. What is it, what can the matter be? What makes all this sidereal and terrestrial “tohu-bohu” *à la mode*, of Chaos? The Globe is shrinking, we hear; and the firmament thickening with foreign matter of all sorts. The ceaseless soot and smoke from millions of chimneys, furnaces, railway engines and other fires may perchance have angered the Powers above. Naturally enough, for they must object to being smoked out of their Svargas and Valhallas and other pleasant detached Elysiums, by the products of incomplete fuel-combustion. As for our

poor mother Earth, what with the ever extending mines, canals, and tunnels, aqueducts, drains, sewers and subways, her venerable hide is becoming so honey-combed as to resemble the skin of a morphiomaniac addicted to subcutaneous injections.

How long she will suffer her robust flanks to be thus scarified, who can tell? The astrologer on the staff of the *Pall Mall Gazette* has just prophesied that October will bring us terrible disasters, floods, houses falling and earthquakes.

Woe to London if the latter should happen, for at the first strong shock every tall mansion within the seismic area will crumble into its own basement and cellar; at the second all the streets sink into the subways; and at the third the four and a half millions of houseless people will find themselves hoisted into cerulean space, *en route* for the starry

land of Silence, by the explosion of all the gas, steam, dynamite and other expansive products of modern ingenuity. We doubt if there will be a sufficient number of ready-made wings and golden harps in stock against the *dies irae*. But it is at least consoling to feel that there will be ample fire and brimstone for all who are “predestined” by God to migrate to tropical regions.

For myself I confess my utter incapacity to know where this exact line will be drawn. Perhaps some Daniel among our subscribers may be able to “come to judgment.” Is it only Presbyterians who can be saved? The conundrum is sufficient to puzzle any philosopher when he reads something like the following, which we copy, *verbatim*, from the original handbill sent us by an American friend. The scene is at Baraboo, Wisconsin:

AN UNPOPULAR PHILOSOPHER

107

LAWN PARTY

At the Residence of

Mrs. R. H. Strong,

For the benefit of the

EPISCOPAL BUILDING FUND,

Under the Auspices of

4—FOUR YOUNG GENTLEMEN—4

Of the Congregation.

On Wednesday Eve, July 18th.

HAMMOCKS, ICE-CREAM,

ATTRACTIVE YOUNG LADIES,

AND A VERY WARM WELCOME!

Gates open at 8 o'clock.

The Episcopal Church is the American section of the Church of England; its bishops are just now preaching over here, in our cathedrals, and sitting in conclave at Lambeth Palace. What will his grace of Canterbury say to the new of raising funds for Church building? Is it immoral for publicans to hire “pretty barmaids” to dispense “something hot”

across the counter, but moral for Episcopalians to employ “attractive young ladies” and “hammocks” to give a “very warm welcome” to visitors “under the auspices of four young gentlemen of the congregation”? *Lucifer* shrouds his face in his mantle to hide the blush which his ignorance excites. He recalls the memories of previous incarnations when, as Venus, he saw the sacred mysteries debased into the lascivious rites of Venus-Astarte, wherein the highest ladies gave themselves to increase the revenues of the Temple, and the *Kadeshuth* of the Jews (*Vide 2 Kings*, xxiii, 7) performed the ignoble duties of the depraved Vallabacharyas of India!

Meanwhile, join us in wishing many happy returns of his birthday, to *Lucifer*, “Son of the Morning.” May he grow to equal in profundity his elder brother, *The Theosophist* of Madras; in suavity and graciousness his elder sister *The Path*, of New York; and in combative zeal and daring *Le Lotus* which flourishes on the banks of the Seine. *Lucifer* is just in time to salute the fledgling of the Theosophical literature the *Hestia*, which our brother, Mr. Sturdy, has just founded in New Zealand as a local organ of Theosophy.

That nothing should be wanting to make the birthday pleasant, our tireless old President-Founder, patriarchal beard and the rest, turns up on a special mission of peace and organization confided to him by the Executive Council at Adyar. A less cool and patient man might well despair of pouring oil upon the troubled waters of European theosophy through which our ship has been labouring during the past twelve months.

Floreat Adyar.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
September, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 13, September, 1888, pp. 69, 81-82]

[Thomas May brings forward some Scriptural data in answer to Rev. T. G. Headley's perplexities on the subject of God and the Devil. He writes: "He is called Satan or Shethen—opposition—and also an Accuser—not, however, a *false accuser*—as, in the book ascribed to Job, he is represented as one of the Sons of God, who presents himself with the others, and as such is invested with superior wisdom, directing even the providence of God." To this, H.P.B. appends the following footnote:]

This is undeniable; for we find stated in the *Zohar* that the "Ancient of all the Ancients" (Ain-soph, the Kabalists say, the *Logos* or At-tee-kah, also Hokhmah, or Wisdom, the Occultists maintain) having evolved or "created" *Thorah* (the law, or Dharma) hitherto hidden,

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

109

Thorah forthwith addressed IT (the Ancient of all the Ancients) in these words: "IT, that wishes to arrange in order other things, should first arrange Itself in its (to it pertaining) Forms." And the "Forever concealed" did follow Thorah's advice and did so arrange its forms as to become manifested as the Universe. And if Thorah, why not Satan?

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
September, 1888

110

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

THEOSOPHIE ET BOUDDHISME

[*Le Lotus*, Paris, Vol. III, No. 18, September, 1888, pp. 321-33]

[This French essay from the pen of H. P. B. has such close similarity to her *Lucifer* editorial entitled "The Theosophical Society: Its Mission and Its Future," published in August, 1888, that it could easily be mistaken for a French translation, especially as it appeared only a month later. A good many of its paragraphs are word for word identical with those of the earlier essay, while others are somewhat different. Some of the material is slightly re-arranged, and the quoted passages from Émile Burnouf are fewer in number than is the case in the *Lucifer* editorial.

To prevent unnecessary repetition, we have translated into English only a few brief passages which contain additional thoughts, or a different presentation of similar ideas expressed in the earlier essay. In this manner no thought of any importance is lost to the reader who may not be familiar with the French language.—*Compiler.*]

M. Émile Burnouf, le sanscritiste bien connu, vient de publier dans la *Revue des Deux-Mondes* (Vol. 88, 15 juillet, 1888), un article intitulé «Le Bouddhisme en Occident», dans lequel il expose ses vues sur la mission et l'avenir de la Société Théosophique. Celle-ci a trop rarement la bonne fortune de recevoir un traitement aussi courtois et des conseils aussi sympathiques, et signes d'un nom aussi cher à tous ceux qui aiment l'Orient, pour que nous ne croyions plaire à nos lecteurs en leur exposant ces critiques d'un penseur sérieux et ces encouragements d'un homme de cœur.

Cet article prouve que la Société Théosophique a enfin pris, dans la pensée du XIX^e siècle, la place qui lui est due et qu'elle va entrer dans une ère nouvelle. Il mérite donc le respect et l'attention de tous ceux qui ont compris notre œuvre ou qui s'y sont dévoués. Burnouf étudie successivement le Bouddhisme, le Christianisme et la Société Théosophique,

« . . . trois religions ou associations d'hommes ayant des doctrines identiques, un même but, et se rattachant à une source commune. Cette source, qui est orientale, était naguère contestée; aujourd'hui, elle est pleinement mise en lumière par les recherches des savants,

THÉOSOPHIE ET BOUDDHISME

111

notamment des savants anglais, et par la publication de textes originaux. Parmi ces scrutateurs sagaces, il suffira de citer les noms de Sayce, de Poole, de Beal, de Rhys-David, de Spence Hardy, de Bunsen; il serait difficile d'épuiser la liste». [p. 341.]

La première partie de l'article est consacrée à la biographie du prince de Kapilavastu, à une courte exposition et à un résumé historique du Bouddhisme jusqu'à l'ère chrétienne. La vie de Çâkyamouni est trop connue pour que nous la reproduisions; mais nous devons signaler quelques mots prouvant que *Nirvâna* ne veut pas dire annihilation.

Je n'ai point à discuter ici sur la nature du nirvâna. Je dirai seulement que l'idée du néant est absolument étrangère à l'Inde, que l'objet du Bouddha fut de soustraire l'humanité aux misères de la vie terrestre et à ses retours alternés; qu'enfin il passa sa longue existence à lutter contre Mâra et ses anges, qu'il appelait lui-même la Mort et l'armée de la mort. Le mot *nirvâna* veut bien dire extinction, par exemple d'une lampe sur laquelle on souffle; mais il veut dire aussi absence de vent.* Je pense donc que le nirvâna n'est autre chose que ce *requies aeterna*, cette *lux perpetua* que les chrétiens aussi demandent pour leurs morts. C'est en ce sens qu'il est entendu dans le texte birman publié il y a quelques années à Rangoun, en anglais, par le révérend Bigandet. [p. 343.]

Peu de conceptions ont été plus mal comprises que celle du Nirvâna, si ce n'est peut-être celle de la divinité. Chez les Juifs et autres Sémites, chez les anciens Grecs et les Romains, et même chez les Brahmanes, le prêtre est le médiateur entre l'homme et Dieu.

. . . Il transmet à Dieu l'offrande et l'adoration du fidèle, Dieu donne en retour ses grâces et ses secours dans la vie, au jour de la mort Dieu reçoit le fidèle parmi ses élus. Pour que cet échange soit possible, il est nécessaire que Dieu soit conçu comme un être individuel, comme une personne, en quelque sorte comme le roi de l'univers, distribuant ses faveurs selon sa volonté, sans doute aussi

* Le fait que *Nirvâna* ne veut pas dire annihilation a été affirmé et répété dans *Isis Unveiled*, dont l'auteur a discuté le sens étymologique donné par Max Müller ou d'autres, et a montré que «l'extinction d'une lampe» n'implique même pas l'idée que Nirvâna soit «l'extinction de la conscience». (Voyez Vol. I, p. 290, et Vol. II pp. 116-17, 286, 320, 566, etc. . .)

selon la justice. . . Rien de pareil dans le Bouddhisme. Comme il n'y a pas de dieu personnel, il n'y a pas de saint-sacrifice, il n'y a pas d'intermédiaire. . . [p. 344.]

. . . Ce Bouddha n'est pas un dieu qu'on implore; ce fut un homme parvenu au degré suprême de la sagesse et de la vertu. . . Quant à la nature du principe absolu des choses, que les autres religions nomment Dieu, la métaphysique bouddhique le conçoit d'une toute autre manière et n'en fait pas un être séparé de l'univers. . . En second lieu, le Bouddha ouvrit son église à tous les hommes, sans distinction d'origine, de caste, de patrie, de couleur, de sexe: «Ma loi, disait-il, est une loi de grâce pour tous». C'était la première fois qu'apparaissait dans le monde une religion universelle. Jusquelà, chaque pays avait eu la sienne, d'où les étrangers étaient exclus. On peut soutenir que, dans les premières années de sa prédication, le réformateur n'eut pas en vue la destruction des castes, puisqu'il admettait comme un droit légitime la puissance royale et ne luttait point contre elle. Mais l'égalité naturelle des hommes fut une des bases de sa doctrine, les livres bouddhiques sont pleins de dissertations, de récits et de paraboles dont le but est de la démontrer. . . La liberté en était la conséquence. Aucun membre de l'église ne pouvait imposer à un autre d'y rester malgré soi. . . [pp. 345-46.] . . On ne naissait pas bouddhiste, on le devenait par un choix volontaire et après une sorte de stage que tout prétendant devait subir. Une fois membre de l'Assemblée, on ne se distinguait plus des autres frères;

l'unique supériorité que l'on pouvait acquérir était celle de la science et de la vertu. Cet amour mutuel, cette fraternité, s'étendait aux femmes et faisait de l'Assemblée une sorte de famille [p. 346.]

Après avoir raconté les progrès du Bouddhisme dans le Sud et le Nord de l'Inde, chez les Mazdéens et les Juifs, M. Burnouf remarque que ceux-ci ont emprunté au Bouddhisme leur idée du Messie. L'influence orientale a été nettement discernée dans l'histoire juive depuis la captivité; la doctrine de la réincarnation vient aussi des Indes.

On regarde les esséniens comme formant le lien et le point de rencontre entre les rabbins, les gnostiques juifs, les platoniciens ou pythagoriciens d'une part, le parsisme et le bouddhisme d'autre part Ils condamnaient les sacrifices sanglants, comme le Bouddha et la Synagogue, et les remplaçaient par la méditation et par le sacrifice des passions. . . .s'abstenaient de viande et de vin. . . . pratiquaient la communauté des biens, l'aumône, l'amour de la vérité, la pureté dans les actions, dans les paroles et dans les pensées proclamaient l'égalité des hommes, proscrivaient l'esclavage et

remplaçaient la discorde par la charité. . . . les premiers chrétiens étaient esséniens. . . . [pp. 352-53.]

En comparant la vie de Jésus et celle de Bouddha, on voit que leurs biographies se divisent en deux parties, la légende idéale et les faits réels. Or, la partie légendaire est identique dans les deux. Au point de vue théosophique, cela est facile à expliquer puisque ces légendes sont basées sur le cycle de l'initiation. Enfin l'auteur compare cette partie légendaire avec les traits correspondants des autres religions, entre autres avec l'histoire védique de Viṣṇu. D'après lui, c'est seulement au concile de Nicée que le Christianisme rompit officiellement avec le Bouddhisme ecclésiastique; cependant il regarde le Credo adopté par le concile comme le développement de la formule: «Le Bouddha, la loi, l'église» (Buddha, Dharma, Sangha).

Quelques pages sont consacrées aux ramifications de la secte des Esséniens, qui n'avaient pas été complètement absorbées par la religion du Christ. Telles sont les sectes des Mandéens, des Sabéens ou Manichéens; enfin les Albigeois d'une part, et de l'autre les Pauliciens, dont l'influence sur le protestantisme est discernable, représentent les derniers vestiges de l'influence bouddhiste en Occident. Les Manichéens étaient, dans l'origine, des *Samans ou Çramanas*, ascètes bouddhistes dont saint Hippolyte mentionne la présence à Rome au milieu du III^e siècle. M. Burnouf explique leur dualisme par rapport à la double nature de l'homme, le bien et le mal, le mal étant le Mâra de la légende bouddhiste. Il montre que les Manichéens dérivèrent leurs doctrines du Bouddhisme, plus directement que les chrétiens; en conséquence une lutte mortelle s'éleva entre les deux, lorsque l'Église chrétienne prit corps et prétendit posséder seule et exclusivement la vérité. Cette idée est en contradiction directe avec les conceptions fondamentales du Bouddhisme, et ceux qui la professaient devaient être naturellement adversaires acharnés des Manichéens. C'est ainsi l'esprit juif d'exclusion qui arma contre les Manichéens le bras séculier des États chrétiens. La persécution fut terrible; «ils furent tellement écrasés, que leur multitude, alors

immense, se dissipa comme une fumée». Les théosophes peuvent donc considérer les persécutions ecclésiastiques comme une des plus nobles portions de leur héritage. Aucune société n'a été plus férocement calomniée et persécutée par l'*odium theologicum*, que l'association théosophique et ses fondateurs, depuis que les églises chrétiennes en sont réduites à n'employer d'autres armes que la langue.

Ayant suivi cette haute ligne depuis l'Inde, à travers la Palestine jusqu'en Europe, nous croyons devoir citer entièrement quelques paragraphes que M. Burnouf consacre à la Société théosophique:

L'analyse nous montre dans notre société contemporaine deux choses essentielles: l'idée d'un Dieu personnel chez les croyants, et chez les philosophes, la disparition à peu près complète de la charité. L'élément juif a repris le dessus, et l'élément bouddhique du christianisme s'est voilé.

C'est donc un des phénomènes les plus intéressants, sinon les plus inattendus de nos jours, que la tentative faite en ce moment de susciter et de constituer dans le monde une société nouvelle, appuyée sur les mêmes fondements que le bouddhisme. Quoiqu'elle ne soit qu'à ses commencements, sa croissance est si rapide que nos lecteurs seront bien aises de voir leur attention appelée sur ce sujet. Elle est encore en quelque sorte à l'état de mission, et sa propagation s'accomplit sans bruit et sans violence. Elle n'a pas même un nom définitif; ses membres se groupent sous des noms orientaux, mis en tête de leurs publications: *Isis, Lotus, Sphinx, Lucifer*. Le nom commun qui prévaut parmi eux pour le moment est celui de *Société Théosophique*.

Cette société est bien jeune; elle a déjà pourtant une histoire. Elle fut fondée en 1875, à New-York, par un très petit groupe de personnes, inquiètes de la rapide décadence des idées morales dans l'âge présent. Ce groupe s'intitula: «Société Théosophique aryenne de New-York». L'épithète d'aryenne indiquait assez que la Société se séparait du monde sémitique, notamment des dogmes juifs; la partie juive du christianisme devait être réformée, soit par une simple amputation, soit, comme cela est arrivé en effet, par voie d'interprétation. Toutefois, un des principes de la société était la neutralité en matière de secte, et la liberté de l'effort personnel vers la science et la vertu. . . .

La société n'a ni argent ni patrons; elle agit avec ses seules ressources éventuelles. Elle n'a rien de mondain. Elle n'a aucun esprit de secte. Elle ne flatte aucun intérêt. Elle s'est donné un idéal moral très élevé, combat le vice et l'égoïsme. Elle tend à l'unification des religions, qu'elle considère comme identiques dans leur origine philosophique; mais elle reconnaît la suprématie de la vérité. *Le*

THÉOSOPHIE ET BOUDDHISME

115

Lotus, revue mensuelle qu'elle publie à Paris, a pris pour épigraphe la devise sanscrite des mahârâjahs de Bénâres: «*Satyân nâsti paro dharmah*, il n'y a pas de religion plus élevée que la vérité».

Avec ces principes et au temps où nous sommes, la société ne pouvait guère s'imposer de plus mauvaises conditions d'existence. Cependant elle a progressé avec une étonnante rapidité. . . [pp. 366-67.]. . . En Amérique, la société a pris une grande extension dans ces derniers temps; ses branches se sont multipliées, puis se sont en quelque sorte fédéralisées autour de l'une d'entre elles, la branche de Cincinnati. . . .

Comme le second objet que se propose l'association est l'étude des littératures, des religions, des sciences aryennes et orientales, et qu'une partie de ses membres poursuit l'interprétation des anciens dogmes mystiques et des lois inexplicables de la nature, on pourrait voir en elle une sorte d'académie hermétique, assez étrangère aux choses de la vie. On est vite ramené à la réalité par la nature des publications qu'elle fait

ou qu'elle recommande, et par la déclaration contenue dans le *Lucifer*, publié à Londres, et reproduite dans *Le Lotus* du mois de janvier dernier: «N'est pas théosophe qui ne pratique pas l'altruisme (le contraire de l'égoïsme); qui n'est pas préparé à partager son dernier morceau de pain avec plus faible ou plus pauvre que lui; qui néglige d'aider l'homme, son frère, quelque soit sa race, sa nation ou sa croyance, en quelque temps et quelque lieu qu'il le voit souffrant, et fait la sourde oreille au cri de la misère humaine; qui enfin entend calomnier un innocent, théosophe ou non, sans prendre sa défense, comme il le ferait pour lui-même». Cette déclaration n'est pas chrétienne, puisqu'elle ne tient pas compte des croyances, qu'elle ne fait de prosélytisme pour aucune communion, et que, en fait, les chrétiens ont ordinairement employé la calomnie contre leurs adversaires, par exemple contre les manichéens, les protestants et les juifs. Elle est bien moins encore musulmane ou brahmanique. Elle est purement bouddhique; les publications pratiques de la société sont ou des livres bouddhiques traduits, ou des ouvrages originaux inspirés par l'enseignement du Bouddha. La Société a donc un caractère bouddhique.

Elle s'en défend un peu dans la crainte de prendre une couleur sectaire et exclusive. Elle a tort: le bouddhisme vrai et original n'est pas une secte, c'est à peine une religion. C'est plutôt une réforme morale et intellectuelle, qui n'exclut aucune croyance, mais n'en adopte aucune. C'est ce que l'a fait la Société Théosophique [pp. 368-69.]

En parlant du Bouddhisme, M. Burnouf a constamment en vue le Bouddhisme primitif, cette magnifique floraison de vertu, de pureté et d'amour dont le cygne de Kapilavastu jeta les semences sur le sol de l'Inde. Sur ce point, nous sommes d'accord avec lui. Le code de

moral établi par Bouddha est le plus grand trésor qui ait été donné à l'humanité: cette religion, ou plutôt cette philosophie, se rapproche de la vérité ou science secrète, bien plus qu'aucune autre forme ou croyance exotérique. Nous ne pouvons proposer un idéal moral plus élevé que ces nobles principes de fraternité, de tolérance et de détachement, et la morale bouddhiste représente à peu près exactement la morale théosophique. En un mot, on ne pourrait nous honorer davantage qu'en nous appelant bouddhistes, si nous n'avions l'honneur d'être théosophes.

Mais la Société Théosophique se défend très sérieusement, et pas seulement pour la forme, d'avoir été créée «pour propager les dogmes du Bouddha». Notre mission n'est pas de propager des dogmes pas plus bouddhistes que védiques ou chrétiens; nous sommes indépendants de toute formule, de tout rituel, de tout exotérisme. Nous avons pu, aux tentatives d'envahissement faites par des chrétiens zélés mais chrétiens, opposer les nobles principes de l'éthique bouddhiste. Les présidents de la Société ont pu se déclarer personnellement bouddhistes, et on le leur a assez reproché; l'un d'eux a consacré sa vie à la régénération de cette religion dans sa terre d'origine. Que ceux-là lui jettent la pierre, qui ne comprennent pas les besoins de l'Inde actuelle et ne désirent pas le relèvement de cette antique patrie des vertus. Mais cela n'engage pas le corps théosophique, comme tel, vis-à-vis du bouddhisme ecclésiastique, pas plus le christianisme de certains de ses membres ne l'engage vis-à-vis d'aucune église chrétienne. Précisément parce que le Bouddhisme actuel a besoin d'être régénéré, débarrassé de toutes les superstitions et de toutes les restrictions qui l'ont envahi comme des plantes parasites, nous aurions grand tort

de chercher à greffer un bourgeon jeune et sain sur une branche qui a perdu de sa vitalité, bien qu'elle soit peut-être moins desséchée que les autres rameaux. Il est infiniment plus sage d'aller tout de suite aux racines, aux sources pures et inaltérables d'où le Bouddhisme lui-même a tiré sa sève puissante. Nous pouvons nous éclairer directement à la pure «Lumière de

l'Asie»; pourquoi nous attarderions-nous dans son ombre déformée? Malgré le caractère synthétique et théosophique du Bouddhisme primitif, le Bouddhisme actuel est devenu une religion dogmatique et s'est morcelé en sectes nombreuses et hétérogènes. L'histoire de cette religion et des autres est là pour nous avertir contre les demi-mesures. Voyez la réforme partielle appelée Protestantisme: les résultats sont-ils assez satisfaisants pour nous engager à des accommodages? L'Arya Samaj même n'est après tout qu'un effort national, tandis que la position essentielle de la Société Thésophique est d'affirmer et de maintenir la vérité commune à toutes les religions, la vérité vraie, que n'ont, pu souiller les inventions, les passions, ni les besoins des âges, et d'y convier tous les hommes, sans distinction de sexe, de couleur ou de rang,—et, qui plus est, de croyance.

M. Burnouf nous met en garde contre l'indifférence. D'où vient celle-ci? De l'indolence d'abord, ce fléau de l'humanité, puis du découragement. Et si l'homme est lassé de symboles et de cérémonies dont le prêtre ne donne jamais l'explication, mais dont il tire de beaux bénéfices, ce n'est pas en substituant des bonzeries à nos chapelles que nous secouons cette torpeur. Le moment est venu où toutes les cloches n'ont qu'un son: elles sonnent l'ennui. Prétendre réinstaller la religion de Bouddha sur les ruines de celle de Jésus, ce serait donner à l'arbre mort le soutien d'un bâton desséché. Notre critique lui-même nous avertit que l'humanité est lassée jusque des mots Dieu, religion. Remarquons, à ce propos, que le terme *théosophie*, qui signifie *sagesse divine*, n'implique pas nécessairement la croyance à un *dieu* personnel. Nous croyons la doctrine des théosophes suffisamment exposée pour n'avoir pas besoin d'insister à ce sujet. Ammonius Saccas, Plotin, Jamblique, Porphyre, Proclus étaient des théosophes; et, ne fût-ce que par respect pour ces hommes, nous pouvons bien conserver ce titre.

Non, le *Sangha* des Bouddhistes ne peut être rétabli dans notre civilisation. Quant au Bouddha lui-même, nous le vénérons comme le plus grand sage et le plus grand

bienfaiteur de l'humanité, et nous ne perdrons aucune occasion de revendiquer ses droits à l'admiration universelle. Mais en présence de cette loi terrible qui fait toujours dégénérer l'admiration en adoration et celle-ci en superstition, en présence de cette cristallisation

désespérante qui s'opère dans les cerveaux disposés à l'idolâtrie et en exclut tout ce qui n'est pas l'idole, serait-il sage de réclamer pour le frère aîné de Jésus la place étroite où ce dernier subit un culte sacrilège? Hélas, se peut-il qu'il y ait des hommes assez egoïstes pour ne pouvoir aimer qu'un être, assez serviles pour ne vouloir servir qu'un maître à la fois!

Reste donc *Dharma*: nous avons dit en quelle haute estime nous tenons la morale bouddhiste. Mais la Théosophie s'occupe d'autre chose que de règles de conduite: elle réalise ce miracle de pouvoir réunir une morale pré-bouddhiste à une métaphysique pré-védique et à une science pré-hermétique. Le développement théosophique fait appel à tous les principes de l'homme, à ses facultés intellectuelles comme à ses facultés spirituelles, et les deux derniers objets de notre programme ont plus d'importance que M. Burnouf ne semble leur en accorder. Nous pouvons lui assurer que si notre Société reçoit l'adhésion de beaucoup d'hommes de sa valeur, elle sera le canal d'un torrent d'idées nouvelles empruntées à des sources antiques: un torrent d'innovations artistiques, économiques, littéraires et scientifiques autant que philosophiques, et autrement fécond pour l'avenir que la première Renaissance. Il y aura là plus qu'une coloration académique: l'académie elle-même apprendra l'alphabet qui permet de lire clairement, entre les lignes, le sens si obscur et souvent si insignifiant en apparence des écritures antiques. Cette clef est à la portée de ceux qui ont le courage de lever la main pour la prendre. Et cette clef, Bouddha la possédait, car il était un adepte de haut rang. Il est vrai qu'il n'existe pas de mystères ou d'ésotérisme dans les deux principales églises bouddhistes, celle du Sud et celle du Nord. Les Bouddhistes peuvent bien se contenter de la lettre morte des doctrines de Siddhârtha Bouddha, car jusqu'à ce

jour, il n'en est pas de plus noble, heureusement; il n'en est pas qui puisse produire d'effet plus important sur l'éthique des masses. Mais c'est ici la grande erreur de tous les orientalistes. *Il y a* une doctrine ésotérique, une philosophie qui ennoblit l'âme, derrière le corps extérieur du Bouddhisme ecclésiastique. Celui-ci, pur, chaste et immaculé comme la neige vierge des sommets de l'Himalaya, est cependant aussi froid et aussi désolé en ce qui concerne la condition de l'homme *post mortem*. Le système secret était enseigné aux *Arhats* seuls, généralement dans le souterrain de Saptaparna (Sattapani de *Mahavam* a), connu de Fa-hian sous le non de grotte *Cheta* près du mont Baibhâr (en pali Webhâra), à Rajagriha, ancienne capitale de Magadha; il était enseigné par le seigneur Bouddha lui-même, entre les heures de *Dhyana* (contemplation mystique). C'est de cette grotte, appelée au temps de *Ākyamuni*, *Saraswati* ou cave des bambous, que les Arhats initiés dans la sagesse secrète emportèrent leur instruction et leur science au delà de l'Himalaya, où la doctrine secrète est enseignée jusqu'à ce jour. Si les Indiens du Sud, les envahisseurs de Ceylan n'avaient «amoncelé en piles aussi hautes que le sommet des cocotiers» les *ollas* des bouddhistes, et ne les avaient brûlés, de même que les Chrétiens brûlèrent toutes les archives secrètes des Gnostiques et des initiés, les Orientalistes en auraient la preuve, et

nous n'aurions pas besoin d'affirmer maintenant ce fait bien connu.

Les trois objets du programme théosophique peuvent se résumer par les trois mots *Amour, Science, Vertu*, et chacun est inséparable des deux autres. Revêtue de ce triple airain, la Société Theosophique *accomplira* le miracle que M. Burnouf lui demande et terrassera le dragon de la «lutte pour l'existence». Elle le fera non pas en niant l'existence de la loi en question, mais en lui assignant sa juste place dans l'ordre harmonieux de l'univers; en en dévoilant la nature et la signification; en montrant que cette pseudo-loi de vie est en réalité une loi de mort, une fiction des plus dangereuses en ce qui concerne la famille humaine. La «soi-conservation», sur de pareilles données, est en vérité un suicide lent et sûr, une politique

d'homicide mutuel. Par son application pratique, les hommes s'enfoncent et reculent de plus en plus vers le degré animal de l'évolution. La lutte pour l'existence, même sur les données de l'économie politique, qui ne s'élève pas au-dessus du plan matériel, ne s'applique qu'à l'être physique et pas du tout à l'être moral. Or, il est assez vraisemblable, à première vue, pour qui a un peu approfondi la constitution de notre univers illusoire en paires de contraires, que si l'égoïsme est la loi de l'extrémité animale, l'altruisme doit être la loi de l'autre extrême; la formule du combat pour la vie est de moins en moins vraie à mesure qu'on monte les degrés de l'échelle, c'est-à-dire à mesure que l'on se rapproche de la nature spirituelle: mais pour ceux qui n'ont pas développé les facultés de cette partie de leur nature, les lois qui la régissent doivent rester à l'état de conviction sentimentale. La théosophie nous indique la route à suivre pour que cette intuition se change en certitude, et le progrès individuel qu'elle demande à ses disciples est aussi la seule sauvegarde contre le danger social dont nous menace notre critique; pour réformer la société, il faut commencer par se réformer soi-même. Ce n'est pas la politique de soi-conservation, ni les intérêts d'une personnalité ou d'une autre, sous leur forme finie et physique, qui peuvent nous conduire au but désiré et abriter la Société Théosophique contre les effets de l'ouragan social, quand même cette personnalité représenterait l'idéal de l'homme, quand même cette égide serait le Bouddha en personne. Le salut est dans l'affaiblissement du sens de séparation entre les unités qui composent le tout social: or ce résultat ne peut être accompli que par un procédé d'*éclairement intérieur*. La violence n'assurera jamais le pain et le confort pour tous; et ce n'est pas non plus par une froide politique de raisonnement diplomatique que sera conquis le royaume de paix et d'amour, d'aide mutuelle et de charité universelle, la terre promise où il y aura «du pain pour tout le monde». Quand on commencera à comprendre que c'est précisément l'égoïsme personnel et féroce, grand ressort de la lutte pour l'existence, qui est au fond la seule cause de la misère humaine; que c'est

encore l'égoïsme national cette fois, et la vanité d'État, qui provoquent les gouvernements et les individus riches à enterrer d'énormes capitaux et à les rendre improductifs en érigeant des églises splendides et en entretenant un tas d'évêques paresseux, vrais parasites de leurs troupeaux; alors seulement l'humanité essayera de remédier au mal universel par un changement radical de politique. Ce changement, les doctrines théosophiques seules peuvent l'accomplir pacifiquement. C'est par l'union étroite et fraternelle des *Soi* supérieurs des hommes, par la croissance de la *solidarité d'âme*, par le développement de ce sentiment qui nous fait souffrir en pensant aux souffrances d'autrui, que pourra être inauguré le règne de l'égalité et de la justice pour tous, et que s'établira le culte de l'Amour, de la Science et de la Vertu, défini dans cet admirable axiome! «Il n'y a pas de religion plus élevée que la vérité».

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

September, 1888

TRANSLATION OF A FEW PASSAGES FROM THE ABOVE.

. . . . But the Theosophical Society rejects the idea, and not merely for the sake of argument, of having been formed in order “to spread the dogmas of the Buddha.” Our mission does not consist in spreading any dogmas, whether Buddhist, Vedic or Christian; *we* are independent of any formula, any ritual, any exotericism. We have been able to counteract by means of the noble principles of Buddhist ethics the attempts at invasion made by over-zealous Christians. The Chief Officers of the Society have declared themselves personally to be Buddhists, and this has been held against them rather strongly. One of them has devoted his life to the regeneration of this religion on its native soil. Let those who do not understand the needs of present-day India, and do not yearn for the upliftment of this ancient fatherland of virtues, throw stones at him. This, however, does not commit the whole body of Theosophists, as such, to

ecclesiastical Buddhism, no more than the Christianity of some of its members commits it to any of the Christian churches. Just because present-day Buddhism is in need of being regenerated and disencumbered from all the superstitions and restrictions which have invaded it like parasites, we would be quite wrong in trying to graft a young and healthy shoot on a branch which has lost its vitality, even though it be less withered than some other branches. It is far wiser to go at once to the root itself, to the unalterable and pure source whence Buddhism itself has drawn its powerful sap. We can enlighten ourselves directly with the pure “Light of Asia”; why then should we linger among its deformed shadows? In spite of the synthetic and theosophical character of primitive Buddhism, present-day Buddhism has become a dogmatic religion, and has fragmented itself into numerous and heterogeneous sects. The history of this and other religions is before us as a warning against half-measures. Look at the partial reform called Protestantism: are its results satisfactory enough to encourage us in trying to mend things? The *Ârya Samâj* itself is after all but a national effort, while the essential attitude of the Theosophical Society is to declare and maintain the Truth common to all religions, the real Truth, unsoiled by the inventions, the passions, and the requirements of the ages, and to invite all men to partake of it, without distinction of sex, colour or rank, and, which is much more, of beliefs.

É. Burnouf warns us against indifference. Whence does it originate? First from indolence, this scourge of humanity; then from discouragement. And if man is tired of symbols and ceremonies which the priest never explains, while deriving handsome benefits

from them, it is not by substituting bonze chapels for our own that we will shake off this torpor. The time has come when all the bells have the same sound: the sound of boredom. To pretend reinstating the religion of Buddha on the ruins of that of Jesus, would be like giving to a dead tree the support of a dried up stick. Our critic himself tells us that humanity is tired of even the words God and Religion.

No, the Sangha of the Buddhists cannot be re-established in our civilization. As to the Buddha himself, we revere him as the greatest sage and benefactor of humanity, and we will not lose any opportunity of claiming for him the right to universal admiration. Faced, however, with that terrible law in accordance with which admiration ever degenerates into adoration, and the latter into superstition, and with that hopeless crystallization which takes place in brains inclined to idolatry, would it be wise to claim for the elder brother of Jesus the narrow confines wherein the latter is subjected to a sacrilegious cult? Alas, is it possible that there be men sufficiently egotistical to love but one being, and sufficiently servile to wish to serve but one master alone?

Now as to the *Dharma*: we have already stated how high we hold Buddhist ethics. Theosophy, however, has to do with something else than just rules of conduct. It achieves the miracle of uniting pre-Buddhist ethics with pre-Vedic metaphysics, and pre-Hermetic science. Theosophical development calls upon all the principles of man, upon his intellectual as well as his spiritual faculties, and the last two objects of our programme have more importance than É. Burnouf seems to grant them. We can assure him that were our Society to receive the support of a large number of people of his own worth, it would become the channel of a torrent of new ideas borrowed from ancient sources; a torrent of artistic, economic, literary, scientific and philosophical innovations, more fruitful for the future than was the Renaissance. It would be far more than just an academic tendency; the Academy itself would learn the alphabet which permits one to read clearly, and between the lines, the obscure and often seemingly insignificant meaning of ancient Scriptures. That key is within reach of those who have the courage to lift their hand to grasp it; Buddha had that key, as he was an adept of very high status.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
October, 1888

124

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

LODGES OF MAGIC

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 14, October, 1888, pp. 89-93]

“When fiction rises pleasing to the eye,
Men will believe, because they love the lie;
But Truth herself, if clouded with a frown,
Must have some solemn proofs to pass her down.”

C. CHURCHILL.

One of the most esteemed of our friends in occult research, propounds the question of the formation of “working Lodges” of the Theosophical Society, for the development of adeptship. If the practical impossibility of forcing this process has been shown once in the course of the theosophical movement, it has scores of times. It is hard to check one's natural impatience to tear aside the veil of the Temple. To gain the divine knowledge, like the prize in a classical tripos, by a system of coaching and cramming, is the ideal of the average beginner in occult study. The refusal of the originators of the Theosophical Society to encourage such false hopes, has led to the formation of bogus Brotherhoods of *Luxor* (and Armley Jail?) as speculations on human credulity. How enticing the bait for gudgeons in the following specimen prospectus, which a few years ago caught some of our most earnest friends and Theosophists.

“Students of the Occult Science, searchers after truth, and Theosophists who may have been disappointed in their expectations of Sublime Wisdom being freely dispensed by HINDU MAHATMAS, are cordially invited to send in their names to . . ., when, if found suitable, they can be admitted, after a short probationary term, as Members of an Occult Brotherhood, who do not boast of their knowledge or attainments, but teach freely [at £1 to £5 *per* letter?] and without reserve [the nastiest portions of P. B. Randolph's *Eulis*], all they find worthy to receive” (read: teachings on a commercial basis; the cash going to the teachers, and the extracts from

LODGES OF MAGIC

125

Randolph and other “love-philter” sellers to the pupils!) *

If rumour be true, some of the English rural districts, especially Yorkshire, are overrun with fraudulent astrologers and fortune-tellers, who pretend to be Theosophists) the better

to swindle a higher class of credulous patrons than their legitimate prey, the servant-maid and callow youth. If the “lodges of magic,” suggested in the following letter to the Editors of this Magazine, were founded, without having taken the greatest precautions to admit only the best candidates to membership, we should see these vile exploitations of sacred names and things increase an hundredfold. And in this connection, and before giving place to our friend’s letter, the senior Editor of *Lucifer* begs to inform her friends that she has never had the remotest connection with the so-called “H (ermetic) B (rotherhood) of L (uxor)”, and that all representations to the contrary are false and dishonest. There is a secret body—whose diploma, or Certificate of Membership, is held by Colonel Olcott alone among modern men of white blood to which that name was given by the author of *Isis Unveiled* for convenience of designation,† but which is known among Initiates by quite another

* Documents on view at *Lucifer* Office, viz., Secret MSS. written in the handwriting of——(name suppressed for past considerations), “Provincial Grand Master of the Northern Section” One of these documents bears the heading, “A brief Key to the Eulian Mysteries,” i.e., *Tantric* black magic on a phallic basis. No; the members of *this* Occult Brotherhood “do not boast of their knowledge.” Very sensible on their part: least said, soonest mended.

† In *Isis Unveiled*, Vol. II, p. 308. It may be added that the “Brotherhood of Luxor” mentioned by Kenneth MacKenzie (*vide* his *Royal Masonic Cyclopaedia*) as having its seat in America, had, after all, nothing to do with the Brotherhood mentioned by, and known to us, as was ascertained after the publication of “Isis” from a letter written by this late Masonic author to a friend in New York. The Brotherhood MacKenzie knew of was simply a Masonic Society on a rather more secret basis, and, as he stated in the letter, he had *heard of, but knew nothing of our* Brotherhood, which, having had a branch at Luxor (Egypt), was thus purposely referred to by us

one, just as the personage known to the public under the pseudonym of “Koot Hoomi,” is called by a totally different name among his acquaintances. What the real name of that society is, it would puzzle the “Eulian” phallicists of the “H.B. of L.” to tell. The real names of Master Adepts and Occult Schools are never, *under any circumstances*, revealed to the profane; and the names of the personages who have been talked about in connection with modern Theosophy, are in the possession only of the two chief founders of the Theosophical Society. And now, having said so much by way of preface, let us pass on to our correspondent's letter. He writes:

A friend of mine, a natural mystic, had intended to form, with others, a Branch T.S. in his town. Surprised at his delay, I wrote to ask the reason. His reply was that he had heard that the T.S. only met and talked, and did nothing practical. I always did think the T.S. ought to have Lodges in which something practical should be done. Cagliostro understood well this craving of humans for something before their eyes, when he instituted the Egyptian Rite, and put it in practice in various Freemason lodges. There are many readers of *Lucifer* in—shire. Perhaps in it there might be a suggestion for students to form such lodges for

themselves, and to try, by their united wills, to develop certain powers in one of the number, and then through the whole of them in succession. I feel sure numbers would enter such lodges, and create a great interest for Theosophy.

A

In the above note of our venerable and learned friend is the echo of the voices of ninety-nine hundredths of the members of the Theosophical Society: one-hundredth only have the correct idea of the function and scope of our Branches. The glaring mistake generally made is in the conception of adeptship and the path thereunto. Of all thinkable undertakings that of trying for adeptship is the most difficult. Instead of being obtainable within a

under this name alone. This led some schemers to infer that there was a regular Lodge of Adepts of that name, and to assure some credulous friends and Theosophists that the "H.B. of L." was either identical or a branch of the same, supposed to be near Lahore!!—which was the most flagrant untruth.

few years of one lifetime, it exacts the unremittent struggles of a series of lives, save in cases so rare as to be hardly worth regarding as exceptions to the general rule. The records certainly show that a number of the most revered Indian adepts became so despite their births in the lowest and seemingly most unlikely, castes. Yet it is well understood that they had been progressing in the upward direction throughout many previous incarnations, and when they took birth for the last time, there was left but the merest trifle of spiritual evolution to be accomplished, before they became great living adepts. Of course, no one can say that one or all of the possible members of our friend A.'s ideal Cagliostroian lodge might not also be ready for adeptship, but the chance is not good enough to speculate upon: Western civilization seems to develop fighters rather than philosophers, military butchers rather than Buddhas. The plan "A." proposes would be far more likely to end in mediumship than adeptship. Two to one there would not be a member of the lodge who was chaste from boyhood and altogether untainted by the use of intoxicants. This is to say nothing of the candidates' freedom from the polluting effects of the evil influences of the average social environment. Among the indispensable pre-requisites for psychic development, noted in the mystical Manuals of all Eastern religious systems, are a pure place, pure diet, pure companionship, and a pure mind. Could "A." guarantee these? It is certainly desirable that there should be some school of instruction for members of our Society; and had the purely exoteric work and duties of the Founders been less absorbing, probably one such would have been established long ago. Yet not for practical instruction, on the plan of Cagliostro, which, by-the-by, brought direful suffering upon his head, and has left no marked traces behind to encourage a repetition in our days. "When the pupil is ready, the teacher will be found waiting," says an Eastern maxim. The Masters do not have

to hunt up recruits in special—shire lodges, nor drill them through mystical non-commissioned officers: time and space are no barriers between them and the aspirant; where thought can pass they can

come. Why did an old and learned Kabalist like “A.” forget this fact? And let him also remember that the potential adept may exist in the Whitechapels and Five Points of Europe and America, as well as in the cleaner and more “cultured” quarters; that some poor ragged wretch, begging a crust, may be “whiter-souled” and more attractive to the adept than the average bishop in his robe, or a cultured citizen in his costly dress. For the extension of the theosophical movement, a useful channel for the irrigation of the dry fields of contemporary thought with the water of life, Branches are needed everywhere; not mere groups of passive sympathisers, such as the slumbering army of church-goers, whose eyes are shut while the “devil” sweeps the field; no, not such. Active, wide-awake, earnest, unselfish Branches are needed, whose members shall not be constantly unmasking their selfishness by asking “What will it profit us to join the Theosophical Society, and how much will it harm us?” but be putting to themselves the question “Can we not do substantial good to mankind by working in this good cause with all our hearts, our minds, and our strength?” If “A.” would only bring his—shire friends, who pretend to occult leanings, to view the question from this side, he would be doing them a real kindness. The Society can get on without them, but they cannot afford to let it do so.

Is it profitable, moreover, to discuss the question of a Lodge receiving even theoretical instruction, until we can be sure that all the members will accept the teachings as coming from the alleged source? Occult truth cannot be absorbed by a mind that is filled with preconception, prejudice, or suspicion. It is something to be perceived by the intuition rather than by the reason; being by nature spiritual, not material. Some are so constituted as to be incapable of acquiring knowledge by the exercise of the spiritual faculty; e.g., the great majority of physicists. Such are slow, if not wholly incapable of grasping the ultimate truths behind the phenomena of existence. There are many such in the Society; and the body of the discontented are recruited from their ranks. Such

persons readily persuade themselves that later teachings, received from exactly the same source as earlier ones, are either false or have been tampered with by chelas, or even third parties. Suspicion and inharmony are the natural result, the psychic atmosphere, so to say, is thrown into confusion, and the reaction, even upon the stauncher students, is very harmful. Sometimes vanity blinds what was at first strong intuition, the mind is effectually

closed against the admission of new truth, and the aspiring student is thrown back to the point where he began. Having jumped at some particular conclusion of his own without full study of the subject, and before the teaching had been fully expounded, his tendency, when proved wrong, is to listen only to the voice of his self-adulation, and cling to his views, whether right or wrong. The Lord Buddha particularly warned his hearers against forming beliefs upon tradition or authority, and before having thoroughly inquired into the subject.

An instance. We have been asked by a correspondent why he should not “be free to suspect some of the so-called ‘precipitated’ letters as being forgeries,” giving as his reason for it that while some of them bear the stamp of (to him) undeniable genuineness, others seem, from their contents and style, to be imitations. This is equivalent to saying that he has such an unerring spiritual insight as to be able to detect the false from the true, though he has never met a Master, nor been given any key by which to test his alleged communications. The inevitable consequence of applying his untrained judgment in such cases, would be to make him as likely as not to declare false what was genuine, and genuine what was false. Thus what *criterion* has any one to decide between one “precipitated” letter, or another such letter? Who except their authors, or those whom they employ as their *amanuenses* (the *chelas* and disciples), can tell? For it is hardly one out of a hundred “occult” letters that is ever written by the hand of the Master, in whose name and on whose behalf they are sent, as the Masters have neither need nor leisure to write them; and that when a Master says, “*I wrote that letter,*” it means only that

every word in it was dictated by him and impressed under his direct supervision. Generally they make their chela, whether near or far away, write (or precipitate) them, by impressing upon his mind the ideas they wish expressed, and if necessary aiding him in the picture-printing process of precipitation. It depends entirely upon the *chela's* state of development, how accurately the ideas may be transmitted and the writing-model imitated. Thus the *non-adept* recipient is left in the dilemma of uncertainty whether, if one letter is false, all may not be; for, as far as intrinsic evidence goes, all come from the same source, and all are brought by the same mysterious means. But there is another, and a far worse condition implied. For all that the recipient of “occult” letters can possibly know and on the simple grounds of probability and common honesty, the unseen correspondent who would tolerate one *single fraudulent line in his name*, would wink at an unlimited repetition of the deception. And this leads directly to the following. All the so-called *occult* letters being supported by identical proofs, *they have all to stand or fall together*. If one is to be doubted, then all have, and the series of letters in *The Occult World*, *Esoteric Buddhism*, etc., etc., may be, and there is no reason why they should not be in such a case—*frauds*, “clever impostures,” and “forgeries,” such as the ingenuous though stupid agent of the “S.P.R.” has made them out to be, in order to raise in the public estimation the “scientific” acumen and standard of his “Principals.”

Hence, not a step in advance would be made by a group of students given over to such an unimpressible state of mind, and without any guide *from the occult side* to open their eyes to the esoteric pitfalls. And where are such guides, so far, in our Society? “They be blind leaders of the blind,” both falling into the ditch of vanity and self-sufficiency. The whole difficulty springs from the common tendency to draw conclusions from insufficient premises, and play the oracle before ridding oneself of that most stupefying of all psychic anaesthetics—IGNORANCE.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
October, 1888

EDITORIAL NOTICE

131

EDITORIAL NOTICE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 14, October, 1888, p. 136]

H. P. BLAVATSKY begs leave to announce that owing to the continued severe illness of her Co-Editor, MABEL COLLINS, she (H.P.B.) accepts, until further notice, the sole editorial responsibility for the Magazine.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
October, 1888

**FOOTNOTES TO “A GLANCE AT THEOSOPHY
FROM OUTSIDE”**

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 14, October, 1888, pp. 137-142]

[James A. Campbell, a broad-minded Spiritualist, contributes a friendly article in which he gives a general appraisal of the work of the Theosophical Society, the character of H.P. Blavatsky, and the basic ideas of Theosophy. Several footnotes are appended to various passages in his article, as shown within square brackets in what follows.]

[. . .in Philosophy and Religion, no less than in prize-fighting, it is important to have a good mob-backing.]

And the changing of water into wine: was this no more dignified a “miracle,” also for “mob-backing”? For simple, honest folk, elementary phenomena; for the Gamaliels, philosophy.

[. . . however reprehensible it may be to become . . . a miracle-worker. . . .for the sake of a philosophical al Idea. . . .]

No true theosophist—the accused party least of all—believes in *miracles*, though every true theosophist ought to believe in the existence of abnormal powers in man; “abnormal” because, so far, either misunderstood or denied. All such objective physical phenomena, however, are simply psychological “glamour,” *i.e.*, if not witchery, at least “a charm on the eyes and senses.” This, people

may call brutally “trick,” but since they are *psychic*, they cannot be *physical*: hence, no conjuring or “sleight of hand.” As well call “tricksters” the grave medical celebrities, who hypnotize their subjects to see things which have no reality! “Theosophical phenomena” differ from these in this: that while hypnotic hallucinations are suggested by the operator’s idle fancy, occult manifestations are produced by the will of the Occultist, that one or a hundred men should see *realities*, generally hidden from the profane, *e.g.*, certain things and persons thousands of miles away, whose astral images are brought within the view of the audience. Thus a cup *may never have been broken in reality*, and yet people are made to see it shattered in atoms and then made whole. Is this a juggler’s trick? Occult phenomena are then simply a hundred-fold intensified hypnotism, and between the hypnotic hallucinations at the *Salpêtrière* and the *magic* of the East there is chiefly a

question of degree.

[Appended to an enumeration of various cultural activities of the Society]

Why omit that branch of our work, which many deem the noblest, the founding of an Oriental Library which may become the most valuable in India, if present appearances are not deceptive; the opening of many Sanskrit schools; the publication of the Vedas in the original tongue? And why not mention our several charitable dispensaries, where from 10,000 to 15,000 poor patients are annually treated free of any charge?

[As regards metaphysical infallibility. . . with evolution, etc., etc. . . . to start with, a little subtle and diligent interweaving by an educated Hindu, or a speculative Scotchman, would bring something very similar to birth in a year.]

Then why has no one of them done so, before us? Moreover, no one, as far as we know, has ever claimed metaphysical infallibility—not even the Masters who do not demand from the Europeans even their due—a simple recognition of their wisdom.

A GLANCE AT THEOSOPHY FROM OUTSIDE

133

[Theosophy warns us away from absorption in common life, just as fervently as does Buddhism or monkish Christianity.]

So does it, also, warn us against ascetic retirement, save in those very rare and exceptional cases where the individual has brought over from his last preceding birth an irrepressible attraction for the life of the Spirit and repugnance for the life of the flesh. The normal man is in normal sympathetic relation with his fellow men at each successive stage of human development. But under the law of psychical differentiation, there are in each epoch beings ahead of the average of the race at that time. From their number develop the teachers, seers and saviours of mankind.

Respecting the whole tenor of the above, we have only to thank our esteemed contributor for the doubts expressed in his article. In these days of wholesale slander:—

“. . . that worst of poisons (which) ever finds
An easy entrance to ignoble minds,”

—as Juvenal says,* even an honest and cautious doubt must be gratefully received. Moreover, there is a line of demarcation beyond which one ought rather to feel proud of being slandered, than otherwise. For Swift’s remark: “the worthiest people are the most injured by slander, as we usually find that to be the best fruit which the birds have been pecking at”—may serve as a consolation.

* [*Satires*, XIV, 173-176; though not identical to the poetical rendering used by H.P.B. from some unknown translation, this reference seems to be the one most likely meant.—*Compiler*.]

Collected Writings VOLUME X
October, 1888

134

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

**AN EXPLANATION IMPORTANT
TO ALL THEOSOPHISTS**

[The following important statement was issued by H. P. Blavatsky as a small 12-page pamphlet bearing on its title-page the imprint: London, Allen Scott & Co., 30, Bouverie Street, E.C., 1888. The month of its publication is most likely October, as we find the same material published in *Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 14, October, 1888, pp. 145-48. There are slight alterations in the *Lucifer* text, as compared with the pamphlet, and the text of the latter is somewhat more complete. We have adhered to the text of the pamphlet.

For the benefit of the serious student, it should be stated that the situation in the Theosophical Movement around that time was very precarious. Many mistakes had been committed, and the Adept-Brothers had retired somewhat into the background, as far as the Society's outer affairs were concerned, while remaining in close touch with a few individuals. The best and most authentic source of information regarding certain factors in the overall situation at the time, is a document in the handwriting of H.P.B., written in pencil on thin note-paper, which appears to be a memorandum of the remarks of Master K.H. regarding the situation in the T.S. in 1888. The original is in the Adyar Archives. It has been published as Letter 47 in *Letters From the Masters of the Wisdom*, First Series (transcribed and compiled by C. Jinarâjadâsa), and deserves most careful study by all those interested in the inner workings of our spiritual Movement, and the many pitfalls encountered by students.

In November, 1888, H.P.B., acting on a previous direct suggestion of William Quan Judge,* organized on the outer plane the Esoteric Section or the Eastern School of Theosophy, to strengthen the link between the outer society and the Brothers who were its real Founders and Inspirers. The T.S. was becoming gradually devitalized, and the idea of Brotherhood had been relegated into the background, as compared with the pursuits of the Second Object of the Society. The pages of *The Theosophist* reflect very definitely the situation at the time. From careful observation it would appear that Col. Olcott during this period feared for the welfare of the Society if it were publicly

* A suggestion embodied by him in a letter addressed to H.P.B. and dated May 18, 1887. It was originally published in Mr. Judge's E.S.T. Circular, "By Master's Direction," dated November, 1894; it was also printed in *Practical Occultism* (Pasadena: Theos. Univ. Press, 1951), pp. 85-86.

AN EXPLANATION TO ALL THEOSOPHISTS

135

linked to the idea of the Masters, and avoided any references to them and their connection with the Society in the magazine. Undoubtedly this was partially due to the shock from the Coulomb-Missionary attack of 1884-85, and the final adverse Report of the Society for Psychical Research.

In London, from about 1886, a band of younger workers had gathered together; among them were Bertram Keightley and Dr. Archibald Keightley, Claude Falls Wright, G.R.S. Mead, Laura Cooper, E.T.

Sturdy, W.G. Old, and others. They definitely desired to tread the path leading to the Masters, and constituted themselves as H.P.B.'s personal disciples.

The situation, however, was somewhat complicated by fear on the part of Col. Olcott that H.P.B. was organizing a counterpoise to his influence in the Society as President, and was perhaps attempting to create an *imperium in imperio* in Europe. Whether this was Col. Olcott's own fear, or whether it was a thought sown in his mind by other individuals under whose influence he was at the time, is somewhat obscure. It may have been both.

The new workers gathered around H.P.B., when she had been prevailed upon to move to London permanently, had very little knowledge of Col. Olcott's magnificent record of sacrifices for the Theosophical Society; they sometimes thought of him as "the old man" at Adyar who was trying to obstruct H.P.B.'s plans for the Cause. This resulted in the rather angry feeling Col. Olcott had, when he left India on his trip to Europe, with the aim of clearing up existing misunderstandings and restoring a better feeling among all concerned.

It was then that Master K.H. definitely entered into the picture with a letter addressed to Col. Olcott, which was precipitated in his cabin on board the SS. *Shannon*, August 22, 1888, the day before reaching Brindisi.*

Oddly enough, in his *Old Diary Leaves*, III, p. 91, Col. Olcott speaks of this letter as if it had been received in 1884. He quotes from it, and connects it with the difficulties of 1884 in the London Lodge, concerning which other instructions had been given him (*Vide* Letter 18 in *Letters*, etc., First Series). The Colonel was definitely mistaken in this, as he himself mentions the receipt of this letter on board the SS. *Shannon*, a steamer of the P. & O. Mail Line on which he sailed from Bombay, August 7th, 1888, as reported in his *Diary* on that date (and in *The Theosophist*, Supplement, September, 1888, p. ciii). Besides, in the body of that

* According to the records kept at Lloyd's of London, the SS. *Shannon* arrived at Brindisi August 23rd, at 7:30 a.m., and proceeded one hour later for London, where she arrived September 2nd. Col. Olcott, however, proceeded to London overland, arriving there August 26th.

letter the Master himself speaks of 1885, and mentions C.W. Leadbeater, who did not come out to India till December, 1884.

As a result of this important letter from Master K.H., Colonel Olcott modified his attitude, and succeeded in smoothing out matters in the Society's administration, so that the Esoteric Section might do its work under the sole direction of H.P.B., and without any interference from exoteric authority.—*Compiler*.]

It having been affirmed by some French members of the Theosophical Society (in the *Bulletin d' Isis*), as well as some in England, that the undersigned had exceeded her constitutional powers as Corresponding Secretary and Co-Founder of the Theosophical Society, in issuing an emergent order dissolving the BUREAU of the "Isis" Branch of the Theosophical Society in Paris, and its Bylaws, and authorizing Mr. F. K. Gaboriau to reconstitute it *ad interim*, until the pleasure of the President in Council could be ascertained, the following extracts from the *official* "Decision" (officially published) of Colonel Olcott, sitting in arbitration at Paris, on the 17th of September last, will be read with interest and profit.

“Mme. Blavatsky, having learned that Mr. Froment would not accept the Presidency (to which he was entitled as Vice-President to succeed upon the death of the President, Mr. Louis Dramard, under the bylaws of ‘Isis’), and seeing the branch upon the point of falling into anarchy, issued *ad interim* (and despite the protestations of Mr. Gaboriau, who preferred to remain Secretary), an order by which the Bureau (Council) of ‘Isis’ was dissolved, its bylaws cancelled; at the same time she named as President of the Branch, Mr. Gaboriau, one of its Founders, who had given many proofs of his devotion to the theosophical cause. Moreover, Mr. Gaboriau was commissioned to compile new bylaws. The branch continued to exist, and the rights of its members were maintained pending the adoption of the new bylaws. It has been objected that Madame Blavatsky had not the right to act in this manner; that her interference was illegal according to the *Rules* of the Theosophical Society, because she is not a member of the *Isis* Branch, but

member of the ‘Blavatsky Lodge,’ of London, and that no branch has right of jurisdiction outside the limits prescribed in its charter. But, in point of fact, Madame Blavatsky *is member of no Branch*. She is with me co-Founder of the Society, and *ex officio* Corresponding Secretary and member of the General Council, of the Executive Council, and of the Annual Convention, a sort of Parliament held at Adyar by Delegates from all countries (*vide* Art. 17*b* of the Rules of the Theosophical Society).

“She was, then, perfectly entitled to issue the order in question as a temporary measure, an order which must be finally submitted for approbation to the President in Council. The Executive Council in its Session of 14th July, formerly ratified the measure taken by Mdme. Blavatsky, a measure which was urgent and which I declare to have been legal.”

This settles the question of the right of the Corresponding Secretary—one of the Founders—to interfere in such *exceptional* cases, and when the welfare and the reputation of the Theosophical Society are at stake. In no other except such a case would the undersigned have consented to take upon herself the right of interfering. Moreover, the extent and limits of such interference are very succinctly and clearly defined in the letter from a MASTER quoted below.

And to remove further misconceptions, it is as well—of course, only for the information of members of the Society—to add that, while still at sea on board the “Shannon,” on his way from Bombay to Brindisi, and on the day before arriving at port, the President received in his cabin a long and important letter from the said Master, generally called “K.H.” Besides general instructions respecting the policy the President should pursue in the present crisis, there were the following special paragraphs relating to his colleague, the undersigned. Colonel Olcott’s sense of justice is so strong, that although some of the passages in the letter have a tone of reproach for his having permitted himself to think too harshly of his old and tried friend and co-worker, he has unreservedly given

permission to copy the passages *in extenso*, in the hope that the warning conveyed may prove profitable to others who find themselves in a hostile mood toward the undersigned. These passages are as follows:—*

“Put all needed restraint upon your feelings, so that you may do the right thing in this Western imbroglio. Watch your first impressions. The mistakes you make spring from failure to do this. Let neither your personal predilections, affections, suspicions nor antipathies affect your action. Misunderstandings have grown up between Fellows, both in London and Paris, which imperil the interests of the movement. You will be told that the chief originator of most, if not of all these disturbances is H.P.B. This is not so; though her presence in England has, of course, a share in them. But the largest share rests with others, whose serene unconsciousness of their own defects is very marked, and much to be blamed. One of the most valuable effects of Upasika’s mission is that it drives men to self-study, and destroys in them blind servility for persons. Observe your own case for example. But your revolt, good friend, against her ‘infallibility’—as you once thought it—has gone too far, and you have been unjust to her, for which I am sorry to say you will have to suffer hereafter along with others. Just now, on deck, your thoughts about her were dark and sinful, and so I find the moment a fitting one to put you on your guard. . . . †

“Try to remove such misconceptions *as you will find*, by kind persuasion and an appeal to the feelings of loyalty

* [The beginning of this letter reads thus:

“Again, as you approach London I have a word or two to say to you. Your impressibility is so changeful that I must not wholly depend upon it at this critical time. Of course you know that things were so brought to a focus as to necessitate the present journey and that the inspiration to make it came to you and to permit it to the Councillors *from without*. Put all needed. . . .”

From here on, as quoted above by H.P.B.—*Compiler*.]

† [These dots do not seem to indicate any deletion, as reference to the original text shows.—*Compiler*.]

to the cause of truth, if not to us. Make *all* these men feel that we have no favourites, nor affections for persons, but only for their good acts and humanity as a whole. But we employ agents—the best available. Of these, for the last thirty years, the chief has been the personality known as H.P.B. to the world (but otherwise to us). Imperfect and very ‘troublesome,’ no doubt, she proves to some; nevertheless, there is no likelihood of our finding a better one for years to come, and your Theosophists should be made to understand it *

“ * Since 1885 I have not written, nor caused to be written, save through her agency, direct or remote, a letter or a line to anybody in Europe or America, nor communicated orally *with* or through any third party. Theosophists should learn it. You will understand later the significance of this declaration, so keep it in mind. . . . * Her fidelity to our work being constant, and her sufferings having come upon her through it, neither I nor either of my Brother Associates will desert or supplant her. As I once before remarked, *ingratitude* is not among our vices. . . . † To help you in your present perplexity, H.P.B. has next to no concern with administrative details, and should be kept clear of them so far as her strong nature can be controlled. But this *you must tell to all; with occult matters she has everything to do.* . . . * We have *not* abandoned her; she is *not* ‘given over to chelas.’ She is *our direct agent*. I warn you against permitting your suspicions and resentment against ‘her many follies’ to bias your intuitive loyalty to her. In the

* [These dots do not seem to indicate any deletion, as reference to the original text shows.—*Compiler.*]

† [The following complete paragraph occurs here in the original text:

“With yourself our relations are direct, and have been with the rare exceptions you know of, like the present, on the psychical plane, and so will continue through force of circumstances. That they are so rare—is your own fault as I told you in my last.”

—*Compiler.*]

adjustment of this European business, you will have two things to consider—the external and administrative, and the internal and psychical. Keep the former under your control and that of your most prudent associates, jointly; *leave the letter to her*. You are left to devise the practical details with your usual ingenuity. Only be careful, I say, to discriminate when some emergent interference of hers in practical affairs is referred to you on appeal, between that which is merely exoteric in origin and effects, and that which, beginning on the practical, tends to beget consequences on the spiritual plane. As to the former, you are the best judge; as to the latter, she. . . . *

“I have also noted your thoughts about the ‘Secret Doctrine.’ Be assured that what she has not annotated from scientific and other works we have given or suggested to her. Every mistake or erroneous notion corrected and explained by her from the works of other theosophists, *was corrected by me, or under my instruction*. It is a more valuable work than its predecessor—an epitome of occult truths that will make it a source of information and instruction for the earnest student for long years to come. . . . †

* [These dots do not seem to indicate any deletion, as reference to the original text shows.—*Compiler.*]

† [At this point, the following two complete paragraphs occur in the original:

“P. Sreenivasrow is in great mental distress once more because of my long silence, not having a clear

intuition developed (as how should he after the life he has led?) . He fears he is abandoned, whereas he has not been lost sight of for one moment. From day to day he is making his own record at the 'Ashrum,' from night to night receiving instructions fitted to his spiritual capabilities. He has made occasional mistakes, e.g., once recently, in helping thrust out of the Headquarters house, one who deserved a more charitable treatment, whose fault was the result of ignorance and psychical feebleness rather than of sin, and who was a strong man's victim. Report to him, when you return, the lesson taught you by \triangle at Bombay, and tell my devoted though mistaken 'son' that it was most theosophical to give her protection, most untheosophical and selfish to drive her away.

AN EXPLANATION TO ALL THEOSOPHISTS

141

“. . . [This letter] . . . is merely given you as a warning and a guide; to others, as a warning only; for you may use it discreetly, if needs be. . . . Prepare, however, to have the authenticity of the present denied in certain quarters.*

(Signed) K. H.*

[Extracts correctly copied.—H. S. OLCOTT.]

“I wish you to assure others T.T., R.A.M., N.N.S., N.D.C., G.N.C., U.U.B., T.V.C., P.V.S., N.B.C., C.S., C.W.L., D.N.G., D.H., S.N.C., etc., among the rest, not forgetting the other true workers in Asia, that the stream of Karma is ever flowing on and we as well as they must win our way toward Liberation. There have been sore trials in the past, others await you in the future. May the faith and courage which have supported you hitherto endure to the end.”

The triangle with dot in the middle refers to Master M. The lesson hinted at has to do with Mr. D.M. Bennett, one of the foremost leaders of Freethought at the time, and a declared opponent of the bigotry of so-called Christianity in the U.S.A. He was the Editor of *The Truthseeker*. Col. Olcott narrates the story of his activities and of the persecutions he had to endure (*Old Diary Leaves*, II, chap. xxii). He details the situation that arose when Mr. Bennett applied to join the T.S. See also in this connection: *The Mahatma Letters to A.P. Sinnett*, Letter XXXVII, received at Allâhâbâd, January, 1882, and Letter XLIII, received in the same city, February, 1882.

Some of the initials in the letter are those of Tookaram Tatya, Norendro Nath Sen, Gyanendra Nath Chakravarti, T. Vijayaraghava Charlu, P. Venkata Subbiah, (Pandit) Chandra Sekhara, C.W. Leadbeater, Dina Nath Ganguli, and S. Nilakantkumar Chatterjee. —*Compiler*.]

* [This last paragraph runs as follows in its entirety:

“You had better not mention for the present this letter to anyone—not even to H.P.B. unless she speaks to you of it herself. Time enough when you see occasion arise. It is merely given you, as a warning and a guide; to others, as a warning only, for you may use it discreetly if needs be.

K.H.

“Prepare, however, to have the authenticity of the present denied in certain quarters.”

—*Compiler*.]

No use repeating over and over again, that neither this “Master” nor any other, Colonel Olcott and I know of, are “Spirits.” They are living and mortal men, whose great wisdom and occult knowledge have won the profound reverence of all those who know them. Those who do not, are welcome to spin out any theory they like about the “Adepts”—even to denying point blank their existence. Meanwhile the incessant charges and denunciations, the idle gossip and the uncharitable constructions to which the President-Founder and myself have been subjected for the last three years, force us now to make the declaration which follows.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

A JOINT NOTE

To dispel a misconception that has been engendered by mischief-makers, we, the undersigned, Founders of the Theosophical Society, declare that there is no enmity, rivalry, strife, or even coldness, between us, nor ever was; nor any weakening of our joint devotion to the Masters or to our work, with the execution of which they have honoured us. Widely dissimilar in temperament and mental characteristics, and differing sometimes in views as to methods of propagandism, we are yet of absolutely one mind as to that work. As we have been from the first, so we are now, united in purpose and zeal, and ready to sacrifice all, even life, for the promotion of Theosophical knowledge, for the succour of mankind from the miseries which spring from ignorance.

H. S. OLCOTT,
H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
October, 1888

THE NATIONAL EPIC OF FINLAND

143

THE NATIONAL EPIC OF FINLAND *

(REVIEW)

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 14, October, 1888, pp. 149-152]

The last proof of the universality in time and space of that grand system of philosophy, called by its disciples the Archaic Wisdom Religion, or the Secret Doctrine—comes to us from a little-known people, inhabiting a bleak, wild, and seldom-visited land. In the *Kalevala*, the national epic of Finland, we find many traces of the Archaic philosophy, some clear and luminous, others more veiled and hidden. This epic cannot be less than 3,000 years old; probably it is much older. Though but recently reduced to writing, it has been preserved orally for ages, and dates from the time when the Finnish tribes lived far south of their present home, probably on the Black Sea or the Caspian.

The Finns, whose origin is very mysterious, but who are evidently related to the peoples now settled on the tablelands of Tibet and Central Asia, stand to the Slavonian nations—Russia especially—in the same mystical relation as the magicians and sorcerers of Thessaly stood to the rest of the Hellenes. The folk-lore of pagan and also Christian Russia is full of the Northern *Koldoon* (enchanters, from the word *Chaldean*, probably), of their deeds and magic powers. One of the best epic poems of Alexander Pushkin, “Ruslan and Ludmila,” is based on the magical struggle and feats of two Northern enchanters, the old and beneficent “wise Finn,” and a wicked sorceress of the same nationality—Naina; the former working for and the latter against the loving couple. These are the embodiment of Good and Evil. The very term “Finn” is almost a synonym, in Russian

* *The Kalevala, the Epic Poem of Finland*. Translated into English verse by John Martin Crawford. New York: J. B. Alden, 1888. 2 vols. 8vo.

folklore, of magician. All these come from the far North, in the popular idea; for many of the gods of pagan Russia were natives of Finland and Scandinavia by early emigration and intercourse of the tribes that peopled the shores of the Baltic and the Northern seas.

The Finns, as reflected in their poetry, are a wonderfully simple nation, still untouched by civilisation's varnish. They live close to Nature, in perfect touch and harmony with all her living powers and forces.

In the words of the Proem to the Runes:—

There are many other legends,
Incantations that were taught me,
That I found along the wayside,
Gathered in the fragrant copses,
Blown me from the forest branches,
Culled among the plumes of pine-trees,
Scented from the vines and flowers,
Whispered to me as I followed
Flocks in land of honeyed meadows,
Over hillocks green and golden,
.....
Many runes the cold has told me,
Many lays the rain has brought me,
Other songs the winds have sung me;
Many birds from many forests,
Oft have sung me lays in concord;
Waves of sea, and ocean billows,
Music from the many waters
Music from the whole creation,
Oft have been my guide and master.

Could any “Hymn to the Influences of Nature,” be more delightful? A glance at the mythology of this little-known people will show the result of their reflective deliberation on these waves of influence from the great mother whose caresses they felt to wrap them round. With them “all beings were persons. The Sun, Moon, Stars, the Earth, the Air, and the Sea, were to the ancient Finns, living, self-conscious beings . . . all objects in

nature are governed by invisible deities, termed *haltiat*, regents or genii. These *haltiat*, like members of the human family, have distinctive bodies and spirits; but the minor ones are somewhat immaterial and formless, and their existences are entirely independent of the objects in which they are particularly interested. They are all immortal, but they rank according to the relative importance of their respective charges. The lower grades of the Finnish gods are sometimes subservient to the deities of greater powers. . .” [Preface, x-xi.] Above all was a Supreme Ruler. “The daughters [Regents] of the Sun, Moon, Great Bear, Polar-star, and of the other heavenly dignitaries, are represented as ever-young and beautiful maidens, sometimes seated on the bending branches of the forest-trees,

sometimes on the crimson rims of the clouds, sometimes on the rainbow, sometimes on the dome of heaven.” [Preface, xiv-xv.]

How closely all this agrees with what the Secret Doctrine teaches of the hierarchies of Dhyan Chohans, and the lower grades of ethereal beings—the hosts of the elementals—a close comparison sufficiently shows. It is true, the Finns have clothed their ideas in a garland of poetry, but through this the radical identity shines out clearly. Among the Ancient Finns, as in India at the present day, we have the ceremony of *®raddha*, and the invocation of ancestors.

As ably pointed out in the Preface [p. xli] to the volumes before us, the “deeper and more esoteric meaning of the *Kalevala*, however, points to a contest between Light and Darkness, Good and Evil; the Finns representing the Light and the Good, and the Lapps, the Darkness and the Evil.” Compare with this the wars of Ormuzd and Ahriman; of the Aryas and the Rakshasas; of the Pandus and Kurus.

The most valuable echoes of the Secret Doctrine in the *Kalevala* are found in the Rune of the birth of Wainamoinen; a series of quotations from this Rune may advantageously be given.

In primeval times, a maiden,
Beauteous Daughter of the Ether,

Passed for ages her existence
In the great expanse of heaven,
.....
In the infinite expanses
Of the air above the sea-foam,
In the far outstretching spaces,
In a solitude of ether,

The Ether or *Akâsha* being the first *Idea* of the yet uncreated Universe; from which must emanate the future Kosmos, in its descending grades of materiality. The Ether is the “Vast abyss” on which the Spirit “dove-like, sat brooding”; it is also “the face of the waters” on which “the spirit rested.” The Epic continues:

She descended to the ocean,
Waves her couch, and waves her pillow.
For *seven* hundred years she wandered o’er the ocean
Toward the east, and also southward,
Toward the west, and also northward;

From the embraces of the ocean, she conceived her firstborn, and was in travail *seven* hundred years, corresponding to the sevenfold division of Manvantaras, or Creative periods. The world is formed, but only mediately through the influence of the daughter of

the Ether. She lamented her loneliness, and

When she ceased her supplications,
Scarce a moment onward passes,
Ere a beauteous duck descending,
Hastens toward the water-mother,
Comes a-flying hither, thither,
Seeks herself a place for nesting.

This “beauteous duck” corresponds exactly, both in idea and imagery, to the *Kâlahamsa*, or “Swan of Time,” of the Hindu Pantheon and the Secret Doctrine. The bird sought in vain a place for nesting:—

THE NATIONAL EPIC OF FINLAND

147

Then the daughter of the Ether,
Now the hapless water-mother,
Raised her shoulders out of water,
Raised her knees above the ocean,
That the duck might build her dwelling,
Build her nesting-place in safety.
.....
Here she builds her humble dwelling,
Lays her eggs within, at pleasure,
Six, the golden eggs she lays there,
Then a *seventh*, an egg of iron.

Compare with this the Chaldean account of Tiamat, the great Sea and the birth therein of the Seven Spirits; the Kabalistic teachings in which the feminine Sephirah is called the “Great Sea,” and the seven lower Sephiroth are born in the “Great Sea,” for this was one of the names of Binah (or Jehovah), the Astral Ocean; and the Puranic accounts of Creation. The maiden moves her shoulders, and the nest and eggs fall into the ocean,

Dash in pieces on the bottom
Of the deep and boundless waters.
In the sand they do not perish,
Not the pieces in the ocean;
But transformed, in wondrous beauty
All the fragments come together
Forming pieces two in number,
One the upper, one the lower,
Equal to the one, the other.

From one half the egg, the lower,
Grows the nether vault of Terra;
From the upper half remaining,
Grows the upper vault of Heaven;

This echoes exactly the Indian thought, in the egg of *Hiranyagarbha*, which divides into two, and from the two parts are produced the universe, above and below; and the duplex heaven, in the Kabala, the higher and the

lower, or Heaven and Earth, are said to have been formed of the “White Head,” the skull or *cranium* being the luminiferous Ether.

We regret that lack of space prevents us from quoting the suggestive Rune of Wainamoinen’s seven-fold sowing, where each crop springs up after a conflagration and strewing of ashes—the periodical dissolutions and reconstructions of the universe always completed in seven. The Runes of the “Origin of Iron,” the “Finding of the Lost-word,” the “Origin of the Serpent,” and the “Restoration of the Sun and Moon,” are also full of Occultism; but for these we must refer readers to Mr Crawford’s admirable translation.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
October, 1888

THE DEVIL—WHO IS HE?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 14, October, 1888, pp. 170-71]

SIR,

Mr. Thomas May (under the above title) tells your readers in the September number of LUCIFER that, with the accumulation of centuries, a very Gordian knot of theological confusion, contradictions and contrarities, has been made, which has caused an unedifying intermingling of the attributes of "the Supreme," and that he, Mr. Thomas May, can cut this knot in a moment, by simply telling your readers that the Devil and Jesus, or the Devil and God, are one and the same Supreme being or person, only seen under different aspects at different periods of time. (1)

And with this simple statement that two contradictory ideas have only one and the same supreme being or person for their origin, Mr. May seems to imagine that he has at once removed all the theological confusion, contradictions and contrarities, which for centuries have accumulated and perplexed mankind respecting Jesus and the Devil, God and Satan, good and evil.

But when it is conceded to Mr. May that there is but one Supreme being or person: it yet remains to be determined, revealed, or understood what "the Supreme" is and whether "the Supreme" is good, or evil.

Mr. May in his letter would seem to imply that "the Supreme" is both evil and good, in like manner as a period of 24 hours, which we call a day, is partly light and partly dark. (2)

THE DEVIL—WHO IS HE?

149

But then this dark period of the day, which we call night, is not evil, but, on the contrary, it is a period of beneficial rest for recruiting and renewing the strength of our bodies in sleep.

And it is possible that Mr. May might also say that what is commonly called evil is also not evil, but is only a course of educational training which is highly beneficial for our spiritual growth and strength.

But when good and evil are thus intermingled as being one and the same, the danger immediately arises of creating theological confusion, contradictions and contrarities. And I do not learn from Mr. May's letter that he has avoided this religious difficulty (3), but that he has himself created it, by speaking of good and evil as being one and the same.

For although Isaiah tells us that God alone is the Supreme Creator both of good and evil, yet it is only in a corrective sense, as a Father would correct his Child, that Isaiah intends to speak of God as creating evil; because the whole burden of Isaiah's writing is to reproach those who called the good evil, the evil good, and the doing of evil doing good.

And it is because this intermingling of God and the Devil, and of good and evil, as being one and the same, made it such a complicated question, that therefore the Scriptures were written in order to make manifest what is good and what is evil. (4) And in the Scriptures it is recorded that so great had become the power of those who made the Word of God of no effect by their evil traditions that they conspired to betray "the Son of Man," who would reconcile the ways of God as being good and not evil, to be crucified as a devil.

And it is the true lesson which is to be learnt (when freedom in the Church can be obtained to teach it) from the Crucifixion of "the Son of Man," which can alone remove the religious difficulty which disturbs both the Christian and the Jewish World: because it is not true, as Mr. May asserts, that good and evil, or Jesus and the Devil, are one and the same. (5)

EDITORS' NOTES

(1) This idea is not original with Mr. May. Lactantius, one of the Fathers of the Church, expressed it in no equivocal language, for he states that the "Word" (or Logos) is the *first-born brother of Satan*" (*Vide Divinarum*

Institutionum Libri Septem, Book II, ch. ix); * for Satan is "a Son of God" (*Vide Job*, ii, i).

(2) The "Supreme," if IT is infinite and omnipresent cannot be anything but that. IT must be "good and evil," "light and darkness," etc., for if it is omnipresent it has to be present in a vessel of dishonour as well as in one of honour, in an atom of dirt as in the atom of the purest essence. The whole trouble is that theology and the (even *militant*) clergy are not consistent in their claims they would force people to believe in an infinite and absolute deity, and dwarf this deity at the same time by making of it a *personal* being with *attributes*, a double claim mutually destructive, and as absurd philosophically, as it is grotesque and soul-killing.

(3) The fact then that showing good and evil intermingled in the deity creates "religious difficulty," *i.e.*, "theological confusion," is the fault of and rests with the clergy and theology, and not at all with Mr. May. Let them drop their idea of a personal god with human attributes, and the difficulty will disappear.

(4) The Scriptures were written to conceal the underlying allegories of cosmogonical and anthropological mysteries, and not at all "to make manifest what is good and what is evil." If our respected and reverend Correspondent accepts Eden and the apple *au sérieux*, then why should he not accept "Crucifixion," as taught by his church, also? "To be crucified as a devil" is a queer phrase. We have heard of several "Sons of God" crucified, but never yet of one single devil. On the other hand, if Christians accepted, as seriously as they do the "apple and the rib," the simple and impressive words of their Christ on the Mount, who says: "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute *you*, and shall say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for my sake,"—then they would abstain from reviling and persecuting and saying all manner of evil against the poor Devil; who, if he is to be regarded as a *personality*,

* [Only implied, not definitely stated.—*Compiler*.]

is sure to “blessed,” as no one from the beginning of Christianity has ever been more reviled and falsely persecuted than was that scapegoat for the sins of man! Finally:

(5) If one takes “good and Evil, or Jesus and the Devil,” for personalities, then as no personality from the beginning of the world was free from evil, Mr. May's proposition must prove correct and the Reverend Mr. Headley be shown in a vicious circle of his own making. *Demon est Deus inversus* is said of a manifested, *differentiated* deity, or of the Universe of Matter. That which is *Absolute* cannot even be homogeneous, it is *Ain*—nothing, or *No-thing*; and if men of finite intellects will insist upon speculating upon the infinite, and therefore to them unreachable and incomprehensible, otherwise than as a necessary philosophical postulate, then they must expect to be worsted by that same philosophy.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
October, 1888

PERTINENT QUERIES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 14, October, 1888, pp. 172-74]

You invite questions respecting all points of difficulty in subjects connected with Occult Science. I cannot reconcile some things relating to the Apostles of Modern Theosophy.

In the “*Preface* to the Original Edition” (page xxiii, of the 5th Edition) of *Esoteric Buddhism*, by Mr. A. P. Sinnett, there are these words—“Two years ago, neither I nor any other European living knew the alphabet of the science here for the first time put into a scientific shape.” This is an emphatic expression; it would seem to imply that the thinking world is exclusively indebted to this book and to its author for that knowledge of the truths of Esoteric Science, which is now making its way amongst European and American Theosophists. But this can hardly be Mr. Sinnett’s meaning.

For, can the statement and its implication be consistent with the fact that Madame Blavatsky, herself a European,* had, some years

* In view of a number of such letters received, a full answer will be given in *The Secret Doctrine*, now nearly ready.—Ed.

152

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

previously, written *Isis Unveiled*, which though it does not give the same constructive teaching respecting the mysteries of the Universe as does *Esoteric Buddhism*, does yet imply a knowledge on the part of its author of much more than “the alphabet of the science”?

But is it not true, as indicated in *The Occult World*, that Mr. Sinnett owed to Madame Blavatsky his own first knowledge of Esoteric Science, and also his introduction to the adept teacher, the Master from whom he derived the bulk of his information? Madame Blavatsky, we have been led to understand, taught these truths of Occult Science years previously to Colonel Olcott, and in so doing converted him from a Spiritualist to a Theosophist. It is further likely that Madame Blavatsky taught others the same truths.*

I would also ask if there are no secret students of Science, in its broadest aspects, who have known these things in advance of its recent publication?

It would be a satisfaction to myself and others if it could be stated how the recent teachings of Occult Science really originated, and what the true position of Esoteric Buddhism is as an authoritative exponent of Occult truth.

Now that Theosophical teachings are taking hold of men’s minds, it is very desirable that the genesis of the modern movement should be truthfully known. I acknowledge myself greatly indebted to *Esoteric Buddhism*, but I am very anxious to understand the facts to which I have alluded, and to have them reconciled.

Yours faithfully,

CHARLES B. INGHAM.

* She did, most undeniably. But as her several pupils (Europeans) were *pledged* disciples, which Mr. Sinnett never was, they could not give out to the world what they had learned. [H.P.B.]

EDITOR'S ANSWER

The case in point is a good illustration of the misconceptions which often spring from looseness of expression in a writer. Certainly, Mr. Sinnett could have no wish whatever to convey the idea that he was the first and only channel for the transmission of Esoteric doctrine. In fact, he specially repudiates the claim, as our correspondent will find if he will turn to p. xxi, of the Preface to the very edition he cites. "Let me add," says Mr. Sinnett, "that I do not regard myself as the sole exponent

PERTINENT QUERIES

153

for the outer world, at this crisis, of esoteric truth." If he omitted to mention the writer and her American pupils and colleagues of 1874-8, Colonel Olcott and Mr. Judge, it was undoubtedly because he regarded "Madame Blavatsky," on account of her Russian nationality, as more Asiatic than European—a harmless delusion many a patriotic Englishman labours under—and the former gentlemen, as Americans. It had also escaped him for the moment, no doubt, that among the group of Initiates to which his own mystical correspondent is allied, are two of European race, and that one who is that Teacher's superior is also of that origin, being half a Slavonian in his "present incarnation," as he himself wrote to Colonel Olcott in New York.

Esoteric Buddhism has rendered precious service, by popularizing in exoteric form esoteric truths, meddling with pure metaphysics being disclaimed by its author (*Vide* p. 46), and in the propagation of theosophical ideas throughout the world; and it has proved its popularity by passing already through six editions, and being just at this moment about to appear in a seventh. Yet it is not free enough of minor errors to entitle it to be regarded as an infallible Scripture, nor its modest author as a Divine Revelator—as some foolish enthusiasts, in search of new idols, figure to themselves. The correspondent's question as to "how the recent teachings of Occult Science really originated," is easily answered. A crisis had arrived in which it was absolutely necessary to bring within reach of our generation the Esoteric Doctrine of the eternal cycles. Religion, both in the West and East, had long been smothering beneath the dust heaps of Sectarianism and enfranchised Science. For lack of any scientific religious concept, Science was giving Religion the *coup-de-grâce* with the iron bar of Materialism. To crown the disorder, the phantom-world of Hades, or Kama-loka, had burst in a muddy torrent into ten thousand séance-rooms, and created most misleading notions of man's *post-mortem* state. Nothing but a few fundamental tenets from the Esoteric philosophy, sketched in broad outlines by such a clear and brilliant writer as Mr. Sinnett

is known to be, could snatch mankind from drowning in the sea of ignorance. So once again the Gates of the Palace of Truth were opened and Mr. Sinnett and many other willing workers have caught each a ray. But as all the light can only be got by re-uniting all the different rays of the spectrum, so the archaic philosophy in its entirety can only be apprehended by combining all the glimpses of light that have passed through the many intellectual prisms of our own and preceding generations.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
October, 1888

**THE ESOTERIC SECTION OF
THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY**

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 14, October, 1888, p. 176] *

Owing to the fact that a large number of Fellows of the Society have felt the necessity for the formation of a body of Esoteric students, to be organized on the ORIGINAL LINES devised by the *real* founders of the T. S., the following order has been issued by the President-Founder:—

I. To promote the esoteric interests of the Theosophical Society by the deeper study of esoteric philosophy, there is hereby organised a body, to be known as the “Esoteric Section of the Theosophical Society.”

II. The constitution and sole direction of the same is vested in Madame H. P. Blavatsky, as its Head; she is solely responsible to the Members for results; and the section has no official or corporate connection with the Exoteric Society save in the person of the President-Founder.

* [The same Official Notice was published the following month, namely November, 1888, on page 264 of *Lucifer*. At the end of it, below the signatures, appeared these words: “Om ah guru munjee Goshaya barsid dhi . . . Höm.”—*Compiler*.]

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

155

III. Persons wishing to join the Section, and willing to abide by its rules, should communicate directly with:--Mme. H. P. Blavatsky, 17 Lansdowne Road, Holland Park, London, W.

(Signed) H. S. OLCOTT,
President in Council.

Attest:—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

October, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 14, October, 1888, pp. 131-32, 164, 167]

[The following important Editorial Note is appended by H.P.B. to an article dealing with the future androgynous human being, and the traditional tales, both of classical antiquity and later times, concerning non-physical beings uniting with physical ones.]

Begging our esteemed correspondent's pardon, we believe it dangerous to leave what he says Without an explanation. There is an enormous difference between the *Sophia* of the Theosophist Gichtel, an Initiate and Rosicrucian (1638-1710), and the modern Lillies, John Kings, and "Sympneumatas." The "Brides" of the Mediaeval adepts are an allegory, while those of the modern mediums are astral realities of *black magic*. The "Sophia" of Gichtel was the "Eternal Bride" (Wisdom and Occult Science *personified*); the "Lillies" and others are astral spooks, semi-substantial "influences," semi-creations of the surexcited brains of unfortunate *hysteriacs* and "sensitives." No purer man ever lived in this world than Gichtel. Let any one read de Saint-Martin's *Correspondence* (pp. 168 to 198), and he will see the difference. From Marcus, the Gnostic, down to the last mystic student of the Kabala and Occultism, that which they called their "Bride" was "Occult Truth," personified as a naked maiden, otherwise called Sophia or Wisdom. That

"spouse" revealed to Gichtel all the mysteries of the outward and inward nature, and forced him to abstain from every earthly enjoyment and desire, and made him sacrifice himself for Humanity. And as long as he remained in that body which represented him on earth, he had to work for the deliverance from ignorance of those who had not yet obtained their inheritance and inward beatitude. "From that time [when he had married his 'Bride'], he gave himself up as a sacrifice, to be accursed for his brethren [men] even without knowing them," says St. Martin. Has this case any analogy with the cases of the Lillies and Rosies of the Summer Land? Sophia descends as a "bride to the Adepts, from the higher regions of spirit, the astral Ninons de l'Enclos, from Kamaloka, to hysterical epileptics. The less one has to do with the latter class—the better. Let "sensitives" talk as poetically as they like, the naked truth is that such unnatural *sexual* unions, between the living man and the beauteous beings of the Elemental world, arise from the abnormal surexcitation of the nervous system and animal passions, through the unclean imagination of the "sensitive." In the Kabalistic world, these "celestial" brides and bridegrooms have always been called by the harsh names of *Succubi* and *Incubi*; and the difference between those creatures and the

“Sympneumatas” shown in Laurence Oliphant’s *Scientific Religion* is only a supposed one, and exists for no one except the author. There are some such unions between mediums and their “controls”—we have known several such personally—and some involuntarily submitted to, under obsession. The tie is a psycho-physiological one, and can be broken by an exercise of will-power, either by the victim or a friendly mesmeriser. Colonel Olcott cured two such cases—one in America, the other in Ceylon. Amiable hysteriacs and certain religious ecstasies may give free run to their diseased fancy, and construct Sophias, Lillies, and other “Sympneumatas” out of the opalescent aura of their brains; but all the same they are but unconscious sorcerers: they enjoy lustful animal feelings by *working black magic upon* themselves. If they admit that

these unnatural unions, or rather hysterical hallucinations of such are *disease*, then they are on a level with insane nymphomaniacs; if they deny it, then, accepting responsibility, they place themselves on a far lower level.

[. . . a foundation statement of “Christian Science” is man’s unchangeable and indestructible union or oneness with spirit itself]

Facts are against this assumption. Were the “Union” *universal* there could be no evil, no disease or suffering in this world.

To help anyone with a cancer on the nose to fancy he has *no* cancer, can only be done through mesmerism, or *hypnotism*, although the operator may call it as he chooses.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

October, 1888

THE SECRET DOCTRINE

[It was in October, 1888, that the First Volume of H.P.B.'s *magnum opus* made its public appearance. We insert the present explanatory Note at this particular point in our chronological series to indicate where *The Secret Doctrine* belongs, as far as its correct time-sequence is concerned.

The First Volume came off the Press on October 20, 1888. This is evidenced by a set of the original edition now in the Archives of the undersigned. On the fly-leaf of the First Volume, in rather faint blue pencil, appear the following words in the handwriting of Richard Harte:

“This is the first copy ever issued. I got it from Printer by special Messenger on the morning of the 20 Oct. '88 as I was leaving the house 17 Lansdowne Road, with Col. Olcott for India (Col. went personally via Naples). The Second Vol. followed me to India.

R.H.”

Both volumes have a greyish binding bearing in the usual place the imprint: Theosophical Publishing Co., Ltd., which was

of course in London. Both volumes bear the inscriptions: Printed by Allen Scott and Co., 30, Bouverie Street, E.C.—facing the title-page; and facing the dedication: Entered at Stationer's Hall. All Rights Reserved.

It would appear that sheets of the First Volume, most likely folded, were sent to W.Q. Judge in New York. At first he planned to have the bound volume ready for distribution in the U.S.A. by October 27th, but all sorts of difficulties arose. One of these had to do with the Appraiser at the Custom House. After Judge had taken out 3 cases, he was told that the book was undervalued. On calculation, it appeared that the 1000 copies came to some 30 cents each. This of course was too low, and Judge was faced with the possibility of a penalty and double duty, the law requiring at the time that a duty of 25% of the market price of the goods be paid; in this case the duty was to be determined by the cost of paper and printing. After much persuasion, the Appraiser consented to let the book through, with the caution that on the next invoice the true value would have to be stated. The cases came from the Custom House the 23rd of October, and were sent to the binder, where the book had to be recollated, as American binders would not accept the risk of collating done abroad. This resulted in further delays.*

Volume I was mailed to subscribers in America on November 3rd, and Volume II was promised at about the same time as the December issue of *The Path* magazine.†

The American edition was published in a dark brown and a dark blue binding, and bears the inscription: “Entered according to Act of Congress in the year 1888, by H.P. Blavatsky, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington, D.C.”—facing the dedication.


From a statement in *The Theosophist*‡ it would appear that the English edition was one of 500 copies only, and was exhausted before the day of actual publication, due to advance subscribers. This necessitated an immediate second impression, which was later very erroneously called “second edition.” It was only a second printing from the same plates.

The Theosophist mentions also a “copious Index and a Glossary” in connection with *The Secret Doctrine*. The Index, however, was a very poor one in this first edition, and no Glossary appeared at all. No definite information seems available as to

* Letters of W.Q. Judge to Bertram Keightley, dated October 5 and 26, 1888, in *Practical Occultism* (Pasadena, Calif.: Theos. Univ. Press, 1951), pp. 127, 133.

† *The Path*, Vol. III, p. 298

‡ Vol. X, *Suppl.* to December, 1888, p. xxxa.



Facsimile of a page from the MS of *The Secret Doctrine*,
Containing an early version of the text.

IS THEOSOPHY A RELIGION?

159

why no Glossary was included, but Judge, writing to C. H. Whitaker, Jan. 11, 1889, suggests that it probably was found too expensive to do so.* It is quite conceivable that material for such a Glossary was later used both in *The Key to Theosophy* and in *The Theosophical Glossary*.

It is likely that Volume II of *The Secret Doctrine* appeared sometime in December, 1888; *The Path* magazine, revising its earlier promise, stated that it would reach its subscribers before the January, 1889, issue of the journal.—*Compiler*.]

* *Practical Occultism*, p. 139.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
November, 1888

IS THEOSOPHY A RELIGION?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 15, November, 1888, pp. 177-187]

“Religion is the best armour that man can have, but it is
the worst cloak”

BUNYAN. †

It is no exaggeration to say that there never was—during the present century, at any rate—a movement, social or religious, so terribly, nay, so absurdly misunderstood, or more blundered about than THEOSOPHY—whether regarded theoretically as a code of ethics, or practically, in its objective expression, *i.e.*, the Society known by that name.

Year after year, and day after day had our officers and members to interrupt people speaking of the theosophical movement by putting in more or less emphatic protests against theosophy being referred to as a “religion,” and the Theosophical Society as a kind of church or religious body. Still worse, it is as often spoken of as a “new sect”! Is it a stubborn prejudice, an error, or both? The

† [It is not known why this saying should be credited here to Bunyan. The statement: “Religion is the best Armour in the World, but the worst Cloak” may be found in Thomas Fuller’s *Gnomologia: Adagies and Proverbs; Wise Sentences and Witty Sayings, Ancient and Modern, Foreign and British*, London, 1732. It is, however, not ascribed to Bunyan therein.—*Compiler*.]

latter, most likely. The most narrow-minded and even notoriously unfair people are still in need of a plausible pretext, of a peg on which to hang their little uncharitable remarks and innocently-uttered slanders. And what peg is more solid for that purpose, more convenient than an “ism” or a “sect.” The great majority would be very sorry to be disabused and finally forced to accept the fact that theosophy is neither. The name suits them, and they pretend to be unaware of its falseness. But there are others, also, many more or less friendly people, who labour sincerely under the same delusion. To these, we say: Surely the world has been hitherto sufficiently cursed with the intellectual extinguishers known as dogmatic creeds, without having inflicted upon it a new form of faith! Too many already wear their faith, truly, as Shakespeare puts it, “but as the fashion of his hat,” ever changing “with the next block.” Moreover, the very *raison d’être* of the Theosophical Society was,

from its beginning, to utter a loud protest and lead an open warfare against dogma or any belief based upon blind faith.

It may sound odd and paradoxical, but it is true to say that, hitherto, the most apt workers in practical theosophy, its most devoted members, were those recruited from the ranks of agnostics and even of materialists. No genuine, no sincere searcher after truth can ever be found among the *blind* believers in the “Divine Word,” let the latter be claimed to come from Allâh, Brahmâ or Jehovah, or their respective *Korân*, *Purâna* and *Bible*. For:

“Faith is not *reason*’s labour, but repose.”

He who believes his own religion on faith, will regard that of every other man as a lie, and hate it on that same faith. Moreover, unless it fetters reason and entirely blinds our perceptions of anything outside our own particular faith, the latter is no faith at all, but a temporary belief, the delusion we labour under, at some particular time of life. Moreover, “faith without principles is but a flattering phrase for willful positiveness or fanatical bodily sensations,” in Coleridge’s clever definition.

What, then, is Theosophy, and how may it be defined in its latest presentation in this closing portion of the XIXth century?

Theosophy, we say, is not a Religion.

Yet there are, as every one knows, certain beliefs, philosophical, religious and scientific, which have become so closely associated in recent years with the word “Theosophy” that they have come to be taken by the general public for theosophy itself. Moreover, we shall be told these beliefs have been put forward, explained and defended by these very Founders who have declared that Theosophy is *not* a Religion. What is then the explanation of this *apparent* contradiction? How can a certain body of beliefs and teachings, an elaborate doctrine, in fact, be labelled “Theosophy” and be tacitly accepted as “Theosophical” by nine tenths of the members of the T. S., if Theosophy is not a Religion?—we are asked.

To explain this is the purpose of the present protest.

It is perhaps necessary, first of all, to say, that the assertion that “Theosophy is not a Religion,” by no means excludes the fact that “Theosophy *is* Religion” itself. A Religion in the true and only correct sense, is a bond uniting men together—not a particular set of dogmas and beliefs. Now Religion, *per se*, in its widest meaning is that which binds not only *all* MEN, but also *all* BEINGS and all *things* in the entire Universe into one grand whole. This is our theosophical definition of religion; but the same definition changes again with every creed and country, and no two Christians even regard it alike. We find this in more than one eminent author. Thus Carlyle defined the Protestant Religion in his day, with a remarkable prophetic eye to this ever-growing feeling in our present day, as:

For the most part a wise, prudential feeling, grounded on mere calculation; a matter, as

all others now are, of expedience and utility; whereby some smaller *quantum* of earthly enjoyment may be exchanged for a far larger *quantum* of celestial enjoyment. Thus religion, too, is profit, a working for wages; not reverence, but vulgar hope or fear.

In her turn Mrs. Stowe, whether consciously or otherwise, seemed to have had Roman Catholicism rather than Protestantism in her mind, when saying of her heroine that:

Religion she looked upon in the light of a ticket (with the correct number of indulgences bought and paid for), which, being once purchased and snugly laid away in a pocket-book, is to be produced at the celestial gate, and thus secure admission to heaven. . .

But to Theosophists (the genuine Theosophists are here meant) who accept no mediation by proxy, no salvation through innocent blood shed, nor would they think of "working for wages" in the *One Universal* religion, the only definition they could subscribe to and accept in full is one given by Miller. How truly and theosophically he describes it, by showing that

“. . . true Religion
Is always mild, propitious and humble;
Plays not *the tyrant*, plants *no faith in blood*,
Nor bears destruction on her chariot wheels;
But stoops to polish, succour and redress,
And *builds her grandeur on the public good.*”

The above is a correct definition of what true theosophy *is*, or ought to be. (Among the creeds Buddhism alone is such a true heart-binding and men-binding philosophy, because it is not a dogmatic religion.) In this respect, as it is the duty and task of every genuine theosophist to accept and carry out these principles, Theosophy *is* RELIGION, and the Society its one Universal Church; the temple of Solomon’s wisdom,* in building which “there

* Whose 700 wives and 300 concubines, by the bye, are merely the personations of man’s attributes, feelings, passions and his various occult powers: the Kabalistic numbers 7 and 3 showing it plainly. Solomon himself, moreover, being, simply, the emblem of SOL—the “Solar Initiate” or the Christ-Sun, is a variant of the Indian “Vikartana” (the Sun) shorn of his beams by Vi□vakarman, his Hierophant-Initiator, who thus shears the *Chrestos*-candidate for initiation of his golden radiance and crowns him with a dark,

was neither hammer nor axe *nor* any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building” (*I Kings*, vi, 7); for this “temple” is made by no human hand, nor built in any locality on earth—but, verily, is raised only in the inner sanctuary of man's heart wherein reigns alone the awakened soul.

Thus Theosophy is not *a* Religion, we say, but RELIGION itself, the one bond of unity, which is so universal and all-embracing that no man, as no speck—from gods and mortal down to animals, the blade of grass and atom—can be outside of its light. Therefore, any organization or body of that name must necessarily be a UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD.

Were it otherwise, Theosophy would be but a word added to hundreds other such words as high-sounding as they are pretentious and empty. Viewed as a philosophy, Theosophy in its practical work is the alembic of the Mediaeval alchemist. It transmutes the apparently base metal of every ritualistic and dogmatic creed (Christianity included) into the gold of fact and truth, and thus truly produces a universal panacea for the ills of mankind. This is why, when applying for admission into the Theosophical Society, no one is asked what religion he belongs to, nor what his deistic views may be. These views are his own personal property and have nought to do with the Society. Because Theosophy can be practised by Christian or Heathen, Jew or Gentile, by Agnostic or Materialist, or even an Atheist, provided that none of these is a bigoted fanatic, who refuses to recognise as his brother any man or woman outside his own special creed or belief. Count Leo N. Tolstoy does not believe in the Bible, the Church, or the divinity of Christ; and yet no Christian surpasses him in the practical bearing out of the principles alleged to have been preached on the

blackened aureole—the “crown of thorns.” (See *The Secret Doctrine* for full explanation.) Solomon was never a living man. As described in *Kings*, his life and works are an allegory on the trials and glory of Initiation.

Mount. And these principles are those of Theosophy; not because they were uttered by the Christian Christ, but because they are universal ethics, and were preached by Buddha and Confucius, Krishna, and all the great Sages, thousands of years before the Sermon on the Mount was written. Hence, once that we live up to such theosophy, it becomes a universal *panacea* indeed, for it heals the wounds inflicted by the gross asperities of the Church “isms” on the sensitive soul of every naturally religious man. How many of these, forcibly thrust out by the reactive impulse of disappointment from the narrow area of blind belief into the ranks of arid disbelief, have been brought back to hopeful aspiration by simply joining our Brotherhood—yea, imperfect as it is.

If, as an offset to this, we are reminded that several prominent members have left the Society disappointed in theosophy as they had been in other associations, this cannot

dismay us in the least. For with a very, *very few* exceptions, in the early stage of the T.S.'s activities, when some left because they did not find mysticism practised in the General Body as *they* understood it, or because "the leaders lacked Spirituality," were "untheosophical, hence, untrue to the rules," you see, the majority left because most of them were either half-hearted or too self-opinionated—a church and infallible dogma in themselves. Some broke away, again, under very shallow pretexts indeed, such, for instance, as "because Christianity [to say Churchianity, or *sham* Christianity, would be more just] was too roughly handled in our magazines"—just as if other fanatical religions were ever treated any better or upheld! Thus, all those who left have done well to leave, and have never been regretted.

Furthermore, there is this also to be added: the number of those who left can hardly be compared with the number of those who found everything they had hoped for in Theosophy. Its doctrines, if seriously studied, call forth, by stimulating one's reasoning powers and awakening the *inner* in the animal man, every hitherto dormant power for good in us, and also the perception of the true and the real, as opposed to the false and the unreal. Tearing off

with no uncertain hand the thick veil of dead-letter with which every old religious scripture was cloaked, scientific Theosophy, learned in the cunning symbolism of the ages, reveals to the scoffer at old wisdom the origin of the world's faiths and sciences. It opens new vistas beyond the old horizons of crystallized, motionless and despotic faiths; and turning blind belief into a reasoned knowledge founded on mathematical laws—the only *exact* science—it demonstrates to him under profounder and more philosophical aspects the existence of that which, repelled by the grossness of its dead-letter form, he had long since abandoned as a nursery tale. It gives a clear and well-defined object, an ideal to live for, to every sincere man or woman belonging to whatever station in Society and of whatever culture and degree of intellect. Practical Theosophy is not *one* Science, but embraces every science in life, moral and physical. It may, in short, be justly regarded as the universal "coach," a tutor of world-wide knowledge and experience, and of an erudition which not only assists and guides his pupils toward a successful examination for every scientific or moral service in earthly life, but fits them for *the lives* to come, if those pupils will only study the universe and its mysteries *within themselves*, instead of studying them through the spectacles of orthodox science and religions.

And let no reader misunderstand these statements. It is Theosophy *per se*, not any individual member of the Society or even Theosophist, on whose behalf such a universal omniscience is claimed. The two—Theosophy and the Theosophical Society—as a vessel and the *olla podrida* it contains, must not be confounded. One is, as an ideal, *divine* Wisdom, perfection itself; the other a poor, imperfect thing, trying to run *under*, if not *within*, its shadow on Earth. No man is perfect; why, then, should any member of the T.S. be expected to be a paragon of every human virtue? And why should the whole

organization be criticized and blamed for the faults, whether real or imaginary, of some of its “Fellows,” or even its Leaders? Never was the Society, as a concrete body, free from blame or sin—*errare humanum est*—nor

were any of its members. Hence, it is rather those members—most of whom will not be led by theosophy, that ought to be blamed. Theosophy is the soul of its Society; the latter the gross and imperfect body of the former. Hence, those modern Solomons who *will* sit in the Judgment Seat and talk of that they know nothing about, are invited before they slander theosophy or any theosophists to first get acquainted with both, instead of ignorantly calling one a “farrago of insane beliefs” and the other a “sect of impostors and lunatics.”

Regardless of this, Theosophy is spoken of by friends and foes as a religion when not a *sect*. Let us see how the special beliefs which have become associated with the word have come to stand in that position, and how it is that they have so good a right to it that none of the leaders of the Society have ever thought of disavowing their doctrines.

We have said that we believed in the absolute unity of nature. Unity implies the possibility for a unit on one plane, to come into contact with another unit on or from another plane. We believe in it.

The just published *Secret Doctrine* will show what were the ideas of all antiquity with regard to the *primeval instructors* of primitive man and his three earlier races. The genesis of that WISDOM-RELIGION, in which all theosophists believe, dates from that period. So-called “Occultism,” or rather Esoteric Science, has to be traced in its origin to those Beings who, led by Karma, have incarnated in our humanity, and thus struck the key-note of that secret Science which countless generations of subsequent adepts have expanded since then in every age, while they checked its doctrines by personal observation and experience. The bulk of this knowledge—which no man is able to possess in its fulness—constitutes that which we now call Theosophy or “divine knowledge.” Beings from other and higher worlds may have it entire; we can have it only approximately.

Thus, unity of everything in the universe implies and justifies our belief in the existence of a knowledge at once scientific, philosophical and religious, showing the necessity

and actuality of the connection of man and all things in the universe with each other; which knowledge, therefore, becomes essentially RELIGION, and must be called in its integrity and universality by the distinctive name of WISDOM-RELIGION.

It is from this WISDOM-RELIGION that all the various individual “Religions”

(erroneously so called) have sprung, forming in their turn offshoots and branches, and also all the minor creeds, based upon and always originated through some personal experience in psychology. Every such religion, or religious offshoot, be it considered orthodox or heretical, wise or foolish, started originally as a clear and unadulterated stream from the Mother-Source. The fact that each became in time polluted with purely human speculations and even inventions, due to interested motives, does not prevent any from having been pure in its early beginnings. There are those creeds—we shall not call them religions—which have now been overlaid with the human element out of all recognition; others just showing signs of early decay; not one that escaped the hand of time. But each and all are of divine, because natural and true origin; aye—Mazdeism, Brahmanism, Buddhism as much as Christianity. It is the dogmas and human element in the latter which led directly to modern Spiritualism.

Of course, there will be an outcry from both sides, if we say that modern Spiritualism *per se*, cleansed of the unhealthy speculations which were based on the dicta of two little girls and their very unreliable “Spirits”—is nevertheless, far more true and philosophical than any church dogma. *Carnalised* Spiritualism is now reaping its Karma. Its primitive *innovators*, the said “two little girls” from Rochester, the Mecca of modern Spiritualism, have grown up and turned into old women since the first raps produced by them have opened wide ajar the gates between this and the other world. It is on their “innocent” testimony that the elaborate scheme of a sidereal Summer-land, with its active astral population of “Spirits,” ever on the wing between their “Silent Land” and our very loud-mouthed, gossiping earth—has been

started and worked out. And now the two female Mohammeds of Modern Spiritualism have turned self-apostates and play false to the “philosophy” they have created, and have gone over to the enemy. They expose and denounce *practical* Spiritualism as the humbug of the ages. Spiritualists—(save a handful of fair exceptions)—have rejoiced and sided with *our* enemies and slanderers, when these, *who had never been Theosophists*, played us false and showed the cloven foot denouncing the Founders of the Theosophical Society as frauds and impostors. Shall the Theosophists laugh in their turn now that the original “revealers” of Spiritualism have become its “revilers”? Never! for the phenomena of Spiritualism are facts, and the treachery of the “Fox girls” only makes us feel new pity for all mediums, and confirms, before the whole world, our constant declaration that no medium can be relied upon. No true theosophist will ever laugh, or far less rejoice, at the discomfiture even of an opponent. The reason for it is simple:—

Because we know that beings from other, higher worlds do confabulate with some elect mortals now as ever; though now far more rarely than in the days of old, as mankind becomes with every civilized generation worse in every respect.

Theosophy—owing, in truth, to the *levée in arms* of all the Spiritualists of Europe and America at the first words uttered against the idea that every communicating *intelligence* is

necessarily the Spirit of some ex-mortal from this earth—has not said its last word about Spiritualism and “Spirits.” It may one day. Meanwhile, an humble servant of theosophy, the Editor, declares once more her belief in Beings, grander, wiser, nobler than any *personal* God, who are beyond any “Spirits of the dead,” Saints, or winged Angels, who nevertheless, *do* condescend in all and every age to occasionally overshadow rare sensitives—often entirely unconnected with Church, Spiritualism or even Theosophy. And believing in high and holy Spiritual Beings, she must also believe in the existence of their opposites—lower “spirits,” good, bad and indifferent. Therefore does she believe in spiritualism and its phenomena, some of which are so repugnant to her.

This as a casual remark and a digression, just to show that Theosophy includes Spiritualism—as it should be, not as it is—among its sciences, based on knowledge and the experience of countless ages. There is not a religion worthy of the name which has been started otherwise than in consequence of such *visits* from Beings on the higher planes.

Thus were born all prehistoric, as well as all the historic religions, Mazdeism and Brahmanism, Buddhism and Christianity, Judaism, Gnosticism and Mohammedanism; in short every more or less successful “ism.” All are true at the bottom, and all are false on their surface. The Revealer, the artist who impressed a portion of the Truth on the brain of the Seer, was in every instance a true artist, who gave out genuine truths; but the instrument proved also, in every instance, to be *only a man*. Invite Rubinstein and ask him to play a sonata of Beethoven on a piano left to *self-tuning*, one half of the keys of which are in chronic paralysis, while the wires hang loose; then see whether, the genius of the artist notwithstanding, you will be able to recognize the sonata. The moral of the *fabula* is that a man—let him be the greatest of mediums or natural Seers—is but a man; and man left to his own devices and speculations *must* be out of tune with absolute truth, while even picking up some of its crumbs. For Man is but a *fallen* Angel, a god within, but having an animal brain in his head, more subject to colds and wine fumes while in company with other men on Earth, than to the faultless reception of divine revelations.

Hence the multi-coloured dogmas of the churches. Hence also the thousand and one “philosophies” so-called (some contradictory, theosophical theories included); and the variegated “Sciences” and schemes, Spiritual, Mental, Christian and Secular; Sectarianism and bigotry, and especially the personal vanity and self-opinionatedness of almost every “Innovator” since the mediaeval ages. These have all darkened and hidden the very existence of TRUTH—the common root of all. Will our critics imagine that we exclude theosophical teachings

from this nomenclature? Not at all. And though the esoteric doctrines which our Society has been and is expounding, are not *mental* or *spiritual* impressions from some “unknown, *from above*,” but the fruit of teachings given to us by living men, still, except that which was dictated and written out by those Masters of Wisdom themselves, these doctrines may be in many cases as incomplete and faulty as any of our foes would desire it. *The Secret Doctrine*—a work which gives out all that can be given out during this century, is an attempt to lay bare in *part* the common foundation and inheritance of all—great and small religious and philosophical schemes. It was found indispensable to tear away all this mass of concremented misconceptions and prejudice which now hides the parent trunk of (a) all the great world-religions; (b) of the smaller sects; and (c) of Theosophy as it stands now—however veiled the great Truth, by ourselves and our limited knowledge. The crust of error is thick, laid on by whatever hand; and because we *personally* have tried to remove some of it, the effort became the standing reproach against all theosophical writers and even the Society. Few among our friends and readers have failed to characterize our attempt to expose error in *The Theosophist* and *Lucifer* as “very uncharitable attacks on Christianity,” “untheosophical assaults,” etc., etc. Yet these are necessary, nay, indispensable, if we wish to plough up at least *approximate* truths. We have to lay things bare, and are ready to suffer for it—as usual. It is vain to promise to *give* truth, and then leave it mingled with error out of mere faint-heartedness. That the result of such policy could only muddy the stream of facts is shown plainly. After twelve years of incessant labour and struggle with enemies from the four quarters of the globe, notwithstanding our four theosophical monthly journals—*The Theosophist*, *The Path*, *Lucifer*, and the French *Le Lotus*—our wishy-washy, tame protests in them, our timid declarations, our “masterly policy of inactivity,” and playing at hide-and-seek in the shadow of dreary metaphysics, have only led to Theosophy being seriously regarded as a religious SECT. For the hundredth

time we are told—“What good is Theosophy doing?” and “See what good the Churches are doing”!

Nevertheless, it is an averred fact that mankind is not a whit better in morality, and in some respects ten- times worse now, than it ever was in the days of Paganism. Moreover, for the last half century, from that period when Freethought and Science got the best of the Churches—Christianity is yearly losing far more adherents among the cultured classes than it gains proselytes in the lower *strata*, the scum of Heathendom. On the other hand, Theosophy has brought back from Materialism and blank despair to belief (based on logic and evidence) in man’s *divine* Self, and the immortality of the latter, more than one of those whom the Church has lost through dogma, exaction of faith and tyranny. And, if it is proven that Theosophy saves one man only in a thousand of those the Church has lost, is not the former a far higher factor for good than all the missionaries put together?

Theosophy, as repeatedly declared in print and *viva voce* by its members and officers, proceeds on diametrically opposite lines to those which are trodden by the Church; and Theosophy rejects the methods of Science, since her inductive methods can only lead to crass materialism. Yet, *de facto*, Theosophy claims to be both “RELIGION” and “SCIENCE,” for theosophy is the essence of both. It is for the sake and love of the two divine abstractions—*i.e.*, theosophical religion and science, that its Society has become the volunteer *scavenger* of both orthodox religion and modern science; as also the relentless Nemesis of those who have degraded the two noble truths to their own ends and purposes, and then divorced each violently from the other, though the two are and *must be one*. To prove this is also one of our objects in the present paper.

The modern Materialist insists on an impassable chasm between the two, pointing out that the “Conflict between Religion and Science” has ended in the triumph of the latter and the defeat of the first. The modern Theosophist refuses to see, on the contrary, any such chasm at all. If it is claimed by both Church and Science that

each of them pursues the truth and *nothing but the truth*, then either one of them is mistaken, and accepts falsehood for truth, or both. Any other impediment to their reconciliation must be set down as purely *fictitious*. Truth is one, even if sought for or pursued at two different ends. Therefore, Theosophy claims to reconcile the two foes. It premises by saying that the *true* spiritual and primitive Christian religion is, as much as the other great and still older philosophies that preceded it—the *light of Truth*—“the life and the light of men.”

But so is the *true* light of Science. Therefore, darkened as the former is now by dogmas examined through glasses smoked with the superstitions artificially produced by the Churches, this light can hardly penetrate and meet its sister ray in a science, equally as cobwebbed by paradoxes and the materialistic sophistries of the age. The teachings of the two are incompatible, and cannot agree so long as both Religious philosophy and the Science of physical and external (in philosophy, *false*) nature, insist upon the infallibility of their respective “will-o’-the-wisps.” The two lights, having their beams of equal length in the matter of false deductions, can but extinguish each other and produce still worse darkness. Yet, they can be reconciled on the condition that both shall clean their houses, one from the human dross of the ages, the other from the hideous excrescence of modern materialism and atheism. And as both decline, the most meritorious and best thing to do is precisely what Theosophy alone can and *will* do: *i.e.*, point out to the innocents caught by the glue of the two waylayers—verily two dragons of old, one devouring the intellects, the other the souls of men—that their supposed chasm is but an optical delusion; that, far from being one, it is but an immense garbage mound respectively erected by the two foes, as a fortification against mutual attacks.

Thus, if theosophy does no more than point out and seriously draw the attention of the world to the fact that the *supposed* disagreement between religion and science is

conditioned, on the one hand by the intelligent materialists rightly kicking against absurd human dogmas,

and on the other by blind fanatics and interested churchmen who, instead of defending the souls of mankind, fight simply tooth and nail for their personal bread and butter and authority—why, even then, theosophy will prove itself the saviour of mankind.

And now we have shown, it is hoped, what real Theosophy is, and what are its adherents. One is divine Science and a code of Ethics so sublime that no theosophist is capable of doing it justice; the others weak but sincere men. Why, then, should Theosophy ever be judged by the personal shortcomings of any leader or member of our 150 branches? One may work for it to the best of his ability, yet never raise himself to the height of his call and aspiration. This is his or her misfortune, never the fault of Theosophy, or even of the body at large. Its Founders claim no other merit than that of having set the first theosophical wheel rolling. If judged at all they must be judged by the work they have done, not by what friends may think or enemies say of them. There is no room for *personalities* in a work like ours; and all must be ready, as the Founders are, if needs be, for the car of Jagannâth to crush them *individually* for *the good of all*. It is only in the days of the dim Future, when death will have laid his cold hand on the luckless Founders and stop thereby their activity, that their respective merits and demerits, their good and bad acts and deeds, and their theosophical work will have to be weighed on the Balance of Posterity. Then only, after the two scales with their contrasted loads have been brought to an equipoise, and the character of the net result left over has become evident to all in its full and intrinsic value, then only shall the nature of the verdict passed be determined with anything like justice. At present, except in India, those results are too scattered over the face of the earth, too much limited to a handful of individuals to be easily judged. Now, these results can hardly be perceived, much less heard of amid the din and clamour made by our teeming enemies, and their ready imitators—the indifferent. Yet however small, if once proved good, even now every man who has at heart the moral

progress of humanity, owes his thankfulness to Theosophy for those results. And as Theosophy was revived and brought before the world, *via* its unworthy servants, the “Founders,” if their work was useful, it alone must be their vindicator, regardless of the present state of their balance in the petty cash accounts of Karma, wherein social “respectabilities” are entered up.*

* [Copious excerpts from this powerful Editorial were published in *The Theosophist*, Vol. X, January, 1889, with a few connecting editorial comments, probably by Col. Olcott.—*Compiler*.]

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
November, 1888

**FOOTNOTES TO “A BUDDHIST PRINCE’S
VIEW OF THE UNIVERSE AND
THE NATURE OF MAN”**

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 15, November, 1888, pp. 205-211]

[This essay was contributed by His Royal Highness, Prince Chandrdhat Chudhathar of Siam, and was published simultaneously in *The Theosophist* (Vol. X, November, 1888, pp. 83-87). Various footnotes were appended by H.P.B. to certain passages which appear in square brackets.]

[This Akasa (or Universe) although it is self-existing, absolute, infinite is yet subject to the immutable law of change.]

A contradiction. A thing cannot be absolute and still subject to change. What H.R.H. means to say, we suppose is that space or the abstract universe (Akasa) is infinite and immutable; but that this universe is subject to changes in its periodical manifestations.

[if this solar system. . . . were to be destroyed the matter which constitutes their bodies will. . . . be turned into elementsother systems of heavenly bodies. . . . will naturally. . . . form out of the molecules of matter and dormant forces a new system to supply the vacancy.]

FOOTNOTES

175

This is certainly not orthodox *exoteric* Buddhism. But it comes very near to our *esoteric* philosophy or “Budhism” (Wisdom religion) taught by our Lord secretly to his elect Arhats.

[by virtue of the living species, new beings are made up by the attractions of their affinities from the remains of those which have died long before.]

This is precisely the doctrine taught (See *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II) with regard to the animal world, of which all the bodies of *mammals* have been formed out of the cast off atoms of various mankinds which preceded ours. Animals were “created” later than Adam and brought to him to be named (*Vide*, Chap. ii, *Genesis*). In the *Purânas*, it is the various Rishis who are the reputed parents of divers animals and even of birds and amphibious monsters.

[What I call a soul is nothing but the active force or attraction in man which, when he dies, must die with him.]

This is too materialistic—we fear. The “Soul” is certainly not immortal, but the ETERNAL KARMIC EGO, *that* which re-incarnates, *is*. This is esoteric philosophy, of course, not orthodox Buddhism.

[if there exists an objective Nirvana] No “objective Nirvana” can exist in Nature. Nirvana is *a state*, not a mode of visible objectiveness, nor a locality. Nirvana, as Nagasena said to the king, IS—but does not exist.

[I am unable to believe that an immortal soul exists] His Royal Highness is evidently unacquainted with esoteric philosophy. The latter believes neither in a God who fabricates souls out of nothing, nor that there is such a thing as any place “outside” the Universe, since the Universe is infinite and limitless. But we must also demur to the idea that SPACE can ever be “used up,” whether during Manvantara (or life cycle) or during *pralaya*, the period of absolute Rest, when SPACE remains the same, *i.e.*, eternal, immutable, as it ever was and as

it will ever be, since abstract SPACE is but another name for the absolute ALL.

[let us strive to cultivate an universal love, which will undoubtedly tend to good actions, the only tools with which we can paint our perfect likenesses at death.]

KARMA, TANHA and SKANDHAS, are the almighty trinity in one, and the cause of our re-birth. The illustration of painting our own present likeness at death, and that likeness becoming the future personality is very poetical and graphic, but we claim it as an occult teaching. What H.R.H. means to infer, as we understand it, is this. At the solemn moment of death no man can fail to see himself under his true colours, and no self-deception is of any use to him any longer. Thence the following thing happens. As at the instant of drowning man sees marshalled past his mind's eye the whole of his life, with all its events, effects and causes, to the minutest details, so at the moment of death, he sees himself in all his moral nakedness, unadorned by either human flattery or self-adulation, and, as he is; hence, *as he*, or rather, as his astral double combined with his *Kama* principle—*shall be*. For the vices, defects and especially the passions of the preceding life become, through certain laws of affinity and transference, the germs of the future potentialities in the *animal* soul (*Kama rupa*), hence of its dependent, the astral double (*linga* □ *arira*)—at a subsequent birth. It is the *personality* alone which changes; the real reincarnating principle, the EGO, remains always the same; and it is its KARMA that guides the idiosyncracies and prominent moral traits of the *old* “personality” that was (and that the EGO knew not how to control), to re-appear in the *new* man that will be. These traits and passions pursue and fasten on the yet plastic third and fourth principles of the child, and—unless the EGO struggles and conquers—they will develop with tenfold intensity and lead the adult man to his destruction. For it is they who are the tools and weapons of the Karmic LAW OF RETRIBUTION. Thus, the Prince says very truly that our good and bad



H.P. BLAVATSKY AND COL. H.S. OLCOTT IN LONDON
Last photograph taken of them together. H.P. B.'s tobacco-basket is now
In the possession of Geoffrey Watkins, London.

actions “are the only tools with which we paint our likenesses at death,” for the *new* man is invariably the son and progeny of the old man that was.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
November, 1888

***ESOTERIC BUDDHISM AND
THE SECRET DOCTRINE*** *

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 15, November, 1888, pp. 247-254]

In reference to various remarks concerning *Esoteric Buddhism* which appear in the course of your new work, *The Secret Doctrine*, I beg to call your attention to some passages on the same subject which appeared on former occasions in *The Theosophist* at a time when that magazine was edited by yourself.

In *The Secret Doctrine* you speak of *Esoteric Buddhism* as a work with “a very unfortunate title,” and in reference to a passage in my preface, emphasising the novelty for European readers of the teachings then given out, you say the error must have crept in through inadvertence. In the last number of *Lucifer* you discuss the same point in a note appended to a correspondent’s letter. Permit me to remind you of an editorial note, evidently from your own pen, in the February *Theosophist*, 1884. This is in reply to an objection raised by Mr. W. Q. Judge that nearly all the leading ideas of the doctrine embodied in *Esoteric Buddhism* are to be found in the *Bhagavad-Gita*. You wrote:—

“We do not believe our American brother is justified in his remarks. The knowledge given out in *Esoteric Buddhism* is, most decidedly, ‘given out for the first time,’ inasmuch as the allegories that lie scattered in the Hindu sacred literature *are now for the first time clearly explained* to the world of the profane. † Since the birth of the Theosophical Society and the publication of *Isis*, it is being repeated daily that all the Esoteric Wisdom of the ages lies concealed in the *Vedas*, the *Upanishads* and *Bhagavad-Gita*. Yet, unto the day of the first appearance of *Esoteric Buddhism*, and for long centuries back, these doctrines remained a sealed letter *to all but a few initiated Brahmans* who had always kept the spirit of it to themselves.”

* [The footnotes signed “Ed.” are by H. P. B.—*Compiler*.]

† The author of *The Secret Doctrine* begs to suggest that she never denied to the doctrines expounded by Mr. Sinnett the privilege of having been *clearly* “EXPLAINED,”

Thus, if I erred in my statement about the doctrine having been unknown previously to Europeans, I erred in very good company—your own. Your note goes on to say that certainly the teachings of *Esoteric Buddhism* lie concealed in the *Bhagavad-Gita*, “but” you say:

“. . . what of that? Of what good to W. Q. Judge or any other is the diamond that lies concealed deep underground? Of course everyone knows that there is not a gem now sparkling in a jeweller’s shop but pre-existed and lay concealed since its formation for ages within the bowels of the earth. Yet, surely, he who got it first from its finder and cut and polished it, may be permitted to say that this particular diamond is ‘given out for the first time’ to the world. . . .”*

for the first time, in *print*, in *Esot. Buddhism*. All she asserts is, that *it is not for the first time* that they were *given out to a European*, and by the latter to other Europeans. Between "publishing" and "giving out" there is a decided difference; an admirable *peg*, at any rate, for our common enemies to hang their captious cavils upon. It is not the writer of *The Secret Doctrine*, moreover, who was the first to put such a natural interpretation upon the sentence used by our esteemed friend and correspondent, but, verily, sundry critics *outside* of, as also *within* the Theosophical Society. It is no personal question between Mr. Sinnett and H. P. Blavatsky, but between these two individuals on the one hand and their critics on the other; the former being both in duty bound—as theosophists and believers in the esoteric teaching—to defend the Sacred Doctrine from side attacks—*via* its expounders.—ED.]

* This proves, firstly, that the desire to defend, in print, a friend and co-worker *quand même*, even when he is not entirely right, is always injudicious; and secondly, that experience comes with age. "The good advocate not only hears, but examines his case, and pincheth the cause where he fears it is foundred"—Fuller teaches. We proved no "good advocate," and now bear our *Karma* for it; from an "advocate" we have become a "defendant."—[ED.]

In regard to my "unfortunate title," which was (as you know, I think) approved when first proposed without any question arising as to the two "d's"—you say in *The Secret Doctrine*:

"It has enabled our enemies to find an effective weapon against theosophy; because, as an eminent Pali scholar very pointedly expressed it, there was in the volume named "neither esotericism nor Buddhism." *

It happens that you discussed the same criticism in an article in *The Theosophist* for November, 1883. Your text on that occasion was an article in the *St. James' Gazette*, which you attributed to Dr. Rhys-Davids, and you wrote:

"But before the Orientalists are able to prove that the doctrines as taught in Mr. Sinnett's exposition are 'not Buddhism, esoteric or exoteric,' they will have to make away with the thousands of Brahmanical Adwaitee and other Vedantin writings—the works of Sankaracharya in particular,—from which it can be proved that precisely the same doctrines are taught in those works, esoterically." †

You spoke, in the course of the article, of the very remark you now find to be "very pointed," + as "such a spiteful and profitless criticism" to attribute it to the pen of the great Pali scholar.

* [Vol. I, p. xvii.]

† [Collected Writings, Vol. V, p. 344.]

‡ So we say now. Not a word of what we wrote *then* do we repudiate here; and *The Secret Doctrine* proves it. But this does not clash at all with the fact that, once made public, no doctrine can be referred to any longer as "esoteric." The esoteric tenets revealed—both in *Esoteric Buddhism* and *The Secret Doctrine* have become *exoteric* now. Nor does a remark cease to be "spiteful" for being "very pointed," *e.g.*, most of Carlyle's remarks. A few years ago, at a time when our doctrines were hardly delineated and the Orientalists knew nothing of them, any such premature discussion and criticism were

“profitless.” But now, when these doctrines have spread throughout the whole world, unless we call things by their true names, and admit our mistakes (for it was one, to spell “Buddhism,” *Buddhism*—a mistake, moreover, distinctly attributed *to ourselves*, “theosophists of India,” *vide* page xviii, Vol. I of *The Secret Doctrine*, and *not at all to Mr. Sinnett*), our critics will have an undeniable right to charge us with sailing under *false* colours.

The propriety of the title given to my book was discussed in an article in *The Theosophist* for June, 1884, when an editorial note was appended, in the course of which the writer said:

“The name given to Mr. Sinnett’s book will not be misleading or objectionable when the close identity between the doctrines therein expounded and those of the ancient Rishis of India is clearly perceived.” *

These extracts seem to show that the unfavourable view of *Esoteric Buddhism* now presented to the readers of *The Secret Doctrine* can only have been developed in your mind within a comparatively recent period. † Satisfied with the assurance conveyed to me— as explained in the preface to the sixth edition—by the reverend teacher from whom its substance was derived—that the book was a sound and trustworthy presentation of his teachings as a whole,

Nothing more fatal to our cause could ever happen. If we would be regarded as *theosophists*, we have to protect THEOSOPHY; we have to defend our colours before we think of defending our own petty personality and *amour propre*, and should be ever ready to sacrifice ourselves. And this is what we have tried to do in the *Introduction to The Secret Doctrine*. Poor is that standard-bearer who shields his body from the bullets of the enemy with the sacred banner entrusted to him!—[ED.]

* The Rishis having nought to do with “Buddhism,” the religion of Gautama Buddha, this question shows plainly that the mistake involved in the double “d” had not yet struck the writer as forcibly as it has done later.—[ED.]

[The quoted passage is from an editorial note signed T. S. which was appended to an article entitled “Esoteric Buddhism and Hinduism,” signed by “A Brahman Theosophist” (*The Theosophist*, Vol. V, June, 1884, pp. 223-25). The initials T. S. were evidently used by T. Subba Row, and the editorial note referred to is included in the collection known as the *Esoteric Writings of T. Subba Row* (2nd ed., 1931).—*Compiler*.]

† This is an error. What we say now in *The Secret Doctrine* is what we *knew*, but kept silent upon ever since the *first year* of the publication of *Esoteric Buddhism*; though we confess we have not realised the importance of the mistake as fully from the beginning as we do now. It is

that would never have to be remodelled or apologised for,* I have been content, hitherto, to leave unnoticed every other criticism that it has called forth. I have known all along that it contained errors which initiates would detect, but by the time any student might be in a position to appreciate these he would be independent

the number of criticisms received in private letters and for publication in *Lucifer*, from friends as well as from foes, that forced us to see the question in its true light. Had they (the criticisms) been directed only against us *personally* (Mr. Sinnett and H. P. Blavatsky) they would have been left entirely unnoticed. But as all such had a direct bearing upon the doctrines taught—some persisting in calling them *Buddhism*, pure and simple, and others charging them with being a *new-fangled doctrine* invented by ourselves and fathered upon Buddhism—the danger became imminent, and a public explanation was absolutely necessary. Moreover, the impression that it was a very materialistic teaching—*Esoteric Buddhism* being accused of upholding the Darwinian hypothesis—spread from the Indian and Vedantin to almost all the European theosophists. This had to be refuted, and—we do so in *The Secret Doctrine*.—[ED.]

* No one has ever dreamt of denying that *Esoteric Buddhism* was a “trustworthy presentation” of the Master’s teachings *as a whole*. That which is asserted is simply that some *personal* speculations of its author were faulty, and led to erroneous conclusions, (a) on account of their incompleteness, and (b) because of the evident anxiety to reconcile them with modern *physical* science, instead of metaphysical philosophy. Very likely errors, emanating from a desire diametrically opposite, will be found in *The Secret Doctrine*. Why should any of us—aye, even the most learned in occult lore among theosophists—pose for infallibility? Let us humbly admit with Socrates that “all we know is, that *we know nothing*”; at any rate nothing in comparison to what we have still to learn.—[ED.]

of its guidance, and till then he could not be embarrassed * by them. Now however, I regret to find that *The Secret Doctrine* is not merely concerned to expand and develop the earlier teaching—a task which I should be the first to recognise could be performed by no one more efficiently than by yourself—but paves the way for its expositions by remarks on *Esoteric Buddhism* which are not in the nature of fresh revelations concerning what are, doubtless, its many shortcomings, but are in the nature of disparagements† which you have, on former occasions rebuked others for putting forward.

You say—in objecting to my title—“the esoteric truths, presented in Mr. Sinnett’s work, had ceased to be esoteric from the moment they were made public.” Is not that an odd objection to appear on the first page of a book called “*The Secret Doctrine*.” Has the doctrine ceased to deserve that designation from the date at which your own book appeared? ‡

* Not “embarrassed,” but *misled*—and it is precisely this which has happened.—[ED.]

† We demur to the expression. No “disparagement” whatever is meant, but simply an

attempt is made to make certain tenets taught in our respective works more clear. Without such explanations, the statements made by both authors would be unavoidably denounced as contradictory. The general public rarely goes to the trouble of sifting such difficult metaphysical questions to the bottom, but judges on appearance. We have to acquaint first the reader with all the sides and aspects of a teaching before we allow him to accept or even to see in one of such a *dogma*.—[ED.]

‡ It *has*, most unquestionably, if logic deserves its name. Our correspondent would have hardly made this query, intended as a hit and a satire, had he paid attention to what is said on pages xvii-xviii (the first and the second) of the *Introduction to The Secret Doctrine*, namely—“‘Esoteric Buddhism’ was an excellent work with a very unfortunate title, though *it meant no more* than does the title of this work, the ‘*Secret Doctrine*’”; which means, if anything, that no more than “*Esoteric Buddhism*” are those portions of the “*Secret Doctrine*”

ESOTERIC BUDDHISM AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

183

These questions however are all of minor importance, though it puzzles me to understand why your view of them should have been so diametrically reversed from what it was a few years ago. * I might hardly have written this letter at all, but for a passage in *The Secret Doctrine* referring to *Esoteric Buddhism* that occurs on page 169. There you suggest that my own attempt to explain planetary evolution fails for want of being sufficiently metaphysical, and you quote a phrase from me—“on pure metaphysics of that sort we are not now engaged”—in connexion with a passage from one of the letters of instruction I received when the book was under preparation. “And in such case,” you say, “as the Teacher remarks in a letter to him, ‘Why this preaching of our doctrines, all this uphill work and swimming *in adversum flumen*?’” † Any reader will imagine that the passage quoted from the letter had reference to the passage quoted from the book.‡ Nothing can be further from the fact. My remark about not being “then” concerned with “pure metaphysics” had a limited and specific application, and on the next page I see that I have dealt with that period before the earliest manifestations of Nature on the plane of the senses, when the work of evolution going on was concerned “with the elemental forces that underlie the phenomena of Nature as visible now and perceptible to the senses of Man.” §

From time to time, amongst criticisms of *Esoteric Buddhism* that have appeared to me misdirected, I have heard this charge—that I have not appreciated the great doctrine metaphysically, that I have

now explained in our volumes *any longer* “*secret*”—since *they are divulged*. We appeal to logicians and literary critics for a decision.—[ED.]

* *Vide Supra* notes: the reasons are now explained. —[ED.]

† [This sentence occurs in *The Mahatma Letters to A. P. Sinnett*, p. 193. Some, notably the Hare Brothers, in their hostile work entitled *Who Wrote the Mahatma Letters?* (by H. E. and W. L. Hare, London: Williams and Norgate, 1936), have asserted that the Latin expression in this sentence was no better than “dog-Latin.” This criticism is entirely unwarranted. *In adversum flumen* means *into* the current or stream flowing against one, while *in adverso flumine*—as has been suggested for the correct expression—means *in* the opposing current or stream. Both are good Latin and occur in a number of passages from the Classics.—*Compiler*]

‡ This remark of the Master was made in a general not in any specific application. But what of that ?—[ED.]

§ [*Esoteric Buddhism*, American edition, p. 87.—*Compiler*.]

materialised its conceptions. I do not think I have ever before put pen to paper to combat this idea, though it has always struck me as curiously erroneous; but when language from yourself seems to fortify the impression I refer to, it is high time for me to explain, at any rate, my own attitude of mind.*

The charge of materialising the doctrine seems to me to arise entirely from the fact that I have partially succeeded in making some parts of it intelligible. The disposition to regard vagueness of exposition as equivalent to spirituality of thought is very widely spread; and multitudes of people are unaccustomed to respect any phraseology that they find themselves enabled to understand. Unused to realise a thought with precision of imaginative insight, they fancy if it is presented vividly to the mind that it must have lost caste in the realms of idealism. They are used to regarding a brick as something with a definite shape and purpose, and an idea as a Protean shadow. Give the idea a specific plan in Nature, and it will seem

* Once more we beg to assure our friend and colleague, Mr. Sinnett, that in saying what is said in *The Secret Doctrine* we did not for one moment contemplate the remarks as expressive of our *own personal objections*—seeing we know our correspondent's ideas too well to have any. They were addressed to and directed against our benevolent critics: especially those who, with an impartiality most admirable, though worthy of a better fate, try to hit us both, and through us to upset the Esoteric Doctrine. Has not the latter been proclaimed by a number of well-wishers as an invention of H. P. Blavatsky's? Did not even an admirably clever and learned man—the late C. W. King—claim, in his *The Gnostics and their Remains* [Preface, p. ix], to have “. . . reason for suspecting that the Sibyl of Esoteric Buddhism [i.e., your humble servant] drew the first notions of her new religion from the analysis of the Inner Man [to wit our seven principles], as set forth in my [his] first edition”! This—because the most philosophical Gnostic works, especially the doctrines of Valentinus and Marcus—are full of our archaic esoteric ideas. Forsooth, it is high time that the defendant, also, should “rise and explain” her attitude in *The Secret Doctrine*, regardless of any one's (even her own) personality!—[ED.]

to them materialised, even if concerned with conditions of life as remote from materiality as Devachanic emotion.

The succession of Cause and Effect seems itself materialised—in the mental

atmosphere I am discussing—if it is represented, in its most interesting aspect, as forcing its way from one plane of nature to another.

For readers of this temperament *Esoteric Buddhism* may be materialistic; but as I venture to believe that it has been a bridge which has conducted many, and may bear many more, across the chasm which divides the interests and materialism of this life, from the realms of spiritual aspiration beyond, I have not yet seen reason to regret the mould in which it was cast, even though some of those who have used it in their time now despise its materialistic construction. * It would load your paper too heavily if I quoted passages to show how constantly I really emphasised the non-material aspects of its teaching; but I may perhaps be allowed one from the closing sentences of the chapter on “the universe,” in which I say:—“It”—the doctrine of the Esoteric Wisdom—“stoops to materialism, as it were, to link its methods with the logic of that system, and ascends to the highest realms of idealism to embrace and expound the most exalted aspirations of spirit.” †

The truth of the whole matter is admirably expressed in a comprehensive sentence at the end of a long article on “The Metaphysical Basis of *Esoteric Buddhism*,” which appeared in *The Theosophist* for May, 1884, with the suggestive signature, Damodar K. Mavalankar. This runs:—

“The reader will now perceive that *Esoteric Buddhism* is not a system of materialism. It is, as Mr. Sinnett calls it, ‘transcendental Materialism,’ which is non-materialism just as the absolute consciousness is non-consciousness. . .” ‡

* No one we know of “despises,” but many, on the other hand, *rejoice*, and very much so, at being able to refer to it as “materialistic.” It was high time to disabuse and contradict them; and this letter from our correspondent, setting forth his true views and attitude *for the first time*, is one of the first good fruits produced by our remarks in *The Secret Doctrine*. It is an excellent check on our mutual enemies.—[ED.]

† [page 262, in 6th ed.]

‡ These are the *verbatim* expressions of your friend and humble servant, the Editor. Damodar only repeated our views. But the “Damodars” are few, and there

Any vindication of oneself must be a repulsive task. For many reasons I would rather have left all such questions alone, but to ignore unfavourable comments when these proceed from your own pen would be to treat them with less respect than is embodied in my present remarks.

In conclusion, since *The Secret Doctrine* so frequently discusses what *Esoteric Buddhism* meant to say as regards Darwinian evolution, let me endeavour to elucidate that point. The teaching I received on the subject of race evolution was very elementary. It was not exactly “fragmentary” (as has sometimes been said), but it was a skeleton statement, as regards all the problems of “Cosmogogenesis,” consequently it dealt merely with that cosmic progress of the spiritual inquiry through the various kingdoms of Nature which, beginning (on the material plane) with the mineral, culminates in Man. It follows from this elementary statement that at some stage of the great evolutionary process there is an ascent from the animal to the human kingdom,* never mind

where the transition is effected.

were, as our correspondent well knows, other Brahmins in England, who were the first to proclaim *Esoteric Buddhism materialistic to the core*, and who have always maintained this idea in others.—[ED.]

* At the stage of the first Round, and partially at the second, never during any stage of the *Fourth* Round. A purely *mathematical* or rather algebraical reason exists for this:—The present (our) Round being the middle Round (between the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd, and the 5th, 6th, and 7th) is one of adjustment and final equipoise between Spirit and matter. It is that point, in short, wherein the reign of *true* matter, its grossest state (which is as unknown to Science as its opposite pole—homogeneous matter or substance) stops and comes to an end. From that point physical man begins to throw off “coat after coat,” his material molecules for the benefit and subsequent formation or clothing of the animal kingdom, which in its turn is passing it on to the vegetable, and the latter to the mineral kingdoms. Man having evolved in the *first* Round from the animal *via* the two other kingdoms, it stands to reason that in the present Round he should appear *before* the animal world of *this* manvantaric period. But see *The Secret Doctrine* for particulars.—[ED.]

There the teaching vindicated the spirit of the Darwinian idea * though the further illumination now cast upon the subject by your present work shows that many specific conjectures of Darwinism are erroneous, and its application to the human evolution of this world period altogether misleading. It is needless to say that I was not furnished with the later teaching on this subject when *Esoteric Buddhism* was written, therefore of course my own impression at the time was that the doctrine supported the Darwinian hypothesis, as a general idea. I never heard a word breathed in India, when writing *Esoteric Buddhism*, to the contrary effect.†

Nor was the point worth raising then. My readers had to be made acquainted with the primary principles of Karma, reincarnation and cosmic progress towards superior conditions of existence. All the cosmo-genesis that was essential to the comprehension of these principles was supplied in the teaching as given. Much was left for further development, for later opportunities. The first book of Euclid cannot also contain the second, third and fourth. In *The Secret Doctrine* I have no doubt we are furnished with esoteric teaching, which is the analogue of the more advanced geometry. Probably it will be least appreciated by those who read its opening pages as warning them off the subject of triangles.

Yours very respectfully,
A. P. SINNETT.

* What did Darwin, or what Darwinians know of our esoteric teaching about “Rounds”? The “Spirit” of the Darwinian idea, is an *Irish bull*, in this case, as that “Spirit” is materialism of the grossest kind.—[ED.]

† The reason for this also is stated in *The Secret Doctrine*.

OUR CLOSING REMARK

We thank Mr. Sinnett, with all our heart, for this letter. Better late than never. On page 186 of Vol. I of our *Secret Doctrine*, now just published, we quote from a letter of a member of the T. S., who wrote: "I suppose you realize that three-fourths of Theosophists and even outsiders imagine that, as far as the evolution of man is concerned, Darwinism and Theosophy kiss one another" in *Esoteric Buddhism*. We repudiate the idea most vehemently on the same page, but our negation would not go

very far without that of Mr. Sinnett. The letter containing the above quoted sentence was written more than two and a half years ago; and our denial, notwithstanding the same charge of Darwinism and materialism in *Esoteric Buddhism*, was maintained by the same writer and supported by many others. Thus it was indispensable for the good of the Cause that Mr. Sinnett should deny it over his own signature. Our object is accomplished, for the author of *Esoteric Buddhism* has now solemnly repudiated the charge, and we hope to receive no more such flings at our philosophical beliefs.

We close by thanking our esteemed correspondent once more for the indulgent spirit in which he deals with our remarks, but which, to our regret, he very erroneously attributes to a personal feeling due to some unwarrantable change in our attitude towards himself. We repudiate such a charge, and hope that our explanations will dissipate the last vestiges of any such suspicion.—[ED.]

***Collected Writings* VOLUME X**
November, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 15, November, 1888, p. 255]

[Regarding Tookaram Tatya, head of the Theosophical Publication Fund at Bombay]
The most active and indefatigable of all our Bombay Theosophists in the spread of Sanskrit and theosophical literature. The good he does to the poor and the distressed, in his Homoeopathic *Free* Dispensaries—they, the sufferers, alone know. May he be rewarded as he deserves.

Collected Writings VOLUME X
November, 1888

CASTING OFF

189

CASTING OFF

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 15, November, 1888, pp. 256-57]

If King Henry VIII, the much-married king of England, stopped in some of his proceedings for divorce, or at least was stopped by the ecclesiastical authorities at the first of his acts, and was warned by them that his divorce with Catherine of Aragon was contrary to the laws of God, and could hardly be made by any sort of *modus vivendi* to fit in with the laws of men, King Milan of Servia has certainly sent in a greater amount of tickets to entitle him to a final "distribution of gifts."

I wish that some authority from the Editorial chair of *Lucifer* would tell me whether the recent action of King Milan of Servia will not entail upon him a *Karma*, a never-ending penalty of remorse, shame, and future sorrow, for the cruel and unjustifiable act which he has committed by the divorce of his Queen Nathalie.

I would like to know whether the Russian Christian Church, as well as the West, considers marriage as a thing which may not be cast aside by the decision of a civil tribunal. Your own creed of the Russian Church appears to my unassisted intellect to be emphatic, pronounced, and unchanging.

I quote from the creed of the Russian Church:—

"!N' ÓD@< .T-I "ÛJä< ,ÆI 6V2" 64<*L<@<, *¥< |>"N|<TJ"4
Ö ¢<"! Î< -88@< àFJ,D@< *¥ \$,"4f<,J"4"

"Ad finem usque vitae, quocunque rerum discrimine, constanter servaturus, nec alter alterum deserturus sit." ("The Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church, A. D. 1643," in P. Schaff, *A History of the Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols., 8vo. London, 1877; Vol. II, p. 393.)

I may also state that there is not a single Latin priest who would dare to contravene the commands of his church by pronouncing a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* in a case like that of King Milan. They are much too careful of the words "Whom God has joined together, let no man put asunder." Surely the Russian Church has the same pure tradition. If the old Patriarchs of Constantinople could speak, their voices would be emphatic to declare that the sacramental ties of marriage are eternal and indissoluble, and that their authority has been decreed by the oracular and changeless fiat of everlasting veracity.

Some of the inferior Jew papers in London have recently had letters on the subject "Is Marriage a Failure?" But they have in this respect often confused the civil and religious ties. In the marriage of King Milan we have both. He may be civilly allowed to emulate King Solomon, but religiously he has only one wife, from whom he *is* now divorced.

Let us now consider the matter. The world, at the end of the present century, and approaching its descending cycle, gradually becomes worse and worse as artificial civilization progresses, and moral improvement diminishes. We see this in the tendency for facilitating divorce, either in Servia or in England, the less attention paid to individual aspirations after holiness, and the probability that the next generation will

be a great deal worse than the present. We live in a time when the words of Horace,

Aetas parentum, peior avis, tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos
Progeniem vitiosiorum,*

are deeply applicable to us, and those who are born of us, and then the action of men like King Milan is only a forecast of the future, when the coming race "*Sans Dieu, sans foi, sans loi*" shall preach "the principles of 1789," "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." Liberty, each to select his own punishment; Equality, before the throne of some self-invoked infernal power; Fraternity, such as was that of Cain towards Abel.

Still, for those who do not contemplate decay on a large scale, it is hard to perceive individual instances of blasphemy and immorality, and harder that they should have the sanction of any religious body.

The old feeling of chivalry in the West makes me inclined to break a lance for the divorced Queen of Servia, and by advocating her strive

"For the cause that lacks assistance,
From the wrong that needs resistance,
To the future in the distance,
And the good that we can do."

C. CARTER BLAKE.

EDITOR'S NOTE

There is no "authority" on ecclesiastical law in the "editorial chair of *Lucifer*." The present editor recognizes no such laws, rejects and cares very little about

* [Horace, *Odes*, Book III, vi, 45-48; the first line being: *damnosa quid non imminuit dies?* In English: "What do the ravages of time not injure? Our parents' age, worse than our grandsires', has brought forth us less worthy and destined soon to yield an offspring still more wicked."—*Compiler*.]

them. But there are laws of honour, and honour—"stands at another bar than that of laws," whether social or ecclesiastical. And there is a woman in the said editorial chair, whose whole being revolts against such an infamous act of despotism and injustice as perpetrated by Milan of Servia, he who claims to reign "by the grace of God" and sticks fast to his throne only by the abject cowardice of his subjects. Of crowned despots, sots and even snobs, there were many, but hitherto even they had tried to preserve an *appearance*, at least, of honour. In our modern day, however, it becomes a matter for serious consideration, whether honour is ever to *be found, to a dead certainty, at home*—anywhere, except perchance among thieves! We live in a strange world of incongruity and paradox. When one knows that upon discovering a *sharper* in their midst,

even the members of the poorest club would not fail to kick him out, one can only stare in finding all the modern sovereigns, great or small, remaining undisturbed and quite unconcerned before the perpetration of the most brutal act of licentiousness and abuse of power *by one of their own* fraternity. That Milan, the lineal descendant of swineherds is *no* gentleman—though his late uncle Michael Obrenovitch was decidedly one—is no wonder. But that other Kings and Emperors, some of whom boast of a long lineage of knightly ancestors and "kings *gentiluomini*"—should allow such an unprecedented outrage upon a woman, a Queen, innocent and pure as few, go unpunished—is most marvellous—even in this age of depravity, and Crowns sold at auction.


“O, that estates, degrees, and offices,
Were not derived corruptly! and that dear honour
Were purchased by the merit of the wearer!”

But, since the day of Solon, to paraphrase him: “Honours created far exceed those that are achieved.”

To the second question of our correspondent, we answer—“most decidedly, the Greek Church would countenance and permit no such breaking of her laws. Nor shall the St. Petersburg *Metropolitan* or his Synod

ever recognize the act of the Servian Theodosius; who is officially branded by that Synod, hence by the press, as the “*pseudo*-Metropolitan.” The orthodox Greek Church is greater than Milan, “King” of a kingdom from an *opéra comique*. But what of that? Russia does not recognize Ferdinand of Coburg; yet the Austrian usurpator rules to this day over Bulgaria, the land of Brigands and Generals Boum-boum. The Synod of Russia is not what it was only thirty years ago, when no divorce could be obtained on any consideration, and divorce plans were smashed against the Synodical rock even when backed up by the Imperial will and protection. Now things have changed. One can obtain a divorce in Russia as easily as in the United States. Russia is getting *civilized*, you see. The government may protect and defend Queen Nathalie, but Russia will not go to war to punish a—Milan. Yet the religious feeling is strong both in Russia and Servia. . . .

It remains to be seen what the Servians will do. Ah, *now* is a fine and easy-going time for the Milans and—“Jack the Rippers.”



FACIMILE OF DOCUMENT APPOINTING WILLIAM
QUAN JUDGE SOLE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ESOTERIC
SECTRION IN AMERICA

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
December, 1888

THE ESOTERIC SECTION AND WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE

195

**[THE ESOTERIC SECTION AND WILLIAM
QUAN JUDGE]**

[The document reproduced in facsimile on the opposite page is in the Archives of the former Point Loma Theosophical Society, and was published in *The Theosophical Forum*, Vol. XXV, No. 12, December, 1947. Its text, without facsimile, was originally published in an undated E. S. T. Circular, issued almost immediately after May 27, 1891, the date on which a full meeting of the E. S. Council, appointed by H. P. B., was held at the Headquarters of the Theosophical Society in Europe, 19, Avenue Road, London, England, following H.P.B.'s passing.—*Compiler.*]

KNOW

DARE

[SEAL]

WILL

SILENCE

Esoteric [TS] Section

*As Head of the Esoteric Section of the Theosophical Society I hereby declare that William Q. Judge of New York, U.S., in virtue of his character as a chela of thirteen years standing and of the trust and confidence reposed in him, is my only representative for said Section in America and he is the sole channel through whom will be sent and received all communications between the members of said Section and myself, and to him full faith, confidence and credit in that regard are to be given. * * * Done at London this fourteenth day of December, 1888, and in the fourteenth year of the Theosophical Society. * * **

H. P. BLAVATSKY:•

[Seal]

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
December, 1888

196

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

IS DENUNCIATION A DUTY?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 16, December, 1888, pp. 265-273]

“Condemn no man in his absence; and when forced to reprove, do so to his face, but gently, and in words full of charity and compassion. For the human heart is like the Kusūli plant: it opens its cup to the sweet morning dew, and closes it before a heavy shower of rain.”

—BUDDHIST PRECEPT.

“Judge not, that ye be not judged.”

—CHRISTIAN APHORISM.

Not a few of our most earnest Theosophists feel themselves, we are sorry to hear, between the horns of a dilemma. Small causes will at times produce great results. There are those who would jest under the cruelest operation, and remain cool while having a leg amputated, who would yet raise a storm and renounce their rightful place in the kingdom of Heaven if, to preserve it, they had to keep silent when somebody treads on their corns.

In the 13th number of *Lucifer* (Vol. III September, page 63), a paper on “The Meaning of a Pledge” was published. Out of the seven articles (six only were given out) which constitute the entire Pledge, the 1st, 4th, 5th, and especially the 6th, require great moral strength of character, an iron will added to much unselfishness, quick readiness for renunciation and even self-sacrifice, to carry out such a covenant. Yet scores of Theosophists have cheerfully signed this solemn “Promise” to work for the good of Humanity forgetful of Self, without one word of protest—save on one point. Strange to say, it is rule the third which in almost every case makes the applicant hesitate and show the white feather. *Ante tubam trepidat*: the best and kindest of them feels alarmed; and he is as overawed before the blast of the trumpet of that third clause, as though he dreaded for himself the fate of the walls of Jericho!

IS DENUNCIATION A DUTY?

197

What is then this *terrible* pledge, to carry out which seems to be above the strength of the average mortal? Simply this:—

“I PLEDGE MYSELF NEVER TO LISTEN WITHOUT PROTEST TO ANY EVIL THING SPOKEN OF A BROTHER THEOSOPHIST, AND TO ABSTAIN FROM CONDEMNING OTHERS.”

To practise this golden rule seems quite easy. To listen without protest to evil said of *any one* is an action which has been despised ever since the remotest days of Paganism.

“To hear an open slander is a curse,
But not to find an answer is a worse,” . . .*

says Ovid. For one thing, perhaps, as pointedly remarked by Juvenal, because:

“Slander, that worst of poisons, ever finds
An easy entrance *to ignoble minds* . . .” †

—and because *in antiquity*, few liked to pass for such—minds. But now!

In fact, the duty of defending a fellow-man stung by a poisonous tongue during his absence, and to abstain, in general, "from condemning others" is the very life and soul of practical theosophy, for such action is the handmaiden who conducts one into the narrow Path of the “higher life,” that life which leads to the goal we all crave to attain. Mercy, Charity and Hope are the three goddesses who preside over that “life.” To “abstain” from condemning our fellow beings is the tacit assertion of the presence in us of the three divine

* [Not identified in Ovid’s works.—*Comp.*]

† [This passage is probably a rendering of Juvenal’s *Satires*, XIV, 173-76: “inde fere scelerum causae, nec plura venena miscuit aut ferro grassatur saepius ullum humanae mentis vitium quam saeva cupido inmodici census.”—*Compiler.*]

Sisters; to condemn on “hearsay” shows their absence. “Listen not to a tale bearer or slanderer,” says Socrates. “For, as he discovereth of the secrets of others, so he will thine in turn.” Nor is it difficult to avoid slander-mongers. Where there is no demand, supply will very soon cease. “When people refrain from *evil-hearing*, then evil speakers will refrain from evil-talking,” says a proverb. To condemn is to glorify oneself over the man one condemns. Pharisees of every nation have been constantly doing it since the evolution of intolerant religions. Shall we do as they?

We may be told, perhaps, that we ourselves are the first to break the ethical law we are upholding. That our theosophical periodicals are full of “denunciations,” and *Lucifer* lowers his torch to throw light on every evil, to the best of his ability. We reply—this is quite another thing. We denounce indignantly systems and organisations, evils, social and religious—*cant* above all: we abstain from denouncing persons. The latter are the children

of their century, the victims of their environment and of the Spirit of the Age. To condemn and dishonour a man instead of pitying and trying to help him, because, being born in a community of lepers he is a leper himself, is like cursing a room because it is dark, instead of quietly lighting a candle to disperse the gloom. “Ill deeds are doubled with an evil word”; nor can a general evil be avoided or removed by doing evil oneself and choosing a scape-goat for the atonement of the sins of a whole community. Hence, we denounce these communities, not their units; we point out the rottenness of our boasted civilisation, indicate the pernicious systems of education which lead to it, and show the fatal effects of these on the masses. Nor are we more partial to ourselves. Ready to lay down our life any day for THEOSOPHY—that great cause of the Universal Brotherhood for which we live and breathe—and willing to shield, if need be, every true theosophist with our own body, we yet denounce as openly and as virulently the distortion of the original lines upon which the Theosophical Society was primarily built, and the gradual

loosening and undermining of the original system by the sophistry of many of its highest officers. We bear our Karma for our lack of humility during the early days of the Theosophical Society; for our favourite aphorism: “See, how these Christians love each other” has now to be paraphrased daily, and almost hourly, into: “Behold, how our Theosophists love each other.” And we tremble at the thought that, unless many of our ways and customs, in the Theosophical Society at large, are amended or done away with, *Lucifer* will one day have to expose many a blot on our own escutcheon—*e.g.*, worship of Self, uncharitableness, and sacrificing to one’s personal vanity the welfare of other Theosophists—more “fiercely” than it has ever denounced the various shams and abuses of power in state Churches and Modern Society.

Nevertheless, there are theosophists, who forgetting the beam in their own eye, seriously believe it their duty to denounce every mote they perceive in the eye of their neighbour. Thus, one of our most estimable, hardworking, and noble-minded members writes, with regard to the said 3rd clause:—

The “Pledge” binds the taker never to speak evil of anyone But I believe that there are occasions when severe denunciation is a duty to truth. There are cases of treachery, falsehood, rascality in private life which should be denounced by those who are certain of them; and there are cases in public life of venality and debasement which good citizens are bound to lash unsparingly. Theosophic culture would not be a boon to the world if it enforced unmanliness weakness, flabbiness of moral texture. . . .

We are sincerely sorry to find a most worthy brother holding such mistaken views. First of all, poor is that theosophic culture which fails to transform simply a “good citizen” of his own native country into a “good citizen” of the world. A true theosophist must be a cosmopolitan in his heart. He must embrace mankind, the whole of humanity in his philanthropic feelings. It is higher and far nobler to be one of those who love their fellow men, without distinction of race, creed, caste or colour, than to be merely a good patriot, or

still less, a

partisan. To mete one measure for all, is holier and more divine than to help one's country in its private ambition of aggrandizement, strife or bloody wars in the name of GREEDINESS and SELFISHNESS. Severe denunciation is a duty to truth." It is; on condition, however, that one should denounce and fight against the *root* of evil and not expend one's fury by knocking down the irresponsible blossoms of its plant. The wise horticulturist uproots the parasitic herbs, and will hardly lose time in using his garden shears to cut off the heads of the poisonous weeds. If a theosophist happens to be a public officer, a judge or magistrate, a barrister or even a preacher, it is then, of course his duty to his country, his conscience and those who put their trust in him, to "denounce severely" every case of "treachery, falsehood and rascality" *even* in private life; but—*nota bene*—only if he is appealed to and called to exercise his legal authority, not otherwise. This is neither "speaking evil" nor "condemning," but truly working for humanity; seeking to preserve society, which is a portion of it, from being imposed upon, and protecting the property of the citizens entrusted to their care as public officers, from being recklessly taken away. But even then the theosophist may assert himself in the magistrate, and show his mercy by repeating after Shakespeare's severe judge: "I show it most of all when I show justice."

But what has a "working" member of the Theosophical Society independent of any public function or office, and who is neither judge, public prosecutor nor preacher, to do with the misdeeds of his neighbours? If a member of the T.S. is found guilty of one of the above enumerated or some still worse crime, and if another member becomes possessed of irrefutable evidence to that effect, it may become his painful duty to bring the same under the notice of the Council of his Branch. Our Society has to be protected, as also its numerous members. This, again, would only be simple justice. A natural and truthful statement of facts cannot be regarded as "evil speaking" or as a condemnation of one's brother.

Between this, however, and deliberate backbiting there is a wide chasm. Clause 3 concerns only those who being in no way responsible for their neighbour's actions or walk in life, will yet judge and condemn them on every opportunity. And in such case it becomes—"slander" and "evil speaking."

This is how we understand the clause in question; nor do we believe that by enforcing it "theosophic culture" enforces "unmanliness, weakness or flabbiness of moral texture," but the reverse. True courage has naught to do, we trust, with denunciation; and there is

little manliness in criticizing and condemning one's fellow men behind their backs, whether for wrongs done to others or injury to ourselves. Shall we regard the unparalleled virtues inculcated by Gautama the Buddha, or the Jesus of the Gospels as "unmanliness"? Then the ethics preached by the former, that *moral code* which Professor Max Muller, Burnouf and even Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire have unanimously pronounced *the most perfect which the world has ever known*, must be no better than meaningless words, and the Sermon on the Mount had better never have been written at all. Does our correspondent regard the teaching of non-resistance to evil, kindness to all creatures, and the sacrifice of one's own self for the good of others as weakness or unmanliness? Are the commands, "Judge not that ye be not judged," and, "Put up again thy sword . . . for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword," to be viewed as "flabbiness of moral texture" or as *the voice of Karma*?

But our correspondent is not alone in his way of thinking. Many are the men and women, good, charitable, self-sacrificing and trustworthy in every other respect, and who accept unhesitatingly every other clause of the "Pledge," who feel uneasy and almost tremble before this special article. But why? The answer is easy: simply *because they fear an unconscious* (to them), *almost unavoidable PERJURY*.

The moral of the fable and its conclusion are suggestive. It is a direct blow in the face of Christian

education and our civilized modern society in all its circles and in every *Christian* land. So deep has this moral cancer—the habit of speaking uncharitably of our neighbour and brother at every opportunity—eaten into the heart of all the classes of Society, from the lowest to the very highest, that it has led the best of its members to feel diffident of their tongues! They *dare not trust themselves* to abstain from condemning others—from mere force of habit. This is quite an ominous "sign of the times."

Indeed, most of us, of whatever nationality, are born and brought up in a thick atmosphere of gossip, uncharitable criticism and wholesale condemnation. Our education in this direction begins in the nursery, where the head nurse hates the governess, the latter hates the mistress, and the servants, regardless of the presence of "baby" and the children grumble incessantly against the masters, find fault with each other, and pass impudent remarks on every visitor. The same training follows us in the class room, whether at home or at a public school. It reaches its apex of ethical development during the years of our education and practical religious instruction. We are soaked through and through with the conviction that, though ourselves "born in sin and total depravity," our religion is the only one to save us from eternal damnation, while the rest of mankind is predestined from the depths of eternity to inextinguishable hell-fires. We are taught that slander of every other people's Gods and religion is a sign of reverence for our own idols, and is a meritorious action. The "Lord God," himself, the "*personal Absolute*," is impressed upon our young plastic minds as ever backbiting and condemning those he created, as cursing the

stiff-necked Jew and *tempting* the Gentile.

For years the minds of young Protestants are periodically enriched with the choicest curses from the *Commination* service in their prayer-books, or the “denouncing of God’s anger and judgments against sinners,” besides eternal condemnation for most creatures; and from his birth the young Roman Catholic constantly hears threats

of curse and excommunication by his Church. It is in the Bible and Church of England prayer-books that boys and girls of all classes learn of the existence of vices, the mention of which, in the works of Zola, falls under the ban of law as immoral and depraving, but to the enumeration and the *cursing* of which in the Churches, young and old are made to say “Amen,” after the minister of the meek and humble Jesus. The latter says, swear *not*, curse *not*, condemn *not*, but “love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate and persecute you.” But the canon of the church and the clergyman tell them: Not at all. There are crimes and vices “for which ye affirm with your own mouths the curse of God to be due.” (*Vide* “Commination Service.”) What wonder that later in life, Christians piously try to emulate “God” and the priest, since their ears are still ringing with, “*Cursed be he* that removeth his neighbour’s landmark,” and “Cursed be he” who does this, that or the other, even “he that putteth his trust in man” (!), and with “God’s” judgment and condemnations. They judge and condemn right and left, indulging in wholesale slander and “comminating” on their own account. Do they forget that in the last curse—the *anathema* against adulterers and drunkards, idolaters and extortionists—“the UNMERCIFUL and SLANDERERS” are included? And that by having joined in the solemn “amen” after this last *Christian* thunderbolt, *they have affirmed* “with their own mouths the curse of God to be due” on their own sinful heads?

But this seems to trouble our society slanderers very little. For no sooner are the religiously brought up children of church-going people off their school benches, than they are taken in hand by those who preceded them. Coached for their final examination in that school for scandal, called the world, by older and more experienced tongues, to pass Master of Arts in the science of cant and commination, a respectable member of society has but to join a religious congregation: to become a church-warden or lady patroness.

Who shall dare deny that in our age, modern society in its general aspect has become a vast arena for such moral murders, performed between two cups of five o’clock tea and amid merry jests and laughter? Society is now more than ever a kind of international shambles wherein, under the waving banners of drawing-room and church Christianity and

the cultured tittle-tattle of the world, each becomes in turn as soon as his back is turned, the sacrificial victim, the sin-offering for atonement, whose singed flesh smells savour in the nostrils of Mrs. Grundy. Let us pray, brethren, and render thanks to the God of Abraham and of Isaac that we no longer live in the days of cruel Nero. And, oh! let us feel grateful that we no longer live in danger of being ushered into the arena of the Colosseum, to die there a comparatively quick death under the claws of the hungry wild beasts! It is the boast of Christianity that our ways and customs have been wonderfully softened under the beneficent shadow of the Cross. Yet we have but to step into a modern drawing-room to find a symbolical representation, true to life, of the same wild beasts feasting on, and gloating over, the mangled carcasses of their best friends. Look at those graceful and as ferocious great cats, who with sweet smiles and an innocent eye sharpen their rose-coloured claws preparatory to playing at mouse and cat. Woe to the poor mouse fastened upon by those proud *Society felidae*! The mouse will be made to bleed for years before being permitted to bleed to death. The victims will have to undergo unheard-of moral martyrdom, to learn through papers *and friends* that they have been guilty at one or another time of life of each and all the vices and crimes enumerated in the Communion Service, until, to avoid further persecution, the said mice themselves turn into ferocious society cats, and make other mice tremble in their turn. Which of the two arenas is preferable, my brethren—that of the old pagan or that of Christian lands?

Addison had not words of contempt sufficiently strong to rebuke this Society gossip of the worldly Cains of both sexes.

IS DENUNCIATION A DUTY?

205

How frequently [he exclaims] is the honesty and integrity of a man disposed of by a smile or a shrug? How many good and generous actions have been sunk into oblivion by a distrustful look, or stamped with the imputation of proceeding from bad motives, by a mysterious and seasonable whisper. Look. . . how large a portion of chastity is sent out of the world by distant hints—nodded away, and cruelly winked into suspicion by the envy of those who are past all temptation of it themselves. How often does the reputation of a helpless creature bleed by a report—which the party who is at the pains to propagate it beholds with much pity and fellow-feeling—that she is heartily sorry for it—hopes in God it is not true!

From Addison we pass to Sterne's treatment of the same subject. He seems to continue this picture by saying:

So fruitful is slander in variety of expedients to satiate as well as to disguise itself, that if those smother weapons cut so sore, what shall we say of open and unblushing scandal, subjected to no caution, tied down to no restraints? If the one like an arrow shot in the dark does, nevertheless, so much secret mischief, this, like pestilence, which rages at noonday, sweeps all before it, levelling without distinction the good and the bad; a thousand fall beside it, and ten thousand on its right hand; they fall, so rent and torn in this tender part of them, so unmercifully butchered, as sometimes never to recover either the wounds or the anguish of heart which they have occasioned.

Such are the results of slander, and from the standpoint of Karma, many such cases *amount to more than murder in hot blood*. Therefore, those who want to lead the "higher

life” among the “*working* Fellows,” of the Theosophical Society, must bind themselves by this solemn pledge, or, remain *droning* members. It is not to the latter that these pages are addressed, nor would they feel interested in that question, nor is it an advice offered to the F.’s T.S. at large. For the “Pledge” under discussion is taken only by those Fellows who begin to be referred in our circles of “Lodges” as the “working” members of the T.S. All others, that is to say those Fellows who prefer to remain ornamental, and belong to the “mutual admiration” groups; or those

who, having joined out of mere curiosity, have, without severing their connexion with the Society, quietly dropped off; or those, again, who have preserved only a skin-deep interest (if any), a luke-warm sympathy for the movement—and such constitute the majority in England—need burden themselves with no such pledge. Having been for years the “Greek Chorus” in the busy drama enacted, now known as the Theosophical Society, they prefer remaining as they are. The “chorus,” considering its numbers, has only, as in the past, to look on at what takes place in the action of the *dramatis personae* and it is only required to express occasionally its sentiments by repeating the closing gems from the monologues of the actors, or remain silent—at their option. “Philosophers of a day,” as Carlyle calls them, they neither desire, nor are they desired “to apply.” Therefore, even were these lines to meet their eye, they are respectfully begged to remember that what is said does not refer to either of the above enumerated classes of Fellows. Most of them have joined the Society as they would have bought a guinea book. Attracted by the novelty of the binding, they opened it; and, after glancing over contents and title, motto and dedication, they have put it away on a back shelf, and thought of it no more. They have a right to the volume, by virtue of their purchase, but would refer to it no more than they would to an antiquated piece of furniture relegated to the lumber-room, because the seat of it is not comfortable enough, or is out of proportion with their moral and intellectual size. A hundred to one these members will not even see *Lucifer*, for it has now become a matter of theosophical statistics, that *more than two thirds* of its subscribers are non-theosophists. Nor are the elder brothers of *Lucifer*—the Madras *Theosophist*, the New York *Path*, the French *Le Lotus*, nor even the marvellously cheap and international “T. P. S.” (of 7, Duke Street, Adelphi), any luckier than we are. Like all prophets, they are not without honour, save in their own countries, and their voices in the fields of Theosophy are truly “the voice of one crying in the wilderness.” This is no exaggeration. Among the

respective subscribers of those various Theosophical periodicals, the members of the T.S.,

whose organs they are, and for whose sole benefit they were started (their editors, managers, and the whole staff of constant contributors working *gratis*, and paying furthermore out of their own generally meagre pockets, printers, publishers and occasional contributors), are on the average 15 *per cent*. This is also a sign of the times, and shows the difference between the “working” and the “resting” theosophists.

We must not close without once more addressing the former. Who of these will undertake to maintain that clause 3 is not a fundamental principle of the code of ethics which ought to guide every theosophist aspiring *to become one in reality*? For such a large body of men and women, composed of the most heterogeneous nationalities, characters, creeds and ways of thinking, furnishing for this very reason such easy pretexts for disputes and strife, ought not this clause to become part and parcel of the obligation of each member—working or ornamental—who joins the Theosophical movement? We think so, and leave it to the future consideration of the representatives of the General Council, who meet at the next anniversary at Adyar. In a Society with pretensions to an exalted system of ethics—the essence of all previous ethical codes—which confesses openly its aspirations to emulate and put to shame by its practical example and ways of living the followers of every religion, such a pledge constitutes the *sine qua non* of the success of that Society. In a gathering where “near the noisome nettle blooms the rose,” and where fierce thorns are more plentiful than sweet blossoms, a pledge of such a nature is *the sole salvation*. No Ethics as a science of mutual duties—whether social, religious or philosophical—*from man to man*, can be called complete or consistent unless such a rule is enforced. Not only this, but if we would not have our Society become *de facto* and *de jure* a gigantic sham parading under its banner of “Universal Brotherhood”—we ought to follow every time the breaking of this *law of laws*, by the expulsion of the

slanderer. No honest man, still less a theosophist, can disregard these lines of Horace:

“He that shall rail against his absent friends,
Or hears them scandalised, and not defends
Tells tales, and brings his friend in disesteem;
That man’s a KNAVE—be sure beware of him.” *

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
December, 1888

THE DIRGE FOR THE DEAD IN LIFE

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 16, December, 1888, pp. 301-303]

The fragments that we publish below form one of the most remarkable instances of so-called automatic writing when the medium, without any previous knowledge of the subject, is impelled to set down upon the paper that which is not in the brain. The medium here is a young lady who knows nothing about this dirge, but we know that it is a portion of the chant which was sung over the entranced body of the neophyte who was about to become an initiate. The original was found in Egypt among the wrappings of a mummy by the grandfather of a gentleman, a Mason, from whom we got it. Although Egyptologists may have seen the fragment, we are certain that the young lady who wrote down the verses had never heard of it before and was much puzzled by the verses, if not by the signature of "Sepher" given to her. Spiritualists may say it is something from the "spirits," but we hold the view that it is a reminiscence from past incarnations of the one who wrote. These recollections are not so rare as is supposed, and while frequently they are not recognised as such, they nevertheless account for many strange things heard at séances with mediums and psycho

* [*Satires*, I, iv, 81-85, the Latin text being as follows:

“. . . absentem qui rodit amicum,
qui non defendet alio culpante, solutos
qui captat risus hominum famamque dicacis,
fingere qui non visa potest, commissa facere
qui nequit: hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto.”

—*Compiler.*]

THE DIRGE FOR THE DEAD IN LIFE

209

graphic writers, as we were told it was only in the days of Ptolemy that this dirge began to be chanted over the really dead or the mummy.—*Ed.**

KHIOS XXI

Bind up thy head and numb thy limbs, for hence cometh wondrous tidings for him who hath the ear open in the sepulchre.

Drink in of the honied words, and mix them with precision to mingle the bitter with the

sweet.

Turn thine heart from all outer knowledge and hold thyself open for the knowledge of the spheres.

Now take quickly the pegs from the tents and let them fall in, for the mighty simoom is nigh at hand.

Art thou ready, pale mortal? Is thy head bandaged and thy blood inert, and hast thou parted with thy blood?

Art thou laid down eastward, and is thy inner ear listening for the music of the voice of the spheres?

Listen, pale mortal.

The voice is commencing to emit sound, and the turn of the tide is swiftly ebbing away.

Pale mortal, lying so like an image of Phineus,† wherefore art thou disquieted? The glitter of chariots will not reach those dazed eyes.

The sound of the battle-axe will not penetrate thy skull.

Now listen to the voice; thou art gone from hence, pale mortal, and the earth knows thee no more.

Thy bandaged head lies on the death stretcher and thy bloodless body is full of sweet-smelling myrrh.

* [As appears from H.P.B.'s explanation in the article "The Dirge for the Dead," which immediately follows the present one, the last two lines of this Editorial Note are faulty, due to a printer's error. The second footnote of the next article explains what was the real meaning intended to be conveyed.—*Compiler*.]

† Phineus, the King of Thrace, who became blind for attempting to see into futurity *without being duly initiated*, and who was killed by Hercules. An allusion to the closed eyes of the entranced seer, or the mummy.—*Ed*.

Thou art a shade, blessed soul!

Thou art a shadowy vapour, pale face!

Thou art a bird of paradise, free soul!

Listen! dost thou hear the freedom of the wind? Thou art no longer on thine earth.

Those groans, pale face, they proceed from the land thou hast quitted.

That burning heat, poor wanderer, that is the desert thou hast passed through.

Now quickly proceed. No more time, poor dove, mayst thou linger, the burning ring is thy resting step.

See thou the circle, it burns with the seared light of a captive fire god!

Quickly step, pale face, and place thyself in the ring of fire.

Now in the ring, does not the past stand out like a sheeted fury?
Dost thou behold the list of evil committed?
Listen! those echoes are the battle shouts, and those shrieking, harsh voices are thine own saved against thee.
Writhe now, poor soul; alas! thou must suffer.
See now the time has passed, and thou art lifted from thy ring of suffering.
Whence comes this change? Thy shadow has gained intensity, and thy form person.
Now take this key, terror stricken dove, and unlock that vast chest.
Why tremble? Those bodies are but the victims which thou hast sacrificed to thy evil lusts.
Those ghastly white, staring skulls thou hast slain with thine own hand.
Oh! those terrible bruised hearts are only those upon whom thou hast trodden.
Blench not, those maimed bodies are thy handiwork.
Oh! pale face, take brave hold. Thou hast gloried over these deeds—why shudder now?
Life taken is life left.

THE DIRGE FOR THE DEAD IN LIFE

211

Slain souls wait in Paradise. (In the *field of Aarzo* in the original.)
Long lost hearts burn in the oil of the lamp of the king.
Hopeless maimed ones rest in the water queen's bosom.
Remember not to forget, but forget to remember.
There now, poor tired one, one more ordeal, one more flame-searching trial.
Jump quickly into the water, mark you its cool, delicate waving; why dost thou shrink? Art thou not hot and weary? It will refresh thee.
Now the time is past. Thou must jump. Days are passing, moments fleeting; jump thou, believe, jump.
There, come up now, and rest in this green grass.
Was it very terrible? Did the water burn thy very life?
Ah! so burned thou the life of others.
Pass, pass, pass !

KHIOS XXIII

Thou art free, see thou how beautiful are thy limbs.
Feel now how perfect is thy health.
Come away to the fire king, thy sufferings are passed.
Thou hast been tormented for a thousand and one years.
Hasten thou, no longer sorrowful wanderer, but bird of Paradise.
Fight no more, thou hast won Elysia.

Weep! Ah! thou canst not, thou hast no fount of tears.
Still thee now, still thee!
See, I bring thee onwards.
Seest thou not that thou art glorified!
See far, far agone, behind time, thy poor body.
See the bandaged head and the bloodless body, see the stuffed carcass. Oh, laugh,
laugh, laugh.
That was once thy dwelling-place.
Now come quickly, for we pass to the absorption; wait not, tarry not, linger not.
Oh! beautiful, moon-faced angel!
Oh! brilliant and happy soul!

Hark thou to the tinkle of those silver bells, they are the fire king's thoughts.
Listen to the convulsions of the atoms; the demons tremble.
Listen to the beautiful songs; they are the Gunlas.
Oh, happy soul, soon must we part, for I must return to the ferry, for I must ferry souls
across.
I cannot enter where thou canst enter, beautiful Bird of Paradise; tell the Fire King
when thou see'st him in his beauty that I languish to join him.
Now, good-bye, Brilliant-Bird, soar above, thou art free as air.
Thou art as a snowflake carried on the rosy pinions of the morn.
Thou art as the lovely wind that cooleth the hot earth.
Fare thee well, free dove, fare thee well; enter that golden glory and pass for ever into
the Fire King.
Gunla, Gunla, Gunla. . . .

SEPHER.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
December, 1888

THE DIRGE FOR THE DEAD

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 18, February, 1889, pp. 526-528] *

The interesting and highly-suggestive specimen of automatic writing that appeared in the December number of *Lucifer* is not a little remarkable in itself, but, pardon my saying, the theory put forward by you in explanation is very far from being satisfactory to the enquiring mind.† As to the dirge, I doubt if it be known to Egyptologists; it forms no portion of the *Book of the Dead*; there

* [This article is published here, out of its actual chronological sequence, because of its direct bearing upon the one that precedes it. The footnotes are by H. P. B.—*Compiler*.]

† No doubt it is not satisfactory to the Spiritualists, not any more than the doctrine of Purgatory or any other Roman Catholic tenet is satisfactory to the Protestant Predestinarian.—[ED.]

THE DIRGE FOR THE DEAD

213

is no copy among the papyri of the British Museum; and its appearance on the mummy of the Ptolemaic period is probably exceptional.* But my interest in the subject centres in your explanation that the communication in question is a reminiscence of past incarnations, presumably of the higher Ego of the writer. This theory of the Theosophist stands opposed to the hypothesis of the Spiritualist, who maintains such communications to be what they profess to be, viz., revelations by an independent, super-mundane intelligence, given through the medium of another organisation. From the standpoint you occupy, and the superior knowledge you possess, your explanation may, for aught I know to the contrary, be the true one, but permit me to say, you have not succeeded in making

* The Editor has premised by saying in the introductory note (which, by-the-bye, was mangled out of recognition by some printer's mistake, who dropped out two whole lines) that some Egyptologists *may* have seen it, but never said they did. Of course, it is not in the *Book of the Dead*. Still, the Editor has seen it, and copied its translation in French and in English; and what is more, the *dirge* (a name given to the writing by the editor) is absolutely identical in spirit and form with other such dirges. These were chanted, ages ago, first during the Mysteries, over the apparently lifeless and entranced bodies of the *mystae* who were made *Epoptai*—*i.e.*, passing through the trial of their last initiation, when they became the “Dead in life,” and later over the really dead—the mummies. It is this explanation, given in the two lines, which were omitted, or dropped out in printing, which

thus disfigured the whole sense of the sentence; and putting a comma after “psychographic writers” followed only by the tail end of the above explanation, namely—”as we were told it was only in the days of Ptolemy that this dirge began to be chanted over the really dead or the mummy”—it made of the last closing sentence in the editorial preface perfect nonsense. Thus, it was not found on a “mummy of the Ptolemaic period,” but on one of the IVth or Vth Dynasty, if we remember right.—[ED.]

it even plausible to the average reader. * On the contrary, the impression left on my mind after reading the editorial note was that the Theosophical theory was trotted out in support of a preconceived doctrine rather than given as a scientific conclusion deduced from the facts. On the face of it the Theosophical theory fails either to cover the ground or explain the facts. My difficulty in accepting your theory of past reminiscences from former existences is not lessened by the mystery that surrounds the doctrine of reincarnation. As gathered from the lips of Theosophists and Theosophical literature, the doctrine appears to me to be largely tintured by the Buddhistic school of thought through which it has descended. It savours of the company it has kept so long, which may account for the apparently contradictory theories obtaining on the subject of reincarnation. † The law of Karma, and the necessary and inevitable periodic return of the ego or astral monad into material existence, and on this planet as the universal destiny of every son and daughter of Adam, I understand to be the view of reincarnation held by Theosophists. But in *Isis Unveiled*, page 351, the following teaching is given:

* Very likely. But the remark cuts both ways since no more has the Spiritualistic explanation ever satisfied us, or appeared “plausible” to the average Theosophist. Not only does the theory of the returning “Spirits,” so called, militate against the whole teaching of the Occult Sciences as taught in the East (the broad reincarnation theory of the Buddhist and Hindu Esoteric philosophies being assuredly that of the Theosophists), but it goes against the writer’s personal experience of about 45 years’ duration.—[ED.]

† The two theories (those of the Spiritualists and Theosophists) are a matter of personal preference. None of us need enforce his views on the other, or those who may differ from him. Time alone can show which side is right and which wrong. Meanwhile, those who study seriously the doctrine of reincarnation, and those supernal Intelligences who *can*, and *do* communicate with persons still in flesh, will find no contradictory theories among us. No one can judge of such a difficult and abstruse subject on simple *hearsay*.—[ED.]

same *planet*,* is not a rule in nature; it is an exception, like the teratological phenomenon of a two-headed infant. It is preceded by a violation of the laws of harmony of nature, and happens only when the latter, seeking to restore its disturbed equilibrium, violently throws back into earth-life the astral monad which had been tossed out of the circle of necessity by crime or accident. . . . If reason has been so far developed as to become active and discriminative, there is no [immediate]

* Since 1882 when the mistake was first found out in *Isis Unveiled*, it has been repeatedly stated in *The Theosophist*, and last year in *The Path*, that the word “planet” was a mistake and that “cycle” was meant, *i.e.*, the “cycle of Devachanic rest.” This mistake, due to one of the literary editors—the writer knowing English more than imperfectly twelve years ago, and the editors being still more ignorant of Buddhism and Hinduism—has led to great confusion and numberless accusations of contradictions between the statements in *Isis* and later theosophical teaching. The paragraph quoted meant to upset the theory of the French Reincarnationists who maintain that the same *personality* is reincarnated, often a few days after death, so that a grandfather can be reborn as his own grand-daughter. Hence the idea was combated, and it was said that neither Buddha nor any of the Hindu philosophers ever taught reincarnation *in the same cycle*, or *of the same personality*, but of the “triune man” (*vide* note which follows) who, when properly united, was “capable of running the race” forward to perfection. The same and a worse mistake occurs on pages 346 and 347 (Vol. I). For on the former it is stated that the Hindus dread *reincarnation* “only on other and inferior planets,” instead of what is the case, that Hindus dread reincarnation *in other and inferior bodies*, of brutes and animals or *transmigration*, while on page 347 the said error of putting “planet” instead of “cycle” and “personality,” shows the author (a professed Buddhist) speaking as though Buddha had never taught the doctrine of reincarnation!! The sentence ought to

reincarnation on this earth, for the three parts of the triune man* have been united together, and he is capable of running the race.”

Here, we have propounded a theory of re-incarnation that must, I think, address itself to every mind as at once probable, scientific, and rational; † a reasonable provision of the All-wise for meeting the case of exceptions to a rule of life. But how can this theory of re-incarnation be accorded with the Theosophical teaching of the same doctrine? If the re-incarnation of *Isis* be the truth, then the explanation of automatic communications, such as that of the “Dirge for the Dead in Life,” or the spirit teachings of M. A. Oxon,

read that the “*former life* believed in by Buddhists is not a life in the same cycle and personality,” as no one appreciates more than they do “the great doctrine of cycles.” As it reads now, however, namely that “this *former life* believed in by the Buddhists is not a *life on this planet*,” and this sentence on page 347 just preceded by that other (paragraph 2 on page 346), “Thus, like the revolutions of a wheel, there is a *regular succession of death and birth*,” etc.—the whole reads like the raving of a lunatic, and a jumble of contradictory

statements. If asked why the error was permitted to remain and run through ten editions, it is answered that (a) the attention of the author was drawn to it only in 1882; and (b) that the undersigned was not in a position to alter it from stereotyped plates which belonged to the American publisher and not to her. The work was written under exceptional circumstances, and no doubt more than one great error may be discovered in *Isis Unveiled*.—[ED.]

* “The three parts,” are Atma, Buddhi-Manas, which this condition of perfect union entitles to a rest in Devachan which cannot be less than 1,000 years in duration, sometimes 2,000, as the “cycle of rest” is proportioned to the merits and demerits of the *Devachanee*.—[ED.]

† So it is, *minus* the erroneous qualification “only this planet,” and the omission of “immediate” before “*re-incarnation*.” If the correction and the substitution of the word planet by that of cycle, are made, there will be no contradiction.—[ED.]

DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TWO EDITORS

217

by the “reminiscences of past existences,” will be found to utterly break down. The re-incarnation theory of explanation will have to be reconsidered and the intelligence who stoutly maintains that he is what he says he is, must be heard in his own defence.

J. H. MITALMIER, F. R. A. S.

ED. NOTE.—Re-incarnation in *Isis* was made faulty by the mistakes as explained, and no edition has been yet corrected. The author proposes, as soon as time permits it, to re-edit entirely, to correct and abridge *Isis Unveiled* to one volume.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

December, 1888

DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TWO EDITORS

ON ASTRAL BODIES, OR DOPPELGNERS

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 16, December, 1888, pp. 328-333]

[In two consecutive months, namely, December 1888, and January, 1889, there were published in the pages of *Lucifer* two instalments of a Dialogue between the two Editors. The first one is published herewith, as its text does not appear to be identical with any other piece of writing from H. P. B.'s pen, even though the same trend of ideas has been expressed by her in other places.

The situation with regard to the second instalment is quite different, however. It deals with the constitution of the inner man and its division, and its text is in every way identical with pp. 117-21, and 156-71, of *The Key to Theosophy*, with the exception of a few brief sentences connecting various paragraphs. As is well known to students, *The Key to Theosophy* was published in 1889, most likely in the latter part of the year.

It should also be borne in mind that most of the material used by H. P. B. in this *second* instalment of her "Dialogue" originally appeared in Russian as an integral part of her serial story, *Iz peshcher i debrey Indostana* (From the Caves and Jungles of Hindostan) published in the *Russkiy Vestnik* (Russian Messenger), namely, in Vol. CLXXXI, February, 1886, pp. 802-813. At the time, it was cast in the form of a conversation between *μhâkur*, a Teacher, and several other persons. When writing her *Key*, H. P. B. apparently drew to a considerable extent upon this early story of hers, or used this second instalment of her "Dialogue" which, in all probability, is her own English translation of her Russian original text in the *Russkiy Vestnik*.

218

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

For some strange reason, another translation of the same Russian text was published in *Lucifer*, Vol. XI, October, 1892, *i.e.*, a considerable time after H. P. B.'s passing.

To avoid any duplication with the text of the *Key*, we publish here only the first instalment of the "Dialogue."—*Compiler.*]

M.C. Great confusion exists in the minds of people about the various kinds of apparitions, wraiths, ghosts or spirits. Ought we not to explain once for all the meaning of these terms? You say there are various kinds of "doubles"—what are they?

H.P.B. Our occult philosophy teaches us that there are three kinds of "doubles," to use the word in its widest sense. (1) Man has his "double" or *shadow*, properly so called, around which the physical body of the *foetus*—the future man—is built. The imagination of the mother, or an accident which affects the child, will affect also the astral body. The astral and the physical both exist before the mind is developed into action, and before the Atma awakes. This occurs when the child is seven years old, and with it comes the responsibility attaching to a conscious sentient being. This "double" is born with man, dies with him and can never separate itself far from the body during life, and though surviving

him, it disintegrates, *pari passu*, with the corpse. It is this, which is sometimes seen over the graves like a luminous figure of the man that was, during certain atmospheric conditions. From its physical aspect it is, during life, *man's vital* double and after death, only the gases given off from the decaying body. But, as regards its origin and essence, it is something more. This "double" is what we have agreed to call *linga-arira*, but which I would propose to call, for greater convenience, "Protean" or "Plastic Body."

M.C. Why Protean or Plastic?

H.P.B. Protean, because it can assume all forms; e.g., the "shepherd magicians" whom popular rumour accuses, perhaps not without some reason, of being "were-wolves," and "mediums in cabinets," whose own "Plastic Bodies" play the part of materialized grandmothers and "John Kings." Otherwise, why the

invariable custom of the "dear departed angels" to come out but little further than arm's length from the medium whether entranced or not? Mind, I do not at all deny foreign influences in this kind of phenomena. But I do affirm that foreign interference is rare, and that the materialized form is always that of the medium's "*Astral*" or Protean body.

M.C. But how is this astral body created?

H.P.B. It is not created; it grows, as I told you, with the man and exists in the rudimentary condition even before the child is born.

M.C. And what about the second?

H.P.B. The second is the "Thought" body, or Dream body, rather; known among Occultists as the *Mayavi-rupa*, or "Illusion-body." During life this image is the vehicle both of thought and of the animal passions and desires, drawing at one and the same time from the lowest terrestrial *manas* (*mind*) and *Kama*, the element of desire. It is *dual* in its potentiality, and after death forms, what is called in the East *Bhoot*, or *Kama-rupa*, but which is better known to theosophists as the "Spook."

M.C. And the third?

H.P.B. The third is the true *Ego*, called in the East, by a name meaning "causal body" but which in the trans-Himalayan schools is always called the "Karmic body," which is the same. For *Karma* or action is the cause which produces incessant rebirths or "reincarnations." It is *not* the *Monad*, nor is it *Manas* proper; but is, in a way, indissolubly connected with, and a compound of the *Monad* and *Manas* in *Devachan*.

M.C. Then there are three doubles?

H.P.B. If you can call the Christian and other Trinities "three Gods," then there are three doubles. But in truth there is only one under three aspects or phases: the most material portion disappearing with the body; the middle one, surviving both as an independent, but temporary entity in the land of shadows; the third, immortal, throughout the *manvantara* unless *Nirvana* puts an end to it before.

M.C. But shall not we be asked what difference there is between the *Mayavi* and *Kama rupa*, or as you propose to call them the “Dream body” and the “Spook”?

H.P.B. Most likely, and we shall answer, in addition to what has been said, that the “thought power” or aspect of the *Mayavi* or “Illusion body,” merges after death entirely into the causal body or the conscious *thinking* EGO. The animal elements, or power of desire of the “Dream body,” absorbing after death that which it has collected (through its insatiable desire *to live*) during life; *i.e.*, all the astral vitality as well as all the impressions of its *material* acts and thoughts while it lived in possession of the body, forms the “Spook” or *Kama rupa*. Our Theosophists know well enough that after death the *higher* Manas unites with the *Monad* and passes into Devachan, while the dregs of the *lower manas* or animal mind go to form this Spook. This has life in it, but hardly any consciousness, except, as it were by proxy; when it is drawn into the current of a medium.

M.C. Is it all that can be said upon the subject?

H.P.B. For the present this is enough metaphysics, I guess. Let us hold to the “Double” in its earthly phase. What would you know?

M.C. Every country in the world believes more or less in the “double” or doppelgänger. The simplest form of this is the appearance of a man’s phantom, the moment after his death, or at the instant of death, to his dearest friend. Is this appearance the *mayavi rupa*?

H.P.B. It is; because produced by the thought of the dying man.

M.C. Is it unconscious?

H.P.B. It is unconscious to the extent that the dying man does not generally do it knowingly; nor is he aware that he so appears. What happens is this. If he thinks very intently at the moment of death of the person he either is very anxious to see, or loves best, he may appear to that person. The thought becomes objective; the double, or shadow of a man, being nothing but the faithful reproduction of him, like a reflection in a mirror, that which the man does, even in thought, that the double

repeats. This is why the phantoms are often seen in such cases in the clothes they wear at the particular moment, and the *image* reproduces even the expression on the dying man’s face. If the double of a man bathing were seen it would seem to be immersed in water; so when a man who has been drowned appears to his friend, the image will be seen to be dripping with water. The cause for the apparition may be also reversed; *i.e.*, the dying man may or may not be thinking at all of the particular person his image appears to, but it is that person who is sensitive. Or perhaps his sympathy or his hatred for the individual whose wraith is thus evoked is very intense physically or psychically; and in this case the

apparition is created by, and depends upon, the intensity of the thought. What then happens is this. Let us call the dying man A, and him who sees the double B. The latter, owing to love, hate, or fear, has the image of A so deeply impressed on his psychic memory, that actual magnetic attraction and repulsion are established between the two, whether one knows of it and feels it, or not. When A dies, the sixth sense or psychic spiritual intelligence of the *inner man* in B becomes cognisant of the change in A, and forthwith apprizes the physical senses of the man, by projecting before his eye the form of A, as it is at the instant of the great change. The same when the dying man longs to see some one; *his* thought telegraphs to his friend, consciously or unconsciously along the wire of sympathy, and becomes objective. This is what the “Spookical” Research Society would pompously, but none the less muddily, call *telepathic impact*.

M.C. This applies to the simplest form of the appearance of the double. What about cases in which the double does that which is contrary to the feeling and wish of the man?

H.P.B. This is impossible. The “Double” cannot act, unless the key-note of this action was struck in the brain of the man to whom the “Double” belongs, be that man just dead, or alive, in good or in bad health. If he paused on the thought a second, long enough to give

it form, before he passed on to other mental pictures, this one second is as sufficient for the *objectivizations* of his personality on the astral waves, as for your face to impress itself on the sensitized plate of a photographic apparatus. Nothing prevents your form then, being seized upon by the surrounding Forces—as a dry leaf fallen from a tree is taken up and carried away by the wind—[to] be made to caricature or distort your thought.

M.C. Supposing the double expresses in actual words a thought uncongenial to the man, and expresses it—let us say to a friend far away, perhaps on another continent? I have known instances of this occurring.

H.P.B. Because it then so happens that the created image is taken up and used by a “Shell.” Just as in *séance*-rooms when “images” of the dead—which may perhaps be lingering unconsciously in the memory or even the auras of those present—are seized upon by the Elementals or Elementary Shadows and made objective to the audience, and even caused to act at the bidding of the strongest of the many different wills in the room. In your case, moreover, there must exist a connecting link—a telegraph wire—between the two persons, a point of psychic sympathy, and on this the thought travels instantly. Of course there must be, in every case, some strong reason why that particular thought takes that direction; it must be connected in some way with the other person. Otherwise such apparitions would be of common and daily occurrence.

M.C. This seems very simple; why then does it only occur with exceptional persons?

H.P.B. Because the plastic power of the imagination is much stronger in some persons than in others. The mind is dual in its potentiality: it is physical and metaphysical. The higher part of the mind is connected with the spiritual soul or Buddhi, the lower with the

animal soul, the Kama principle. There are persons who never think with the higher faculties of their mind at all; those who do so are the minority and are thus, in a way, *beyond*, if not above, the average of human kind. These will think even upon ordinary matters on that *higher* plane.

The idiosyncrasy of the person determines in which “principle” of the mind the thinking is done, as also the faculties of a preceding life, and sometimes the heredity of the physical. This is why it is so very difficult for a materialist—the metaphysical portion of whose brain is almost atrophied—to raise himself, or for one who is naturally spiritually minded, to descend to the level of the matter-of-fact vulgar thought. Optimism and pessimism depend on it also in a large measure.

M.C. But the habit of thinking in the higher mind can be developed—else there would be no hope for persons who wish to alter their lives and raise themselves? And that this is possible must be true, or there would be no hope for the world.

H.P.B. Certainly it can be developed, but only with great difficulty, a firm determination, and through much self-sacrifice. But it is comparatively easy for those who are born with the gift. Why is it that one person sees poetry in a cabbage or a pig with her little ones, while another will perceive in the loftiest things only their lowest and most material aspect, will laugh at the “music of the spheres,” and ridicule the most sublime conceptions and philosophies? This difference depends simply on the innate power of the mind to think on the higher or on the lower plane, with the *astral* (in the sense given to the word by de Saint-Martin), or with the physical brain. Great intellectual powers are often no proof of, but are impediments to spiritual and right conceptions; witness most of the great men of science. We must rather pity than blame them.

M.C. But how is it that the person who thinks on the higher plane produces more perfect and more potential images and objective forms by his thought?

H.P.B. Not necessarily that “person” alone, but all those who are generally sensitives. The person who is endowed with this faculty of thinking about even the most trifling things from the higher plane of thought has, by virtue of that gift which he possesses, a plastic power of formation, so to say, in his very imagination. Whatever such a person may think about, his thought will be so far

more intense than the thought of an ordinary person, that by this very intensity it obtains the power of creation. Science has established the fact that thought is an energy. This energy in its action disturbs the atoms of the astral atmosphere around us. I already told

you; the rays of thought have the same potentiality for producing forms in the astral atmosphere as the sunrays have with regard to a lens. Every thought so evolved with energy from the brain, creates *nolens volens* a shape.

M.C. Is that shape absolutely unconscious?

H.P.B. Perfectly unconscious unless it is the creation of an adept, who has a pre-conceived object in giving it consciousness, or rather in sending along with it enough of his will and intelligence to cause it to appear conscious. This ought to make us more cautious about our thoughts.

But the wide distinction that obtains between the adept in this matter and the ordinary man must be borne in mind. The adept may at his will use his *Mayavi-rupa*, but the ordinary man does not, except in very rare cases. It is called *Mayavi-rupa* because it is a form of illusion created for use in the particular instance, and it has quite enough of the adept's mind in it to accomplish its purpose. The ordinary man merely creates a thought-image, whose properties and powers are at the time wholly unknown to him.

M.C. Then one may say that the form of an adept appearing at a distance from his body, as for instance Ram Lal in *Mr. Isaacs*, is simply an image?

H.P.B. Exactly. It is a walking thought.

M.C. In which case an adept can appear in several places almost simultaneously.

H.P.B. He can. Just as Apollonius of Tyana, who was seen in two places at once, while his body was at Rome. But it must be understood that not *all* of even the *astral* adept is present in each appearance.

M.C. Then it is very necessary for a person of any amount of imagination and psychic powers to attend to their thoughts?

H.P.B. Certainly, for each thought has a shape which borrows the appearance of the man engaged in the action

of which he thought. Otherwise how can clairvoyants see in your *aura* your past and present? What they see is a passing panorama of yourself represented in successive actions by your thoughts. You asked me if we are punished for our thoughts. Not for all, for some are still-born; but for the others, those which we call "silent" but potential thoughts—yes. Take an extreme case, such as that of a person who is so wicked as to wish the death of another. Unless the evil-wisher is a *Dugpa*, a high adept in black magic, in which case Karma is delayed, such a wish only comes back to roost.

M.C. But supposing the evil-wisher to have a very strong will, without being a *dugpa*, could the death of the other be accomplished?

H.P.B. Only if the malicious person has the evil eye, which simply means possessing enormous plastic power of imagination working involuntarily, and thus turned unconsciously to bad uses. For what is the power of the "evil eye"? Simply a great plastic power of thought, so great as to produce a current impregnated with the potentiality of every kind of misfortune and accident, which inoculates, or attaches itself to any person

who comes within it. A *jettatore* (one with the evil eye) need not be even imaginative, or have evil intentions or wishes. He may be simply a person who is naturally fond of witnessing or reading about sensational scenes, such as murder, executions, accidents, etc., etc. He may be not even thinking of any of these at the moment his eye meets his future victim. But the currents have been produced and exist in his visual ray ready to spring into activity the instant they find suitable soil, like a seed fallen by the way and ready to sprout at the first opportunity.

M.C. But how about the thoughts you call “silent”? Do such wishes or thoughts come home to roost?

H.P.B. They do; just as a ball which fails to penetrate an object rebounds upon the thrower. This happens even to some *dugpas* or sorcerers who are not strong enough, or do not comply with the rules—for even they have *rules* they have to abide by—but not with those who are

regular, fully developed “black magicians”; for such have the power to accomplish what they wish.

M.C. When you speak of rules it makes me want to wind up this talk by asking you what everybody wants to know who takes any interest in occultism. What is a principal or important suggestion for those who have these powers and wish to control them rightly—in fact to enter occultism?

H.P.B. The first and most important step in occultism is to learn how to adapt your thoughts and ideas to your plastic potency.

M.C. Why is this so important?

H.P.B. Because otherwise you are creating things by which you may be making bad Karma. No one should go into occultism or even touch it before he is perfectly acquainted with his own powers, and that he knows how to commensurate it with his actions. And this he can do only by deeply studying the philosophy of Occultism before entering upon the *practical* training. Otherwise, as sure as fate—HE WILL FALL INTO BLACK MAGIC.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
December, 1888

**CHILDREN ALLOWED TO TRAIN
THEMSELVES FOR MURDER**

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 16, December, 1888, pp. 341-342]

“ARIADNA” writes:—

English folk are fond of maintaining the superiority of their national morals as contrasted with those of our Continental neighbours across the seas. Yet had one of the latter been strolling down a thoroughfare of one of our large seaside resorts but a few days ago he might have been inclined to doubt it. In a large shop an alluring tray of boys’ knives was exhibited, ticketed “Jack Ripper’s knives”! In an adjacent street, a merry gang of children, aged respectively from six to eleven years, were playing at “Ripper,” jumping one over the other and knocking them down—a true *rehearsal* of the felonious act.

Of course the natural question would be, “Why did not their parents stop them and prohibit the ghastly play?”

CHILDREN ALLOWED TO TRAIN FOR MURDER

227

But they did not, it is evident; and the fond parents, children themselves of the present age, must have merrily laughed and felt amused at the “original idea.” Good Christian people! They do not even think of uprooting the evil by lodging a complaint against the infamous speculators who are permitted to bring out *such* a toy! The translators and publishers of Zola’s outlandish “immorality,” which shows vice in all its hideous nakedness and ugliness, are condemned to heavy fines. “Jack Ripper’s” knives are permitted to be freely sold to children: for what can be more innocent than a cardboard or a wooden knife, gaudily painted, for boys and girls to play with, on its very face! Has any of the lookers-on while witnessing those children, bright things “fresh from the hand of God,” the merry, playing babes, put himself the question:

“What wilt thou be hereafter?”

Yet, how many of these little boys and girls now openly sporting with knives and playing at “Jack Ripper” shall, directly in consequence of such “play” become candidates for gallows and *swing* in that “hereafter.” Yea, LAW in all her majesty may claim, through her righteous judges, ten or twenty years hence, any of these light-hearted “little ones” as her lawful prey. “May God have mercy on your soul” will be the pompous but awful verdict of a black-capped Judge as the logical result of such play for one of those now innocent, then guilty, “Jack Rippers.” Will any of the future judges or jurymen, we wonder, remember during such a possible trial that, when himself a boy, he may have longed to take the part, nay, perhaps actually has had a hand in the *fun* during a vacation in

one of those fashionable seaside resorts?

The child is father to the man. It is the first impressions, visual or mental, which the young senses take in the quickest, to store them indelibly in the virgin memory. It is the imagery and scenes which happen to us during our childhood, and the spirit in which they are viewed by our elders and received by us, that determine the

manner in which we accept such like scenes or look upon good or evil in subsequent years. For, it is most of that early intellectual capital so accumulated day by day during our boyhood and girlhood that we trade with and speculate upon throughout later life.

The capacity of children for the storing away of early impressions is great indeed. And, if an innocent child playing at “Jack Ripper,” remarks that his *sport* produces merriment and amusement instead of horror in the lookers-on, why should a child be expected to connect the same act with sin and crime later on? It is by riding wooden horses in childhood that a boy loses all fear of a living horse in subsequent years. Hence, the urchin who now *pretends* to murder will look on murder and kill *de facto*, with as much unconcern when he becomes a man as he does now. There is much sophistry in Mrs. Stowe’s remark that “children will grow up substantially what they *are* by nature,” for this can only apply to those exceptional children who are left to take care of themselves; and these do not buy toys at fashionable shops. A child brought up by parents, and having a home instead of a gutter to live and sleep in, if left to *self*-education will draw from his own observations and conclusions for evil as for good, and these conclusions are sure to colour all his after life. Playing at “Jack Ripper,” he will think unconsciously of Jack Ripper, and what he may have heard of that now fashionable Mr. Hyde of Whitechapel. And—

“. . . he who but conceives a crime in thought
Contracts the danger of an actual fault.”

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
December, 1888

THE DEVIL, WHO IS HE?

229

THE DEVIL, WHO IS HE?

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 16, December, 1888, pp. 343-345]

SIR,

As I consider the criticism upon my letter in your issue of October altogether unjustified, I trust you will allow me space for a few lines in reply thereto.

There is one thing absolutely necessary to be observed in discussion in order for it to be of any profit, either to the parties themselves or to any one else who may either hear or read of it. And the one thing necessary in discussion is that the parties to the discussion should first understand and accept the premises upon which the argument is intended to be built, or the conclusion is intended to be drawn.

For if, in a written discussion, the critic assumes the writer to have taken certain dogmas or premises as the basis of his argument which he never dreamt of taking, and upon this erroneous assumption the critic then proceeds to ridicule the argument of the writer as though the writer's argument had been based on the critic's erroneous conception of his premises, such discussion and criticism is profitable to no one, and amuses no one but the superficial reader who is unable to see the delusion.

And that there may, at least, be no excuse in future for misapprehending my views, I may say that I know of; and believe in, no such person as the Devil, in the commonly reputed Orthodox sense.

But surely those who speak evil of God or their neighbours would be justly entitled to the name.

And, with respect to Jesus, I know nothing of Jesus, excepting that as a Man (whether historical or allegorical) he is the most Christ-like I can conceive, and therefore to me he is the Christ, and likewise therefore "the Son of God according to the spirit of holiness," whom to know and love is to know and love God, and whom, therefore, to revile and reject, is to reject and hate God. And as I understood that Theosophists (in December No. of *Lucifer*) accepted this view of Jesus being the Christ, and his practical religion, therefore I am surprised that things should be thrown in my face as accepted by me which I have nowhere in any wise professed to accept. And I should think it as foolish to be offended with what is good in the Scriptures because of there being something hard to accept, as it would be to be offended with the nut and milk of the cocoanut only because the shell and the husk could not be eaten also. And if Theosophists are obliged to admit that philosophical postulates are absolutely necessary to be accepted as a basis of argument, I only ask the same; but I cannot see the need of taking offence at my having spoken of the Son of Man having been crucified as a devil.

230

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

Surely, if he was condemned to be a deceiver, a blasphemer and a devil, and to be therefore slain, it cannot be incorrect to say he was crucified as a blasphemer, or a devil, just as we speak, of the martyrs having been burnt *as heretics*. I have been a friend to *Lucifer*, both in word and deed, but with such hostile criticism as there is in the October number, one would suppose I had fallen into the midst of enemies.

REV. T. G. HEADLEY.

THE EDITOR'S REPLY

We feel sorry for having unintentionally given offence to our reverend friend and contributor; but we would have been still more sorry to publish in our magazine an unjust fling at another contributor's ideas and to have *facts* denied—without entering a protest. Our magazine is essentially controversial, and was founded for the purpose of throwing light upon “the hidden things of darkness”—of religious superstition pre-eminently. And what superstition can be compared to that which accepts a “personal” God, or a “personal” devil? He who objects to having his views controverted and criticized must not write for *Lucifer*. Neither Mr. May's nor the editor's remarks were personal, and were concerned with the peculiar views about God and Devil made *by* Mr. Headley, and not at all with the reverend gentleman himself.

Moreover, we have given good proofs of our impartiality. We published articles and letters criticizing not alone our personal theosophical and philosophical views, but discussing on subjects directly concerned with *our personal honour and reputation*; reviving the *infamous calumnies* in which not simple doubts, but distinctly formulated charges of dishonesty were cast into our teeth and our private character was torn to shreds (*Vide* “A Glance at Theosophy from the Outside,” *Lucifer* for October, 1888). And if the editor will never shrink from what she considers her duty to her readers, and that she is prepared to throw every possible light upon mooted questions in order that truth should shine bright

and hideous lies and superstitions be shown under their true colours—why should our contributors prove themselves so thin-skinned? *Magna est veritas et prevalebit*. Every hitherto far-hidden truth, whether concealed out of sight by Nature's secretiveness or human craft, must and shall be unveiled some day or other. Meanwhile, we do our best to help poor, shivering, naked Truth in her arduous progress, by cutting paths for her through the inextricable jungle of theological and social shams and lies. The best means of doing it is to open the pages of our magazine to free controversy and discussion, regardless of personalities or prejudices—though some of our friends may object to such modes of excavating far hidden truths. They are wrong, evidently. It is by this means alone that he who holds correct views has a chance of proving them, hence of seeing them accepted and firmly established; and he who is mistaken, of being benefited by having his better senses awakened and directed to the other side of the question he sees but in one of its aspects. Logic, Milton says to us, teaches us “that contraries laid together more evidently appear; it follows, then, that all controversy being permitted, falsehood will appear more false, and truth the more true; which must needs conduce much to the general confirmation of an implicit truth.” Again, “if it (controversy) be profitable for one man to read, why should it

not at least be tolerable and free for his adversary to write?"

Why then should Mr. Headley address his opponent, while saying: "it is not true, *as Mr. May asserts*, that good and evil, or Jesus and the Devil, are one and the same," instead of taking to task for it Lactantius, the Church father, who was the first to say so more than a millennium ago, by stating that the Logos or Christ was "the *first-born brother of Satan*"? Or why again, should not our reverend friend explain to us the real meaning of that verse in *Revelation* (xxii, 16) which makes Jesus say: "I *Jesus . . . am . . . the bright and morning Star*," i.e., *Phosphoros* and *Lucifer* respectively in the Greek and Latin texts—and thus give the lie to the

editor of *Revelation*, instead of giving it to Mr. May? Nor does this gentleman say anywhere, as Mr. Headley accuses him of saying, that he regards God "the Supreme Being or *Person*"—as a *person*. Finally, to our humble mind, there is more truth and philosophy in Mr. May's closing sentence, namely: "the divine ESSE or God is but One Supreme and All, even as the seven colours of the Sun's rays appear but as one"—than in all the ecclesiastical theology put together, modern reformations included.

To close: we deny that our criticism of Mr. Headley's letter was in any way "hostile," and we can but regret that the reverend gentleman should labour under the very erroneous impression that he has "fallen in the midst of enemies." We repeat again: *Lucifer* has a settled and plainly outlined policy of its own, and those who write for it have either to accept it, or—turn their backs on our magazine. No discourteous epithets or vulgar abuse of personalities shall ever be allowed in our Monthly. We should be very *sorry* to follow in the usual track of the English dailies, which—even those claiming to be considered as leading organs of the press, high-principled and high-toned—are ever indulging in *personal* attacks, not only on their political opponents, but, pandering to the public, even upon unpopular characters. No individual—friend or foe—risks being called in our journal "adventurer," "hallucinated lunatic," "impostor and free lover," "charlatan" or "credulous fool," as the leading theosophists of England and America are repeatedly referred to by the highly-cultured and learned editors of not only political but even drawing-room, "Society" papers on both sides of the Atlantic—save a few honourable exceptions.

But, on the other hand, no one—of whatever rank or influence—as nothing however "time-honoured," shall ever be pandered to or propitiated in our magazine. Never shall any error, sham or superstition be daubed with the whitewash of propriety, or passed over in prudent silence. As our journal was not established for a moneymaking enterprise, but verily as a champion for every

fact and truth, however tabooed and unpopular—it need pander to no lie or absurd superstition. For this policy the Theosophical Publishing Co. is, already, several hundred pounds out of pocket. The editor invites free criticism upon everything that is said in *Lucifer*; and while protecting every contributor from direct personalities, is quite willing to accept any amount of such against herself, and promises to answer each and all to the best of her ability. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*

“FAIS QUE DOIS, ADVIENNE QUE POURRA.”

H.P.B.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
December, 1888

LITERARY JOTTINGS

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 16, December, 1888, pp. 346-349]

ECHOES OF THEOSOPHY

The following paragraph in a Boston weekly, Wade's *Fibre and Fabric*, October 27, 1888, No. 191, speaks for itself:

As the farmer winnows his wheat when threshed, to separate the grain from the chaff, so should we examine all things and hold fast to that which is good. In this way only can the individual elevate his mental and improve his physical condition, and perhaps retain, or secure and hold positions he would otherwise be incapable of filling. The tendency of most people is to slight or shun what we least understand. The editor of *Fibre and Fabric* some time ago, in "Facts Whittled Down," in a very brief item mentioned theosophy in a way that he will always be ashamed to see when turning to that particular page; and this shows the necessity of all using the greatest care in what we say, as well as what we do. For an unkind act or unjust word, once spoken, can *never* be recalled. For some time we have been looking into theosophy, and we find there is nothing bad or incomprehensible about it. The following being a fair explanation of what it is: "The word theosophy is derived from two Greek words, Theos, meaning God, and Sophia, meaning wisdom. Theosophia, or theosophy, is the wisdom of God, or divine wisdom. Theosophy is at once a science and a religion." The science of truth and the religion of justice. Self-reliance, self-control, self-respect, willingness to draw knowledge from all sources, and a firm

234

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

and heartfelt desire to be just and kind and forbearing towards others are believed by theosophists to be essential to any progress in theosophy. Those who support free inquiry and free discussion are their natural allies. Those who are in possession of authority unjustly acquired, or unworthily employed, are their natural enemies. "No person's religious opinions are asked upon his joining, nor is interference with them permitted; but every one is required, before admission, to promise to show towards his fellow-members the same toleration in this respect as he claims for himself." The idea is to form a nucleus of a universal brotherhood of humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex or colour. Theosophy is, in fact, the religion of the human race, and has existed since the creation of the planetary system, waiting the advent of man to grasp and comprehend it.

If only every second editor of the papers and magazines which for years went on steadily abusing theosophy and slandering theosophists, were to show himself half as gentlemanly and fair as Jas. M. Wade, Theosophy and its society would very soon occupy their rightful place in the world.

As Pope said: "A man should never be ashamed to own he has been in the wrong." But, oh! for fair-minded and just editors in this century of fierce selfishness, competition

and sensational, if even slanderous, news! Where are they, such paragons of virtue, ready to give even the devil his due at the risk of treading on the corns of their subscribers? All honour, long life and 10,000 more subscriptions to this Boston *rara avis* among editors.

The London *Star*, from which sundry other papers copied *verbatim* the remark wrote some time ago:

The first edition of Madame Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* has been already bought up, and a second edition is being printed as fast as possible to meet the continued demand. This is curious considering that the book is of a more occult and difficult character than any that has preceded it.

Though "curious," indeed, the fact has nevertheless an easy explanation. The twenty millions of Englishmen so rudely ticketed by Carlyle as being "mostly fools," have become a wee bit wiser. There is time enough in twenty odd years to show an increase—even of brains.

As a correspondent remarks with regard to the archaic teachings given in Volume I of *The Secret Doctrine*, each of them infuses "*a raison d'être* and intelligibility into a universe whose drift has been utterly unperceived by Western Thought," and he adds very suggestively:

The essence of the greatness of Western thought seems to me to lie in the splendid mastery of detail and method in dealing with the physical aspects of Nature. Eastern Occultism, on the contrary, supplies us with "generals" and troubles little about particulars e.g., it would, I gather, be absurd to look for any detailed physical sciences in India or elsewhere, with their accurate classifications and punctilious researches. Even in the realm of psychology, the volumes of Spencer, Bain, Dewey and others seem to be so complete in detail as to render much of Eastern teaching *superficial* in the extreme *at first sight*. But after all is said and done, one has to face the fact that the psychology favoured in Europe deals *simply with brain-correlated states of consciousness, i.e.*, with a reflection of a ray of the *Manas* (mind) conditioned by organism. It blunders even in this little domain so far as its general theory of the relations of mind and body go, but its *data* are superb. Eastern psychology is *more sketchy*, but its generalisations are certain, and cover an area in comparison with which that of Mills & Co. sinks into insignificance. It seems to cover Goethe's notion that the real value of the Sciences may be condensed onto a sheet of note-paper. It loves *results* more than the minute detail which props up the varying inductions of the West.

Thus, Europe is slowly returning to an appreciation of old wisdom, and as it gradually casts off the dead letter that killeth, of the Jewish Bible and Churchianism, it turns back, by a natural *reversion* of the evolution of the human brain—to the spirit through which all liveth of the old philosophies. Thus the same paper says:—

Miss Mabel Collins' *Light on the Path* has been translated into Sanskrit, and will be placed by the

Hindoo Pundits as one of the Sanskrit classics. Translation into Sanskrit is a thing which has not been done for at least 100 years past; but the book is sufficiently Buddhistic and occult to satisfy even the learned Hindoos.

This little book—a true jewel—belongs to, and emanates from the same school of Indo-Aryan and Buddhist thought and learning as the teachings in *The Secret Doctrine*.

How deep indeed, real theosophy has impressed itself even on our matter-of-fact journalism, is evidenced in this other bit of appreciative reference to it in the *Lady's Pictorial*, in which, on October 13th last, it is so pointedly remarked:—

LUCIFER. (Office, 7, Duke Street, Adelphi.) Let me recommend those who take their ideas of LUCIFER from 'Milton' to read the article in the September number, called 'The Meaning of a Pledge.' Let them substitute the name of their own particular sect for the name 'Theosophy'; let them take a pledge and live up to it, and all 'sects' will soon be merged in a universal brotherhood of love and service.

"LUCIFER," the "offspring of Heaven, first-born, and of the eternal co-eternal beam," divine light, mistaken for and stubbornly maintained *by the majority* of the so-called cultured Christians to represent SATAN, the *devil!* Oh, Milton, poor, great man. What harm hast thou done to weak human brains! . . .

"CULTURE, which renders man less like an ape, has also licked the devil into shape," seem to be prophetic words in Göthe's *Faust*.

Heladiw Ruwana or "*the Ceylon Gem*" is a new periodical brought out by the Buddhist Publication Society of Ceylon; and, as it states under its sub-title, the paper is established in the year of our Lord Buddha, 2432.

This is also one of the direct boughs which have grown out of the tree of Theosophy. In the Department of "correspondence" (art. "The Rise and Progress of Buddhism in Ceylon") are some curious passages very interesting to the Theosophists of Europe and America, for whose benefit we cull a few of its rhetorical flowers:—

Since European scholars have begun to study Buddhism, there is a great deal spoken of it, and its secret doctrine, as prevailing among the Lamas of Tibet. There are, it seems, two schools of Buddhist Philosophy there: one devoted to esoteric doctrine, and the other to the exoteric phase of Gautama Buddha's Philosophy. Among the first sect, there are said to exist Mahatmas of wonderful psychical powers, similar to those possessed by the Dhyanis an

Arahats of old. In Ceylon these adepts counted over thousands in the reign of Dutthagamani. They have gradually ceased to exist, as the keys of those mysteries were lost by the degeneracy of the Buddhist monks of subsequent times, who sought more after worldly renown and glory, than the higher spiritual developments. Any one carefully reading . . . the *Mahavansa*, will not, I trust, fail to observe that distinct and particular reference is made to the Arahats of the different periods. And I may, by way of attestation to the truth of the facts stated in the *Mahavansa*, draw the kind attention of our readers to the travels of "Fa-Hien," the Chinese pilgrim. . . .

Since the discovery of the true Law by the most enlightened Gautama, men have become wild and wretched by the awful lusts of the flesh, and have consequently lost the secrets of that Law. But those immortal and divine gems of truth, were not destined to disappear altogether from the habitation of man, as it was decreed by the departing Arahats to be safely and sacredly kept by the Adepts of the trans-Himalayan depths, until man's condition be adapted to receive it. That time is now drawing nigh; and the custodians of the secret doctrine have thought it fit to send Missionaries among mankind to divulge it to them. One of those is Madame Blavatsky, who travelled over to America and converted Colonel Olcott who was then earnestly searching for the truth and investigating the phenomena of Spiritualism To institute a happy comparison between this conversion and the planting of a branch of the sacred Bo-tree by Sanghamitta, who came over into Ceylon in the reign of Dewanam Piya Tissa, I take the liberty to say that Madame Blavatsky like the princess Sanghamitta carried the secret doctrine to America, and there she implanted it in the mind of Col. Olcott, who received it with as great readiness as the virgin soil of Anuradhapura received the shoot of the Bo-tree. As the sacred Bo-tree was the incentive to the yearly visits of Buddhist pilgrims from the most remote corners of Ceylon, so was the true Law when disclosed to Col. Olcott by Madame Blavatsky the stimulus for him to leave bright prospects and friends behind him in America, and to launch out in a mission round the world to promulgate the true Law to all mankind.

In the year 1880, Madame Blavatsky and Col. Olcott paid their first visit to Ceylon, and honestly and publicly declared themselves Buddhists, and in furtherance of the dear wish of their heart they established branches of the Theosophical Society in various parts of the Island. By their united endeavours, I must admit that a new impulse has been given to Buddhism; so much so, that the many thousands of natives of the Island, who had hitherto remained ignorant of Buddhism in its pure form, and those who were ashamed to declare themselves Buddhists in public, have all begun to learn, teach and profess Buddhism most openly and vigorously. The most enthusiastic and lavish manner in which the Buddhists of Ceylon

celebrated the Wesak days of the past two years, cannot but fail to testify to their honest belief in Buddhism, and to the substantial work done by Madame Blavatsky and Col. Olcott in the cause of Buddhism. . . .

This is all correct, and the two above named personages feel proud to see their feeble services so well appreciated and remembered. But they would certainly feel still happier had the actual state of the moral standard in Ceylon—once the pearl of the Indian Ocean—been such as not to have necessitated the letter published in the same paper by a "Chela." This shows the reverse of the medal and mars somewhat the delight of those who have devoted their life to the noble work of spreading the philosophy of the great "Light of Asia." For, it is not the modern temple-Buddhism with all the excrescences that have crept into it, but verily the esoteric *Budhism*, * of the Lord Gautama, the BUDDHA, that the Founders had in view, when working for the REVIVAL OF BUDDHISM.

* *Vide* Introduction to the 1st Volume of *The Secret Doctrine* (pp. 1 and 2).

Such seems to be also the inner thought of “Chela,” who, while greeting the appearance of *Heladiw Ruwana* and informing the editor that many Buddhists have looked forward to it, “as a banner of light destined to throw much light on the hidden and true meanings of the Buddhist Scriptures and the ceremonials observed in the Buddhist temples in Ceylon,” adds the following ominous words:

Since the introduction of Buddhism by Mahinda Thero in the reign of the blessed Monarch Dewanam Piatissa, the errors that have crept into the pure and admirable doctrines of Buddha have led to many misapprehensions on the part of those who study Buddhism for the sake of spiritual development or curiosity. Very few indeed amongst those who profess Buddhism have been able to understand, and much less to explain, the noble precepts and spiritual truths which Buddha discovered and taught his disciples. Time, the

most irreconcilable enemy of things of antiquity has, as its wonted custom, laid mighty empires and cities in ruins, and the greatest and noblest thoughts and doctrines in hopeless confusion. Buddhism whose pure form is a mere byword now, has not been able to avoid the scathing hand of Time, any more than were the admirable teachings of many a noble mind of antiquity. As the gold is found mixed up with much dross and rust, so have the superstitions and the frauds of the ignorant and designing priesthood, enveloped and corrupted the sterling and pure teachings of the enlightened Gautama. It will, at present, therefore, be an Augean task to sift His notable doctrines from the superstitions of the Hindus and other nations, who from time to time attempted to trample them down and establish their own, instead. That influence has been such as to saturate our priesthood with those grovelling superstitions and forget and forego the secret keys to the blissful and mysterious state of Sowan, * Sakridagamin, Anagamin and Arahant. The methods and the discipline to be observed by the chelas in those high Spiritual developments, have been the life long study, and the fundamental truths which our Blessed Lord Buddha discovered from the mysterious volumes of nature. Those discoveries are, to speak analogically with things of comparatively a lesser value and difficulty, like the Binomial Theorem and the law of gravitation, discovered by Sir Isaac Newton, eternal and inviolable laws of nature. We may, therefore, justly and pertinently say, that our Lord Buddha, unlike the supposed uncreated and formless creator of the universe . . . discovering the laws of animal existence, and the cause of such existence, taught the certain and the only way to escape the curse of painful and unhappy rebirths. This way is the only one to attain that inexplicable and blissful state, the Nirvana.

Having briefly summarized the meaning and scope of Buddhism proper and pure, I express my sincerest congratulations to the promoters of the Buddhist Publication Society; and promising them all help and endeavour which lie in my power in the cause of truth. Hoping that by the benign influence of your society, erring Buddhists and reviling Christians will find all their errors righted, and their hatred of Buddhism turned into admiration and adoration of the Lord Buddha, the only true Teacher of the Law,

I am, yours truly,
CHELA.

* [The nature of this term is somewhat uncertain. There is a Pâli word *SowaŚŚa*, which means “golden.” As to the first stage in that series, its term is usually *Srotâpatti* in Sanskrit, and *Sotâpatti* in Pâli, meaning “entrance into the river leading to *NirvâŚa*. —*Compiler*.]

AMEN, we say, if Buddhism will make Christians more tolerant and charitable, less slanderous, or “reviling,” as “Chela” characterizes them—and as full of love and compassion for the animal and for the human kind instead of slaughtering both for sport and war.

But—we are almost afraid to enquire whether this bravely expressed hope of “Chela,” has not had some dire results in Colombo? Was not that truly good man and deep-water *Baptist*, the editor of the *Ceylon Observer*, found drowned in a sea of his own home-made gall? Let us trust no such calamity befell the pearl of the Ocean! Ceylon can as ill-afford to lose her Fergusson, as the Kingdom of God its shadow and *pillar*—the DEVIL.

A THEOSOPHICAL SCULPTOR

Our friend, Mr. Gerald Massey, the poet and Egyptologist, sends to us from New York the photograph of a medallion, made by Mrs. Josepha North (F. T. S., Aryan Branch of New York).—The woman’s head on it called “Futurity,” is very beautiful and suggestive in its symbolism and idea. To our mind, the crescent moon which encircles the neck of the head, and the six-pointed star in front of its brow, point to the coming sixth Race which, as the Secret Doctrine teaches us, will originate in America. (*Vide* Volume II of *The Secret Doctrine*, the closing pages of Part I.) Mr. G. Massey refers to Mrs. J. North as a “beginner.” If so, she may turn out the finest sculptor of her country, for, as far as one can judge from the photograph of that “beginner’s” work it is very promising. We also hear that Mrs. North is engaged upon a bust of Gautama Buddha, showing him as the young Prince Siddhartha. This, when finished, is to be placed in the Aryan T.S. Headquarters in New York, and will form an interesting addition to the many Eastern objects and pictures already there. We welcome Mrs. North, our sister in Theosophy, and wish her every success in life, as much as in her art. As beautifully

expressed by some writer, the chiselled marble can be made as eloquent in its beauty as spoken poetry. The genius of the artist may force it to become as easily the infallible prophet of “Futurity” as the faithful echo of the Past. But of course, those who see in the sculptured block only the forms of material beauty, are unable to follow in the path of soul

tuition, trodden only by those who are truly awakened to theosophical life.

ADVERSARY.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

December, 1888

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES


[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 16, December, 1888, pp. 288-90, 339-41]

[blue] The symbolical colour of magnetism and its Force.

[a lamp . . . in shape . . . like a shallow sauce-boat] The Yoni-shaped *Argua*, the lamp of the phallic and exoteric, or dead-letter creeds. This is typical.

[broken bread] The broken fragments of the ONE TRUTH, which underlies each and every religion.

[in all four sevens] The four septenaries of the moon, the Occult meaning of the division of the lunar month, which division contains the mystery of generation and birth. This “dream” shows that the “Chela” has entered the phase of practical instruction given so often in symbolical dreams.

[A writer comments on the disputed word *Theos* in *I Timothy*, iii, 16 in connection with the various existing Codices. He ends by asking the question: “What is the occult meaning of the ; and in what sense did St. Paul and his copyists, a few centuries later, use the symbol as an equivalent to the Ineffable God?” To this, H. P. B. replies:]

In the Occult meaning it is the primordial Ideation, the plane for the double-sexed *logos*, the first differentiation

242

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

of the ever-unknowable PRINCIPLE or abstract Nature, sexless and infinite. The *point* represents the first formation of the root of *all things* growing out of the *rootless* ROOT, or what the Vedantins call “Parabrahm.” It is the periodical and ever-recurring primordial manifestation after every “Night of Brahmâ,” or of potential space within abstract space: not Jehovah, assuredly not; but the “*Unknown* God” of the Athenians, the IT which St. Paul, the *master Mason* and the INITIATE, declared unto them. It is the *unmanifested* LOGOS.

[I own I should like to see phenomena] It is not in the Theosophical Society that our correspondent can ever hope to evoke spooks or to see any *physical* phenomena.

[Is not the “Esoteric Section” of the T. S. likely to run counter to the views of your Editorial on “Lodges of Magic”? Who is to ensure that the Esoteric Members are not only willing to, but *will* “abide by its rules”?]

Our correspondent’s question is a natural one—coming from a European. No, it does not run counter, because it *is not* a lodge of *magic*, but of *training*. For however often the true nature of the occult training has been stated and explained, few Western students seem to realize how searching and inexorable are the tests which a candidate must pass before *power* is entrusted to his hands. Esoteric philosophy, the occult hygiene of mind and body, the unlearning of false beliefs and the acquisition of true habits of thought, are more than sufficient for a student during his period of probation, and those who rashly pledge themselves in the expectation of acquiring forthwith “magic powers” will meet only with disappointment and certain failure.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
December, 1888

THE SECRET DOCTRINE

243

THE SECRET DOCTRINE

[*Light*, London, Vol. VIII, No. 416, December 22, 1888, pp. 634]

To the Editor of *Light*.

SIR,—Permit me for the first time after many years of silence, and probably for the last time, to say a few words in answer to the direct attack upon me (in your issue of October 15th) by “Leo.” He premises by speaking of my “violence and personal animus against Christianity.” I premise by replying that his statement is absolutely the reverse of truth, and that only one who reads my writings very superficially could get such a wrong idea. I have no animus. On the contrary, I have the greatest admiration for the Christianity of Christ, identified with Jesus of Nazareth and embodied in the Sermon on the Mount. On the other hand, in perfect agreement with “Leo,” I have the greatest contempt for “Church” Christianity, or “Churchianity,” so-called by Mr. Laurence Oliphant—that which “Leo” so aptly describes in his criticism as a “combination of feeble ignorance and bigotry.”

At this Christianity, as my critic confesses, “it is no wonder that the shafts of the enemy [read Theosophists, or, perhaps, ‘Madame Blavatsky’] are levelled.” And if so, why should my “violence and personal animus”—if any—be taken to task by one who is at one with me in this? He adds, it is true, “Very different is the grand and magnificent Christianity which is to come,” and proceeds as though it were this *future* Christianity I was sinning against in *The Secret Doctrine* as in private life. Now, notwithstanding “Leo’s” suspicion that I “evidently” consider myself “superior to Éliphas Lévi,” even my outrageous vanity in that direction could have hardly suggested to me any “violence or personal animus” against the grand and magnificent Christianity *which is to come*. For how can I hate that which exists nowhere so far—outside the womb of futurity? No more than the “foolish virgins” can even “Leo” “know the day nor the hour when the bridegroom [of that future

244

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

Christianity] cometh.” For which Christianity then, am I taken to task? Is it for “Christianity as at present,” or the one now gestating in the brain of “Leo”? Evidently my critic, who accuses me of having neglected “the management of currents,” taught by

Éliphas Lévi, has neglected it as much, if not more. He sought to direct a current of sarcasm against me, and got himself caught in the finest current of paradoxical illogicalness, such as even the great Abbé Louis Constant could well envy him.

Nor is his selection of “Theosophical perversion of religious ideas” any happier. He quotes a query in *The Secret Doctrine*: “. . . . what have other nations to do with that particular *national* Deity?,” * *i.e.*, *Yahoveh* or *Jehovah*, and shows me making the latter identical with chaos “The Sun and Moon, good and evil, God and demon.” But, as elsewhere † I remark in an entirely different combination of symbolism, that “the Sun is the giver of life to the whole planetary system; the Moon is the giver of life to our globe,” “Leo” promptly proceeds to make of these two remarks (separated, by-the-bye, by almost 200 pages, and relating to entirely different subjects) a major and a minor proposition, and draws therefrom the following syllogistic *conclusion*: “Therefore the God of the Jews and Christians is both Sun and Moon and Giver of Life.” *Ergo*, Madame Blavatsky is guilty of a gross contradiction.

Now, the “therefore” is a conclusion that a Frenchman would call *tirée par les cheveux*. Why should it be *Jehovah* of the Jews and Christians, “therefore,” any more than *Ahura Mazda* of the Parsis, *Osiris* of the Egyptians, or *Bel* of the Chaldees? And why should *Jehovah* be called “the God of the *Christians*,” since he is not once named in the New Testament, and since no Theosophist could speak with more implied contempt of

* [*The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 576.]

† [*The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 386.]

that tribal god and his commandments than Jesus himself? Let “Leo” read *Matthew* v, and see whether almost every verse in it does not demolish the Ten Commandments given by that angry and jealous Sinaitic Deity through Moses. “Therefore,” I would strongly advise “Leo” before he finds fault with others and exposes their supposed “contradictions”—“with unprejudiced mind and taking notes thereof”—to study the Bible himself, and above all, to learn to read it understandingly.

I feel very thankful, however, for his kind advice to the public to read my work. This is very unselfish; the more so as upon following it, comparing it with his criticism, and “taking notes,” no man with a teaspoonful of unprejudiced brains in his head can fail to see that there are more illogical contradictions in the half column occupied by “Leo’s” denunciatory letter, than in the 1,500 pages of *The Secret Doctrine*. But then people *do* like to see themselves in print, and to give other people pokes in the ribs from behind the sure screen of a pseudonym!

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Collected Writings VOLUME X
December, 1888

246

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

DREAMS

*Meetings held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on December 20th and 27th, 1888;
Mr. T.B. HARBOTTLE in the Chair.*

(The following is a Summary of the teachings during several meetings which preceded the Transactions of the “Blavatsky Lodge of the T. S.,” when the explanations of the *Stanzas* from *The Secret Doctrine* became incorporated in a regular series of instructions.) *

Q. What are the “principles” which are active during dreams?

A. The “principles” active during ordinary dreams—which ought to be distinguished from real dreams, and called idle visions—are *Kama*, the seat of the personal Ego and of desire awakened into chaotic activity by the slumbering reminiscences of the lower Manas.

Q. What is the “lower Manas”?

A. It is usually called the animal soul (the *Nephesh* of the Hebrew Kabalists). It is the ray which emanates from the Higher Manas or permanent EGO, and is that “principle” which forms the human mind—in animals instinct, for animals also dream. † The combined action of *Kama* and the “animal soul,” however, are purely mechanical. It is instinct, not reason, which is active in them. During the sleep of the body they receive and send out mechanically electric shocks to and from various nerve-centres. The brain is hardly impressed by them, and memory stores them, of course, without order or sequence. On waking these impressions gradually fade out, as does every fleeting shadow that has no basic or substantial reality underlying it. The retentive faculty

* [Published here in correct chronological sequence, though originally appearing as an “Appendix” to the *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge*, Part I, pp. 49-64.—*Compiler*.]

† The word dream means really “to slumber”—the latter function being called in Russian “*dremat*”—ED.

of the brain, however, may register and preserve them if they are only impressed strongly enough. But, as a rule, our memory registers only the fugitive and distorted impressions

which the brain receives at the moment of awakening. This aspect of “dreams” however, has been sufficiently observed and is described correctly enough in modern physiological and biological works, as such human dreams do not differ much from those of the animals. That which is entirely *terra incognita* for Science is the real dreams and experiences of the higher EGO, which are also called dreams, but ought not to be so termed, or else the term for the other sleeping “visions” changed.

Q. How do these differ?

A. The nature and functions of real dreams cannot be understood unless we admit the existence of an immortal Ego in mortal man, independent of the physical body, for the subject becomes quite unintelligible unless we believe—that which is a fact—that during sleep there remains only an animated form of clay, whose powers of independent thinking are utterly paralyzed.

But if we admit the existence of a higher or permanent *Ego* in us—which Ego must not be confused with what we call the “Higher Self,” we can comprehend that what we often regard as dreams, generally accepted as idle fancies, are, in truth, stray pages torn out from the life and experiences of the *inner* man, and the dim recollection of which at the moment of awakening becomes more or less distorted by our physical memory. The latter catches mechanically a few impressions of the thoughts, facts witnessed, and deeds performed by the *inner* man during its hours of complete freedom. For our *Ego* lives its own separate life within its prison of clay whenever it becomes free from the trammels of matter, i.e., during the sleep of the physical man. This Ego it is which is the actor, the real man, the true human self. But the physical man cannot feel or be conscious during dreams; for the personality, the outer man, with its brain and thinking apparatus, are paralyzed more or less completely.

We might well compare the real Ego to a prisoner, and the physical personality to the jailer of his prison. If

the jailer falls asleep, the prisoner escapes, or, at least, passes outside the walls of his prison. The jailer is half asleep, and looks, nodding all the time, out of a window, through which he can catch only occasional glimpses of his prisoner, as he would a kind of shadow moving in front of it. But what can he perceive, and what can he know of the real actions, and especially the thoughts, of his charge?

Q. Do not the thoughts of the one impress themselves upon the other?

A. Not during sleep, at all events; for the real Ego does not think as his evanescent and temporary personality does. During the waking hours the thoughts and Voice of the Higher Ego do or do not reach his jailer—the physical man, for they are the *Voice of his Conscience*, but during his sleep they are absolutely the “Voice in the desert.” In the thoughts of the *real* man, or the immortal “Individuality,” the pictures and visions of the Past and Future are as the Present; nor are his thoughts like ours, subjective pictures in our cerebration, but living acts and deeds, present actualities. They are realities, even as they

were when speech expressed in sounds did not exist; when thoughts were things, and men did not need to express them in speeches, for they instantly realised themselves in action by the power of *Kriya-@akti*, that mysterious power which transforms instantaneously ideas into visible forms, and these were as objective to the “man” of the early *third Race* as objects of sight are now to us.

Q. How, then, does Esoteric Philosophy account for the transmission of even a few fragments of those thoughts of the Ego to our physical memory which it sometimes retains?

A. All such are reflected on the brain of the sleeper like outside shadows on the canvas walls of a tent, which the occupier sees as he wakes. Then the man thinks that he has dreamed all that, and feels as though *he* had lived through something, while in reality it is the *thought-actions* of the true Ego which he has dimly perceived. As he becomes fully awake, his recollections become with every minute more distorted, and mingle with the images

projected from the physical brain, under the action of the stimulus which causes the sleeper to awaken. These recollections, by the power of association, set in motion various trains of ideas.

Q. It is difficult to see how the Ego can be acting during the night things which have taken place long ago. Was it not stated that dreams are not subjective?

A. How can they be subjective when the dream state is itself for us, and on our plane, at any rate, a subjective one? To the dreamer (the Ego), on his own plane, the things on that plane are as objective to him as our acts are to us.

Q. What are the senses which act in dreams?

A. The senses of the sleeper receive occasional shocks, and are awakened into mechanical action; what he hears and sees are, as has been said, a distorted reflection of the thoughts of the Ego. The latter is highly spiritual, and is linked very closely with the higher principles, *Buddhi* and *Atma*. These higher principles are entirely inactive on our plane, and the higher Ego (*Manas*) itself is more or less dormant during the waking of the physical man. This is especially the case with persons of very materialistic mind. So dormant are the Spiritual faculties, because the Ego is so trammelled by matter, that *It* can hardly give all its attention to the man's actions, even should the latter commit sins for which that Ego—when reunited with its *lower Manas*—will have to suffer conjointly in the future. It is, as I said, the impressions projected into the physical man by this Ego which constitute what we call “conscience”; and in proportion as the Personality, the lower Soul (or *Manas*), unites itself to its higher consciousness, or EGO, does the action of the latter upon the life of mortal man become more marked.

Q. This Ego, then, is the “Higher Ego”?

A. Yes; it is the higher *Manas* illuminated by *Buddhi*; the principle of self-consciousness, the “I-am-I,” in short. It is the *Karana-@arira*, the immortal man, which passes from one incarnation to another.

Q. Is the “register” or “tablet of memory” for the true dream-state different from that of waking life?

250

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

A. Since dreams are in reality the actions of the Ego during physical sleep, they are, of course, recorded on their own plane and produce their appropriate effects on this one. But it must be always remembered that dreams in general, and as we know them, are simply our waking and hazy recollections of these facts.

It often happens, indeed, that we have no recollection of having dreamt at all, but later in the day the remembrance of the dream will suddenly flash upon us. Of this there are many causes. It is analogous to what sometimes happens to every one of us. Often a sensation, a smell, even a casual noise or a sound, brings instantaneously to our mind long-forgotten events, scenes and persons. Something of what was seen, done, or thought by the “night-performer,” the Ego, impressed itself at that time on the physical brain, but was not brought into the conscious, waking memory, owing to some physical condition or obstacle. This impression is registered on the brain in its appropriate cell or nerve centre, but owing to some accidental circumstance it “hangs fire,” so to say, till something gives it the needed impulse. Then the brain slips it off immediately into the conscious memory of the waking man; for as soon as the conditions required are supplied, that particular centre starts forthwith into activity, and does the work which it had to do, but was hindered at the time from completing.

Q. How does this process take place?

A. There is a sort of conscious telegraphic communication going on incessantly, day and night, between the physical brain and the inner man. The brain is such a complex thing, both physically and metaphysically, that it is like a tree whose bark you can remove layer by layer, each layer being different from all the others and each having its own special work, function, and properties.

Q. What distinguishes the “dreaming” memory and imagination from those of waking consciousness?

A. During sleep the physical memory and imagination are of course passive, because the dreamer is asleep:

DREAMS

251

his brain is asleep, his memory is asleep, all his functions are dormant and at rest. It is only when they are stimulated, as I told you, that they are aroused. Thus the consciousness of the sleeper is not active, but passive. The inner man, however, the real Ego, acts independently during the sleep of the body; but it is doubtful if any of us—unless

thoroughly acquainted with the physiology of occultism—could understand the nature of its action.

Q. What relation have the Astral Light and Akâsa to memory?

A. The former is the “tablet of the memory” of the animal man, the latter of the spiritual Ego. The “dreams” of the Ego, as much as the acts of the physical man, are all recorded, since both are actions based on causes and producing results. Our “dreams” being simply the waking state and actions of the true Self, must be, of course, recorded somewhere. Read “Karmic Visions” in *Lucifer*,* and note the description of the real Ego, sitting as a spectator of the life of the hero, and perhaps something will strike you.

Q. What, in reality, is the Astral Light?

A. As the Esoteric Philosophy teaches us, the *Astral Light* is simply the dregs of *Akâsa* or the Universal Ideation in its metaphysical sense. Though invisible, it is yet, so to speak, the phosphorescent radiation of the latter, and is the medium between it and man’s thought-faculties. It is these which pollute the Astral Light, and make it what it is—the storehouse of all human and especially psychic iniquities. In its primordial genesis, the astral light as a radiation is quite pure, though the lower it descends approaching our terrestrial sphere, the more it differentiates, and becomes as a result impure in its very constitution. But man helps considerably in this pollution, and gives it back its essence far worse than when he received it.

* [Vol. II, No. 10, June, 1888, pp. 311-22. Incorporated into Vol. IX of the present Series, in its correct chronological sequence.—*Compiler*.]

Q. Can you explain to us how it is related to man, and its action in dream-life?

A. Differentiation in the physical world is infinite. Universal Ideation—or *Mahat*, if you like it—sends its homogeneous radiation into the heterogeneous world, and this reaches the human or *personal* minds through the Astral Light.

Q. But do not our minds receive their illuminations direct from the higher Manas through the Lower? And is not the former the pure emanation of divine Ideation—the “Manasa-Putras,” which incarnated in men?

A. They are. Individual *Manasa-Putras* or the Kumaras are the direct radiations of the divine Ideation—“individual” in the sense of later differentiation owing to numberless incarnations. In sum they are the collective aggregation of that Ideation, become on our plane, or from our point of view, *Mahat*, as the Dhyan Chohans are in their aggregate the WORD or “Logos” in the formation of the World. Were the Personalities (Lower Manas or the *Physical* minds) to be inspired and illumined solely by their higher *alter Egos* there would be little sin in this world. But they are not; and getting entangled in the meshes of the Astral Light, they separate themselves more and more from their parent Egos. Read and study what Éliphas Lévi says of the Astral Light, which he calls Satan and the Great

Serpent. The Astral Light has been taken too literally to mean some sort of a second blue sky. This imaginary space, however, on which are impressed the countless images of all that ever was, is, and will be, is but a too sad reality. It becomes in, and for, man—if at all psychic—and who is not?—a tempting Demon, his “evil angel,” and the inspirer of all our worst deeds. It acts on the will of even the sleeping man, through visions impressed upon his slumbering brain (which visions must not be confused, with the “dreams”), and these germs bear their fruit when he awakes.

Q. What is the part played by Will in dreams?

A. The will of the outer man, our volition, is of course dormant and inactive during dreams; but a

DREAMS

253

certain bent can be given to the slumbering will during its inactivity, and certain after-results developed by the mutual inter-action—produced almost mechanically—through union between two or more “principles” into one, so that they will act in perfect harmony, without any friction or a single false note, when awake. But this is one of the dodges of “black magic,” and when used for good purposes belongs to the training of an Occultist. One must be far advanced on the “path” to have a will which can act consciously during his physical sleep, or act on the will of another person during the sleep of the latter, *e.g.*, to control his dreams, and thus control his actions when awake.

Q. We are taught that a man can unite all his “principles” into one—what does this mean?

A. When an adept succeeds in doing this he is a *Jivanmukta*: he is no more of this earth virtually, and becomes a Nirvanee, who can go into *Samadhi* at will. Adepts are generally classed by the number of “principles” they have under their perfect control, for that which we call will has its seat in the higher EGO, and the latter, when it is rid of its sin-laden personality, is divine and pure.

Q. What part does Karma play in dreams? In India they say that every man receives the reward or punishment of all his acts, both in the waking and the dream state.

A. If they say so, it is because they have preserved in all their purity and remembered the traditions of their forefathers. They know that the Self is the *real* Ego, and that it lives and acts, though on a different plane. The external life is a “dream” to this Ego, while the inner life, or the life on what we call the dream plane, is the real life for it. And so the Hindus (the profane, of course) say that Karma is generous, and rewards the real man in dreams as well as it does the false personality in physical life.

Q. What is the difference, “karmically,” between the two?

A. The physical animal man is as little responsible as a dog or a mouse. For the bodily form all is over with the death of the body. But the real SELF, that which

emanated its own shadow, or the lower thinking personality, that enacted and pulled the wires during the life of the physical automaton, will have to suffer conjointly with its *factotum and alter ego* in its next incarnation.

Q. But the two, the higher and the lower, Manas are one, are they not?

A. They are, and yet they are not—and that is the great mystery. The Higher Manas or EGO is essentially divine, and therefore pure; no stain can pollute it, as no punishment can reach it, *per se*, the more so since it is innocent of, and takes no part in, the deliberate transactions of its Lower Ego. Yet by the very fact that, though dual and during life the Higher is distinct from the Lower, “the Father and Son” *are one*, and because that in reuniting with the parent Ego, the Lower Soul fastens upon and impresses upon it all its bad as well as good actions—both have to suffer, the Higher Ego, though innocent and without blemish, has to bear the punishment of the misdeeds committed by the *lower Self* together with it in their future incarnation. The whole doctrine of atonement is built upon this old esoteric tenet; for the Higher Ego is the antitype* of that which is on this earth the type, namely, the personality. It is, for those who understand it, the old Vedic story of Visvakarman over again, practically demonstrated. Visvakarman, the all-seeing Father-God, who is beyond the comprehension of mortals, ends, as son of Bhuvana, the holy Spirit, by *sacrificing himself to himself*, to save the worlds. The mystic name of the “Higher Ego” is, in the Indian philosophy, *Kshetrajñā*, or “embodied Spirit,” that which knows or informs *Kshetra* “the body.” Etymologize the name, and you will find in it the term *aja*, “first-born,” and also the “lamb.” All this is very suggestive, and volumes might be written upon the pregenetic and postgenetic development of type and antitype*—of

* [Considering the highly metaphysical nature of the teaching involved, this word could be used here in the sense of “prototype,” and would then be spelled “antitype.” We leave it unaltered, as the meaning is somewhat uncertain.—*Compiler*.]

Christ-*Kshetrajñā*, the “God-Man,” the First-born, symbolized as the “lamb.” *The Secret Doctrine* shows that the Manasa-Putras or incarnating EGOS have taken upon themselves, voluntarily and knowingly, the burden of all the future sins of their future personalities. Thence it is easy to see that it is neither Mr. A. nor Mr. B., nor any of the personalities that periodically clothe the Self-Sacrificing EGO, which are the real Sufferers, but verily the innocent *Christos* within us. Hence the mystic Hindus say that Eternal Self; or the Ego (the one in three and three in one), is the “Charioteer” or driver; the personalities are the temporary and evanescent passengers; while the horses are the animal passions of man. It is, then, true to say that when we remain deaf to the Voice of our Conscience, we crucify

the Christos within us. But let us return to dreams.

Q. Are so-called prophetic dreams a sign that the dreamer has strong clairvoyant faculties?

A. It may be said, in the case of persons who have truly prophetic dreams, that it is because their physical brains and memory are in closer relation and sympathy with their "Higher Ego" than in the generality of men. The Ego-Self has more facilities for impressing upon the physical shell and memory that which is of importance to such persons than it has in the case of other less gifted persons. Remember that the only God man comes in contact with is his own God, called Spirit, Soul and Mind, or Consciousness, and these three are one.

But they are weeds that must be destroyed in order that a plant may grow. We must die, said St. Paul, that we may live again. It is through destruction that we may improve, and the three powers, the preserving, the creating and the destroying, are only so many aspects of the divine spark within man.

Q. Do Adepts dream?

A. No advanced Adept dreams. An adept is one who has obtained mastery over his four lower principles, including his body, and does not, therefore, let flesh have its own way. He simply paralyzes his lower Self during Sleep, and becomes perfectly free. A dream, as

we understand it, is an illusion. Shall an adept, then, dream when he has rid himself of every other illusion? In his sleep he simply lives on another and more real plane.

Q. Are there people who have never dreamed?

A. There is no such man in the world so far as I am aware. All dream more or less; only with most, dreams vanish suddenly upon waking. This depends on the more or less receptive condition of the brain ganglia. Unspiritual men, and those who do not exercise their imaginative faculties, or those whom manual labour has exhausted, so that the ganglia do not act even mechanically during rest, dream rarely, if ever, with any coherence.

Q. What is the difference between the dreams of men and those of beasts?

A. The dream state is common not only to all men, but also to all animals, of course, from the highest mammalia to the smallest birds, and even insects. Every being endowed with a physical brain, or organs approximating thereto, must dream. Every animal, large or small, has, more or less, physical senses; and though these senses are dulled during sleep, memory will still, so to say, act mechanically, reproducing past sensations. That dogs and horses and cattle dream we all know, and so also do canaries, but such dreams are, I think, merely physiological. Like the last embers of a dying fire, with its spasmodic flare and occasional flames, so acts the brain in falling asleep. Dreams are not, as Dryden says, "interludes which fancy makes," for such can only refer to physiological dreams provoked by indigestion, or some idea or event which has impressed itself upon the active brain during waking hours.

Q. What, then, is the process of going to sleep?

A. This is partially explained by Physiology. It is said by Occultism to be the periodical and regulated exhaustion of the nervous centres, and especially of the sensory ganglia of the brain, which refuse to act any longer on this plane, and, if they would not become unfit for work, are compelled to recuperate their strength on another plane or *Upadhi*. First comes the *Svapna*, or

dreaming state, and this leads to that of *Sushupti*. Now it must be remembered that our senses are all dual, and act according to the plane of consciousness on which the thinking entity energises. Physical sleep affords the greatest facility for its action on the various planes; at the same time it is a necessity, in order that the senses may recuperate and obtain a new lease of life for the *Jagrata*, or waking state, from the *Svapna* and *Sushupti*. According to *Raj Yoga*, *Turya* is the highest state. As a man exhausted by one state of the life fluid seeks another; as, for example, when exhausted by the hot air he refreshes himself with cool water; so sleep is the shady nook in the sunlit valley of life. Sleep is a sign that waking life has become too strong for the physical organism, and that the force of the life current must be broken by changing the waking for the sleeping state. Ask a good clairvoyant to describe the aura of a person just refreshed by sleep, and that of another just before going to sleep. The former will be seen bathed in rhythmical vibrations of life currents—golden, blue, and rosy; these are the electrical waves of Life. The latter is, as it were, in a mist of intense golden-orange hue, composed of atoms whirling with an almost incredible spasmodic rapidity, showing that the person begins to be too strongly saturated with Life; the life essence is too strong for his physical organs, and he must seek relief in the shadowy side of that essence, which side is the dream element, or physical sleep, one of the states of consciousness.

Q. But what is a dream?

A. That depends on the meaning of the term. You may “dream,” or, as we say, sleep visions, awake or asleep. If the Astral Light is collected in a cup or metal vessel by will-power, and the eyes fixed on some point in it with a strong will to see, a waking vision or “dream” is the result, if the person is at all sensitive. The reflections in the Astral Light are seen better with closed eyes, and, in sleep, still more distinctly. From a lucid state, vision becomes translucent; from normal organic consciousness it rises to a transcendental state of consciousness.

Q. To what causes are dreams chiefly due?

A. There are many kinds of dreams, as we all know. Leaving the “digestion dream”

aside, there are brain dreams and memory dreams, mechanical and conscious visions. Dreams of warning and premonition require the active co-operation of the inner Ego. They are also often due to the conscious or unconscious co-operation of the brains of two living persons, or of their two Egos.

Q. What is it that dreams, then?

A. Generally the physical brain of the personal Ego, the seat of memory, radiating and throwing off sparks like the dying embers of a fire. The memory of the Sleeper is like an Æolian seven-stringed harp; and his state of mind may be compared to the wind that sweeps over the chords. The corresponding string of the harp will respond to that one of the seven states of mental activity in which the sleeper was before falling asleep. If it is a gentle breeze the harp will be affected but little; if a hurricane, the vibrations will be proportionately powerful. If the personal Ego is in touch with its higher principles and the veils of the higher planes are drawn aside, all is well; if on the contrary it is of a materialistic, animal nature, there will be probably no dreams; or if the memory by chance catch the breath of a "wind" from a higher plane, seeing that it will be impressed through the sensory ganglia of the cerebellum, and not by the direct agency of the spiritual Ego, it will receive pictures and sounds so distorted and inharmonious that even a Devachanic vision would appear a nightmare or grotesque caricature. Therefore there is no simple answer to the question "What is it that dreams," for it depends entirely on each individual what principle will be the chief motor in dreams, and whether they will be remembered or forgotten.

Q. Is the apparent objectivity in a dream really objective or subjective?

A. If it is admitted to be apparent, then of course it is subjective. The question should rather be, to whom or what are the pictures or representations in dreams either objective or subjective? To the physical man, the *dreamer*,



ANNIE BESANT

Photograph taken in London in 1888

all he sees with his eyes shut, and in or through his mind, is of course subjective. But to the *Seer* within the physical dreamer, that Seer himself being subjective to our material senses, all he sees is as objective as he is himself to himself and to others like himself. Materialists will probably laugh, and say that we make of a man a whole family of entities, but this is not so. Occultism teaches that physical man is one, but the thinking man septenary, thinking, acting, feeling, and living on seven different states of being or planes of consciousness, and that for all these states and planes the permanent Ego (not the false personality) has a distinct set of senses.

Q. Can these different senses be distinguished?

A. Not unless you are an Adept or highly-trained Chela, thoroughly acquainted with these different states. Sciences, such as biology, physiology, and even psychology (of the Maudsley, Bain, and Herbert Spencer schools), do not touch on this subject. Science teaches us about the phenomena of volition, sensation, intellect, and instinct, and says that these are all manifested through the nervous centres, the most important of which is our brain. She will speak of the peculiar agent or substance through which these phenomena take place as the vascular and fibrous tissues, and explain their relation to one another, dividing the ganglionic centres into motor, sensory and sympathetic, but will never breathe one word of the mysterious agency of intellect itself, or of the mind and its functions.

Now, it frequently happens that we are conscious and know that we are dreaming; this is a very good proof that man is a multiple being on the thought plane; so that not only is the Ego, or thinking man, Proteus, a multiform, ever-changing entity, but he is also, so to speak, capable of separating himself on the mind or dream plane into two or more entities; and on the plane of illusion which follows us to the threshold of Nirvâna, he is like Ain-Soph talking to Ain-Soph, holding a dialogue with himself and speaking through, about, and to himself. And this is the mystery of the inscrutable Deity in the *Zohar*, as in the Hindu philosophies; it is the same in

the Kabbala, *Puranas*, Vedantic metaphysics, or even in the so-called Christian mystery of the Godhead and Trinity. Man is the microcosm of the macrocosm; the god on earth is built on the pattern of the god in nature. But the universal consciousness of the real Ego transcends a millionfold the self-consciousness of the personal or false Ego.

Q. Is that which is termed "unconscious cerebration" during sleep a mechanical process of the physical brain, or is it a conscious operation of the Ego, the result of which only is impressed on the ordinary consciousness?

A. It is the latter; for is it possible to remember in our conscious state what took place while our brain worked unconsciously? This is apparently a contradiction in terms.

Q. How does it happen that persons who have never seen mountains in nature often see them distinctly in sleep and are able to note their features?

A. Most probably because they have seen pictures of mountains; otherwise it is somebody or something in us which has previously seen them.

Q. What is the cause of that experience in dreams in which the dreamer seems to be ever striving after something, but never attaining it?

A. It is because the physical self and its memory are shut out of the possibility of knowing what the real Ego does. The dreamer only catches faint glimpses of the doings of the Ego, whose actions produce the so-called dream in the physical man, but is unable to follow it consecutively. A delirious patient, on recovery, bears the same relation to the nurse who watched and tended him in his illness as the physical man to his real Ego. The Ego acts as consciously within and without him as the nurse acts in tending and watching over the sick man. But neither the patient after leaving his sick bed, nor the dreamer on awaking, will be able to remember anything except in snatches and glimpses.

Q. How does sleep differ from death?

A. There is an analogy certainly, but a very great difference between the two. In sleep there is a connection, weak though it may be, between the lower

and higher mind of man, and the latter is more or less reflected into the former, however much its rays may be distorted. But once the body is dead, the body of illusion, *Mayavi Rupa*, becomes *Kama Rupa*, or the animal soul, and is left to its own devices. Therefore, there is as much difference between the spook and man as there is between a gross material, animal, but sober mortal, and man incapably drunk and unable to distinguish the most prominent surroundings; between a person shut up in a perfectly dark room and one in a room lighted, however imperfectly, by some light or other.

The lower principles are like wild beasts, and the higher *Manas* is the rational man who tames or subdues them more or less successfully. But once the animal gets free from the master who held it in subjection; no sooner has it ceased to hear his voice and see him than it starts off again to the jungle and its ancient den. It takes, however, some time for an animal to return to its original and natural state, but these lower principles or “spook” return instantly, and no sooner has the higher Triad entered the Devachanic state than the lower Triad rebecomes that which it was from the beginning, a principle endued with purely animal instinct, made happier still by the great change.

Q. What is the condition of the Linga @arira, or plastic body, during dreams?

A. The condition of the Plastic form is to sleep with its body, unless projected by some powerful desire generated in the higher *Manas*. In dreams it plays no active part, but on the contrary is entirely passive, being the involuntarily half-sleepy witness of the experiences through which the higher principles are passing.

Q. Under what circumstances is this wraith seen?

A. Sometimes, in cases of illness or very strong passion on the part of the person seen

or the person who sees; the possibility is mutual. A sick person, especially just before death, is very likely to see in dream, or vision, those whom he loves and is continually thinking of, and so also is a person awake, but intensely thinking of a person who is asleep at the time.

Q. Can a Magician summon such a dreaming entity and have intercourse with it?

A. In black Magic it is no rare thing to evoke the “spirit” of a sleeping person; the sorcerer may then learn from the apparition any secret he chooses, and the sleeper be quite ignorant of what is occurring. Under such circumstances that which appears is the *Mayavi rupa*; but there is always a danger that the memory of the living man will preserve the recollections of the evocation and remember it as a vivid dream. If it is not, however, at a great distance, the Double or *Linga @arira* may be evoked, but this can neither speak nor give information, and there is always the possibility of the sleeper being killed through this forced separation. Many sudden deaths in sleep have thus occurred, and the world been no wiser.

Q. Can there be any connection between a dreamer and an entity in “Kama Loka”?

A. The dreamer of an entity in *Kama Loka* would probably bring upon himself a nightmare, or would run the risk of becoming “possessed” by the “spook” so attracted, if he happened to be a medium, or one who had made himself so passive during his waking hours that even his higher Self is now unable to protect him. This is why the mediumistic state of passivity is so dangerous, and in time renders the Higher Self entirely helpless to aid or even warn the sleeping or entranced person. Passivity paralyzes the connection between the lower and higher principles. It is very rare to find instances of mediums who, while remaining passive *at will*, for the purpose of communicating with some higher intelligence, some *ex-terranous* spirit (not disembodied), will yet preserve sufficiently their personal will so as not to break off all connection with the higher Self.

Q. Can a dreamer be “en rapport” with an entity in Devachan?

A. The only possible means of communicating with Devachanees is during sleep by a dream or vision, or in trance state. No Devachanee can descend into our plane; it is for us—or rather our *inner Self*—to ascend to his.

Q. What is the state of mind of a drunkard during sleep?

A. It is no real sleep, but a heavy stupor; no physical rest, but worse than sleeplessness, and kills the drunkard as quickly. During such stupor, as also during the waking drunken state, everything turns and whirls around in the brain, producing in the imagination and

fancy horrid and grotesque shapes in continual motion and convolutions.

Q. What is the cause of nightmare, and how is it that the dreams of persons suffering from advanced consumption are often pleasant?

A. The cause of the former is simply physiological. A nightmare arises from oppression and difficulty in breathing; and difficulty in breathing will always create such a feeling of oppression and produce a sensation of impending calamity. In the second case, dreams become pleasant because the consumptive grows daily severed from his material body, and more clairvoyant in proportion. As death approaches, the body wastes away and ceases to be an impediment or barrier between the brain of the physical man and his Higher Self.

Q. Is it a good thing to cultivate dreaming?

A. It is by cultivating the power of what is called “dreaming” that clairvoyance is developed.

Q. Are there any means of interpreting dreams—for instance, the interpretations given in dream-books?

A. None but the clairvoyant faculty and the spiritual intuition of the “interpreter.” Every dreaming Ego differs from every other, as our physical bodies do. If everything in the universe has seven keys to its symbolism on the physical plane, how many keys may it not have on higher planes?

Q. Is there any way in which dreams may be classified?

A. We may roughly divide dreams also into seven classes, and subdivide these in turn. Thus, we would divide them into:—

1. Prophetic dreams. These are impressed on our memory by the Higher Self, and are generally plain and clear: either a voice heard or the coming event foreseen.

2. Allegorical dreams, or hazy glimpses of realities caught by the brain and distorted by our fancy. These are generally only half true.

3. Dreams sent by adepts, good or bad, by mesmerisers, or by the thoughts of very powerful minds bent on making us do their will.

4. Retrospective; dreams of events belonging to past incarnations.

5. Warning dreams for others who are unable to be impressed themselves.

6. Confused dreams, the causes of which have been discussed above.

7. Dreams which are mere fancies and chaotic pictures, owing to digestion, some mental trouble, or suchlike external cause.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
June, 1893, and April, 1894

OCCULT VIBRATIONS

A FRAGMENT OF CONVERSATION WITH H.P.B. IN 1888.

[*The Path*, New York, Vol. VIII, June, 1893, pp. 79-81]

The following was written by me at the dictation of H.P.B. in 1888 with the purpose of printing it at that time. But it was not used then, and as I brought it home with me it is now of interest.—W. Q. J.*

Quest.—It has struck me while thinking over the difference between ordinary people and an adept or even a partly developed student, that the rate of vibration of the brain molecules, as well as the coordination of those with the vibrations of the higher brain, may lie at the bottom of the difference and also might explain many other problems.

* [This introductory Note is by William Quan Judge.—*Compiler.*]

H.P.B.—So they do. They make differences and also cause many curious phenomena; and the differences among all persons are greatly due to vibrations of all kinds.

Q.—In reading the article in *The Path* of April, 1886, this idea was again suggested. I open at p. 6, Vol. I. “The Divine Resonance is only the outbreathing of the first sound of the entire Aum. . . . It manifests itself not only as the power which stirs up and animates the particles of the Universe, but also in the evolution and dissolution of man, of the animal and mineral kingdom, and of solar systems. Among the Aryans it was represented in the planetary system by Mercury, who has always been said to govern the intellectual faculties and to be the universal stimulator.” What of this?

H.P.B.—Mercury was always known as the god of secret wisdom. He is Hermes as well as Budha the son of Soma. Speaking of matters on the lower plane, I would call the “Divine Resonance” you read of in *The Path* “vibrations” and the originator, or that which gives the impulse to every kind of phenomena in the astral plane.

Q.—The difference found in human brains and natures must, then, have their root in

differences of vibration?

H.P.B.—Most assuredly so.

Q.—Speaking of mankind as a whole, is it true that all have one key or rate of vibration to which they respond?

H.P.B.—Human beings in general are like so many keys on the piano, each having its own sound, and the combination of which produces other sounds in endless variety. Like inanimate nature they have a keynote from which all the varieties of character and constitution proceed by endless change. Remember what was said in *Isis Unveiled*, at p. xvi, Vol. I, “The universe is the combination of a thousand elements, and yet the expression of a single spirit—a chaos to the sense [physical], a cosmos to the reason” (manas).

Q.—So far this applies generally to nature. Does it explain the difference between the adept and ordinary people?

H.P.B.—Yes. This difference is that an adept may be compared to that one key which contains all the keys in the great harmony of nature. He has the synthesis of all keys in his thoughts, whereas ordinary man has the same key as a basis, but only acts and thinks on one or a few changes of this great key, producing with his brain only a few chords out of the whole great possible harmony.

Q.—Has this something to do with the fact that a disciple may hear the voice of his master through the astral spaces, while another man cannot hear or communicate with the adepts?

H.P.B.—This is because the brain of a chela is attuned by training to the brain of the Master. His vibrations synchronize with those of the Adept, and the untrained brain is not so attuned. So the chela’s brain is abnormal, looking at it from the standpoint of ordinary life, while that of the ordinary man is normal for worldly purposes. The latter person may be compared to those who are colour-blind.

Q.—How am I to understand this?

H.P.B.—What is considered normal from the view of the physician is considered abnormal from the view of occultism, and *vice versa*. The difference between a colour-blind signal man who mistakes the lamps and the adept who sees is that the one takes one colour for another, while the adept sees all the colours in every colour and yet does not confuse them together.

Q.—Has the adept, then, raised his vibrations so as to have them the same as those of nature as a whole?

H.P.B.—Yes; the highest adepts. But there are other adepts who, while vastly in advance of all men, are still unable to vibrate to such a degree.

Q.—Can the adept produce at his will a vibration which will change one colour to another?

H.P.B.—He can produce a sound which will alter a colour. It is the sound which

produces the colour, and not the other or opposite. By correlating the vibrations of a sound in the proper way a new colour is made.

Q.—Is it true that on the astral plane every sound always produces a colour?

H.P.B.—Yes; but these are invisible because not yet correlated by the human brain so as to become visible on the earth plane. Read Galton, who gives experiments with colours and sounds as seen by psychics and sensitives, showing that many sensitive people always see a colour for every sound. The colour-blind man has coming to him the same vibrations as will show red, but not being able to sense these he alters the amount, so to say, and then sees a colour corresponding to the vibrations he can perceive out of the whole quantity. His astral senses may see the true colour, but the physical eye has its own vibrations, and these, being on the outer plane, overcome the others for the time, and the astral man is compelled to report to the brain that it saw correctly. For in each case the outer stimulus is sent to the inner man, who then is forced, as it were, to accept the message and to confirm it for the time so far as it goes. But there are cases where the inner man is able to even then overcome the outer defect and to make the brain see the difference. In many cases of lunacy the confusion among the vibrations of all kinds is so enormous that there is no correlation between the inner and the outer man, and we have then a case of aberration. But even in some of these unfortunate cases the person inside is all the time aware that he is not insane but cannot make himself be understood. Thus often persons are driven really insane by wrong treatment.

Q.—By what manner of vibrations do the elementals make colours and lights of variety?

H.P.B.—That is a question I cannot reply to though it is well known to me. Did I not tell you that secrets might be revealed too soon?

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
June, 1893, and April, 1894

268

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

CONVERSATIONS ON OCCULTISM WITH H.P.B.

[*The Path*, New York, Vol. IX, April, 1894, pp. 17-21]

[The Introductory Note, and various comments throughout this article, which are not in quotation marks, are from the pen of William Quan Judge.]

In 1875, '76, '77, and '78 my intimacy with H.P.B. gave me many opportunities for conversing with her on what we then called "Magic." These useful, and for me very wonderful, occasions came about late at night, and sometimes during the day. I was then in the habit of calling on her in the daytime whenever I could get away from my office. Many times I stayed in her flat for the purpose of hearing as much and seeing as much as I could. Later on, in 1884, I spent many weeks with her in the Rue Notre-Dame-des-Champs in Paris, sitting beside her day after day and evening after evening; later still, in 1888, being with her in London, at Holland Park, I had a few more opportunities.* Some of what she said I publish here for the good of those who can benefit by her words. Certainly no greater practical occultist is known to this century: from that point of view what she said will have a certain useful weight with some.

ON DEVACHAN

This term was not in use at this time. The conversation was about steps on the Path and returning here again. In answer to a question:

"Yes, you have been here and at this before. You were born with this tendency, and in other lives have met these persons [supposed Adept influences], and they are here to see you for that reason."

* [Wm. Q. Judge arrived in Paris on March 25, 1884, on his way to India, and left for Bombay, at the end of June. *Vide* his letters published in *The Word*, Vol. XV, April, 1912, pp. 17-18.—*Compiler*.]

Later, when definite terms had come into use, the question raised was whether or not

all stayed 1500 years in Devachan.

“Well, Judge, you must know well that under the philosophy we don’t all stay there so long. It varies with the character of each. A thoroughly material thinker will emerge sooner than one who is a spiritual philosopher and good. Besides, recollect that all workers for the Lodge, no matter of what degree, are helped out of Devachan if they themselves permit it. Your own idea which you have stated, that 1500 years had not elapsed since you went into Devachan, is correct, and what I tell is what Master himself tells me. So there you are.”

PRECIPITATIONS BY MASTERS

In reply to a question on this she said:

“If you think Master is going to be always precipitating things, you mistake. Yes, He can do it. But most of the precipitations are by chelas who would seem to you almost Masters. I see His orders, and the thoughts and words He wishes used, and I precipitate them in that form; so does * * * and one or two more.”

“Well, what of Their handwritings?”

“Anything you write is your handwriting, but it is not your personal handwriting, generally used and first learned if you assume or adopt some form. Now you know that Masters’ handwritings, peculiar and personal to Themselves, are foreign both as to sound and form—Indian sorts, in fact. So They adopted a form in English, and in that form I precipitate Their messages at Their direction. Why B——almost caught me one day and nearly made a mess of it by shocking me. The message has to be seen in the astral light in *facsimile*, and through that astral matrix I precipitate the whole of it. It’s different, though, if Master sends me the paper and the message already done. That’s why I call these things ‘psychological tricks.’ The sign of an objective wonder seemed to be required, although a moment’s thought will show it is not proof of anything but occult ability.

Many a medium has had precipitations before my miserable self was heard of. But blessed is the one who wants no sign. You have seen plenty of these things. Why do you want to ask me? Can’t you use your brain and intuition? I’ve sampled almost the whole possible range of wonders for you. Let them use their brains and intuition with the known facts and the theories given.”

IF WHITE MAGICIANS ACT, WHAT THEN?

“Look here; here’s a man who wants to know why the Masters don’t interpose at once and save his business. They don’t seem to remember what it means for a Master to use occult force. If you explode gunpowder to split a rock you may knock down a house. There is a law that if a White Magician uses his occult power an equal amount of power may be used by the Black one. Chemists invent powders for explosives and wicked men may use

them. You force yourself into Master's presence and you take the consequences of the immense forces around him playing on yourself. If you are weak in character anywhere, the Black ones will use the disturbance by directing the forces engendered to that spot and may compass your ruin. It is so always. Pass the boundary that hedges in the occult realm, and quick forces, new ones, dreadful ones, must be met. Then if you are not strong you may become a wreck for that life. This is the danger. This is one reason why Masters do not appear and do not act directly very often, but nearly always by intermediate degrees. What do you say—"the dual forces in nature"? Precisely, that's just it; and Theosophists should remember it."

DO MASTERS PUNISH?

"Now I'm not going to tell you all about this. They are just; They embody the Law and Compassion. Do not for an instant imagine that Masters are going to come down on you for your failures and wrongs, if any. Karma looks out for this. Masters' ethics are the highest.

From the standpoint of your question They do not punish. Have I not told you that, much as detractors have cast mud at Them, never will the Masters impose punishment. I cannot see why such a question comes up. Karma will do all the punishing that is necessary."

ABOUT ELEMENTALS

"It's a long time ago now that I told you this part would not be explained. But I can tell you some things. This one that you and Olcott used to call * * * can't see you unless I let him. Now I will impress you upon it or him so that like a photograph he will remember so far. But you can't make it obey you until you know how to get the force directed. I'll send him to you and let him make a bell."

[In a few days after this the proposed sign was given at a distance from her, and a little bell was sounded in the air when I was talking with a person not interested in Theosophy, and when I was three miles away from H.P.B. On next seeing her she asked if * * * had been over and sounded the bell, mentioning the exact day and time.]

"This one has no form in particular, but is more like a revolving mass of air. But it is, all the same, quite definite, as you know from what he has done. There are some classes with forms of their own. The general division into fiery, airy, earthy, and watery is pretty correct, but it will not cover all the classes. There is not a single thing going on about us, no matter what, that elementals are not concerned in, because they constitute a necessary part of nature, just as important as the nerve currents in your body. Why, in storms you should see them, how they move about. Don't you remember what you told me about that lady * * * who saw them change and move about at that opera? It was due to her

tendencies and the general idea underlying the opera.” [It was the opera of Tristan and Isolde, by Wagner.—J.] “In that case, as Isolde is Irish, the whole idea under it aroused a class of elementals peculiar to that island and its

traditions. That’s a queer place, Judge, that Ireland. It is packed full of a singular class of elementals; and, by Jove! I see they even have emigrated in quite large numbers. Sometimes one quite by accident rouses up some ancient system, say from Egypt; that is the explanation of that singular astral noise which you said reminded you of a sistrum being shaken; it was really objective. But, my dear fellow, do you think I will give you a patent elemental extractor?—not yet. Bulwer-Lytton wrote very wisely, for him, on this subject.”

[Riding over in Central Park, New York.] “It is very interesting here. I see a great number of Indians, and also their elementals, just as real as you seem to be. They do not see us; they are all spooks. But look here, Judge, don’t confound the magnetism escaping through your skin with the gentle taps of supposed elementals who want a cigarette.” [In W. 34th street, New York. The first time she spoke to me of elementals particularly, I having asked her about Spiritualism.—J.]

“It is nearly all done by elementals. Now I can make them tap anywhere you like in this room. Select any place you wish.” [I pointed to a hard plaster wall-space free from objects.] “Now ask what you like that can be answered by taps.”

Q. What is my age? *Taps:* the correct number.

Q. How many in my house? *Taps:* right.

Q. How many months have I been in the city? *Taps:* correct.

Q. What number of minutes past the hour by my watch? *Taps:* right.

Q. How many keys on my ring? *Taps:* correct.

H.P.B. “Oh bosh! Let it stop. You won’t get any more, for I have cut it off. Try your best. They have no sense; they got it all out of your own head, even the keys, for you know inside how many keys are on the ring, though you don’t remember; but anyhow I could see into your pocket and count the number, and then that tapper would give the right reply. There’s something better than all that magic nonsense.”

SHE PRECIPITATES IN LONDON

In 1888 I was in London and wanted a paper, with about four sentences written on it in purple ink, which I had left in America. I came down to her room where B. Keightley was,

and, not saying anything, sat down opposite H.P.B. I thought: "If only she would get me back somehow a copy of that paper." She smiled at me, rose, went into her room, came out at once, and in a moment handed me a piece of paper, passing it right in front of Keightley. To my amazement it was a duplicate of my paper, a *facsimile*. I then asked her how she got it, and she replied: "I saw it in your head and the rest was easy. You thought it very clearly. You know it can be done; and it was needed." This was all done in about the time it takes to read these descriptive sentences.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
January, 1889

THE YEAR IS DEAD, LONG LIVE THE YEAR!

277

THE YEAR IS DEAD, LONG LIVE THE YEAR!

DECEMBER, 1888, AND JANUARY, 1889

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 17, January, 1889, pp. 353-359]

LUCIFER sends the best compliments of the season to his friends and subscribers, and wishes them a happy New Year and many returns of the same. In the January issue of 1888, *Lucifer* said: “. . . let no one imagine that it is a mere fancy, the attaching of importance to the birth of the year. The earth passes through its definite phases and man with it; and as a day can be coloured so can a year. The astral life of the earth is young and strong between Christmas and Easter. Those who form their wishes now will have added strength to fulfil them consistently.” He now repeats what was said and adds: Let no one mistake the importance and potency of numbers—as *symbols*. Everything in the Universe was framed according to the eternal proportions and combinations of numbers. “God geometrizes,” and numbers and numerals are the fundamental basis of all systems of mysticism, philosophy, and religion. The respective festivals of the year and their dates were all fixed according to the Sun—the “father of all calendars” and of the Zodiac, or the Sun-god and the twelve great, but still minor gods; and they became subsequently sacred in the cycle of national and tribal religions.

A year ago, it was stated by the editors that 1888 was a dark combination of numbers: it has proved so since. Earthquakes and terrible volcanic eruptions, tidal waves and landslips, cyclones and fires, railway and maritime disasters followed each other in quick succession. Even in point of weather the whole of the past year was an insane year, an unhealthy and uncanny year, which shifted its seasons, played ducks and drakes with the calendar and laughed at the wiseacres who preside over the meteorological stations of the globe. Almost every nation was visited by some dire calamity. Prominent

278

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

among other countries was Germany. It was in 1888 that the Empire reached, virtually, the 18th year of its unification. It was during the fatal combination of the four numbers 8 that it lost two of its Emperors, and planted the seeds of many dire Karmic results.

What has the year 1889 in store for nations, men and theosophy, and what for *Lucifer*?

But it may be wiser to forbear looking into Futurity; still better to pray to the now ruling Hosts of *Numbers* on high, asking them to be lenient to us, poor terrene ciphers. Which shall we choose? With the Jews and the Christian Kabalists, the number of their deity—the God of Abraham and Jacob—is 10, the number of perfection, the ONE in space, or the Sun, astronomically, and the ten Sephiroth, Kabalistically. But the Gods are many; and every December, according to the Japanese, is the month of the *arrival, or descent of the Gods*; therefore there must be a considerable number of deities lurking around us mortals in astral space. The 3rd of January, a day which was, before the time of Clovis, consecrated to the worship of *Isis*—the goddess-patroness of Paris who has now changed her name and become *Ste.-Geneviève*, “she who generates life”—was also set apart as the day on which the deities of Olympus visited their worshippers. The third day of every month was sacred to *Pallas Athene*, the goddess of Wisdom; and January the 4th is the day of Mercury (Hermes, Budha), who is credited with adding brains to the heads of those who are civil to him. December and January are the two months most connected with gods and numbers. Which shall we choose?—we ask again. “This is the question.”

We are in the Winter Solstice, the period at which the Sun entering the sign of Capricornus has already, since December 21st, ceased to advance in the Southern Hemisphere, and, cancer or crablike, begins to move back. It is at this particular time that, every year, he is born, and December 25th was the *day of the birth of the Sun* for those who inhabited the Northern Hemisphere. It is also on December the 25th, Christmas, the day with the Christians on which the “Saviour of the World” was

THE YEAR IS DEAD, LONG LIVE THE YEAR!

279

born, that were born, ages before him, the Persian Mithra, the Egyptian Osiris, the Greek Bacchus, the Phoenician Adonis, the Phrygian Attis. And, while at Memphis the people were shown the image of the god *Day*, taken out of his cradle, the Romans marked December 25th in their calendar as the day *natalis solis invicti*.

Sad derision of human destiny. So many Saviours of the world born unto it, so much and so often propitiated, and yet the world is as miserable—nay, far more wretched now than ever before—as though none of these had ever been born!

January—the *Januarius* dedicated to Janus the God of Time, the ever revolving cycle, the double-faced God—has one face turned to the East, the other to the West; the *Past* and the *Future*! Shall we propitiate and pray to him? Why not? His statue had 12 altars at its feet, symbolising the twelve signs of the Zodiac, the twelve great gods, the twelve months of the solar year and—the twelve Apostles of the Sun-Christ. *Dominus* was the title given to the Sun by the ancients; whence *dies domini, dies solis*, the “Sun-days.” *Puer nobis nascitur dominus dominorum*, sing the Roman Catholics on Christmas day. The statue of Janus-January carried engraved on his right hand the number 300, and on his left, 65, the number of the days in the Solar year; in one hand a sceptre, in the other a key, whence his name *Janitor*, the door-keeper of the Heavens, who opened the gates of the year at its beginning. Old Roman coins represent Janus *bifrons* on one side, and *a ship* on the other.

Have we not the right to see in him the prototype of Peter, the fisherman of the celestial ship, the Janitor of Paradise, to the gates of which he alone holds the keys? Janus presided over the four seasons. Peter presides over the four Evangelists. In Occultism the potency and significance of Numbers and Numerals lie in their right application and permutation. If we have to propitiate any mysterious number at all, we have most decidedly to address Janus-Peter, in his relation to the ONE—the Sun. Now what would be the best thing for *Lucifer* and his staff to ask from the latter for 1889? Our joint wishes are

many, for our course as that of true love, does not run altogether smooth.

Thus addressing the bright luminary in perpetual *abscondito* beyond the eternal fogs of the great city, we might ask him for a little more light and warmth in the coming year than he gave us in the year 1888. We might entreat him at the same time to pour a little light into the no less befogged heads of those who insist on boycotting *Lucifer* under the extraordinary notion that he and Satan are one. Shine more on us, O, Helios, Son of Hyperion! Those on whom thou beamest thy greatest radiance must be, as in the legend of Apollo, good and kind men. Alas, for us. The British Isle will never be transformed, in this our cycle, into the isle of Aea, the habitat of Helios, as of the children of that God and the Oceanide Perseis. Is this the occult reason why our hearts become, with every year, colder and more indifferent to the woes of mankind, and that the very souls of the multitudes seem turning into icicles? We ask thee to shed thy radiance on these poor shivering souls.

Such is *Lucifer's*, our Light-bearer's fervently expressed desire. What may be that of the Theosophical Society in general, and its working members in particular? We would suggest a supplication. Let us ask, Brethren, the Lord on High, the *One* and the *SOLE* (or *Sol*), that he should save us from the impudent distortion of our theosophical teachings. That he should deliver us in 1889 from his pretended priests, the "Solar Adepts" as they dub themselves, and their sun-struck followers, as he delivered us once before; for verily "man is born unto trouble," and our patience is well-nigh exhausted!

But, "wrath killeth the foolish man"; and as we know that "envy slayeth the silly one," for years no attention was paid to our ever increasing parodists. They plagiarized from our books, set up sham schools of magic waylaid seekers after truth by deceiving them with holy names, misused and desecrated the sacred science by using it to get money by various means, such as selling as "magic mirrors" for £15, articles made by common cabinet makers for £1 at most. With them, as with all

charlatans, fortune-tellers, and *self-styled* "Adepts," the sacred science of *Theosophia* had

become when kabalistically read—Dollar-Sophia. To crown all, they ended by offering, in a most generous manner, to furnish all those “awakened” who were “disappointed in Theosophical Mahatmas” with the *genuine* article in the matter of adeptship. Unfortunately the said article was traced in its turn to a poor, irresponsible medium, and something worse; and so that branch of the brood finally disappeared. It vanished one fine morning into thin air leaving its disconsolate disciples thoroughly “awakened” this time, and fully alive to the sad fact, that if they had acquired less than no occult wisdom, their pockets, on the other hand, had been considerably relieved of their weight in pounds and shillings. After their Exodus came a short lull. But now the same is repeated elsewhere.

The long metaphysical articles *borrowed* from *Isis Unveiled*, and *The Theosophist* ceased suddenly to appear in certain Scotch papers. But if they disappeared from Europe, they reappeared in America. In August 1887 the New York *Path* laid its hand heavily on *The Hidden Way Across the Threshold* printed in Boston,* and proceeded to speedily squelch it, as “stolen goods.” As that Journal expresses itself about this pretentious volume, *copied*, not written by its authors—“whatever in it is new, is not true, and whatever is true, is not new; scattered through its six hundred pages, are wholesale thefts from the *Vedas*, *Paracelsus*, *Isis Unveiled*, *The Path*, etc., etc.” This unceremonious appropriation of long paragraphs and entire pages “either verbatim or with unimportant changes,”—from various, mostly theosophical authors—a list of which is given in *The Path* (*Vide* August 1887, pp. 159-160), might be left to its fate, but for the usual trick of our wretched imitators. In the words of the same editor of *The Path*:

* [The author’s name is J. C. Street, A. B. N.; the book was published by Lee & Shepard, Boston, 1887. The italics in the last quote from *The Path* are H. P. B.’s.—*Comp.*]

. . . . The claim is made that it [the book] is inspired by great adepts both living and dead, who have condescended to relent and give out these six hundred pages, with certain restrictions *which prevent their going into any detail or explanation beyond those given by the unfortunate or unprogressed [theosophical] authors from whose writings they [the adepts] have either allowed or directed their humble disciple, Mr. Street, to steal.*

Before the appearance of modern Theosophical literature it was “Spirits” and “Controls” that were ever in the mouths of these folk; now the living “adepts” are served up with every sauce. It is ever and always Adepts here, Hierophants there. And this only since the revival of Theosophy and its spread in America in 1884, note well; after the great soap-bubble conspiracy between Madras and Cambridge against the Theosophical Society had given a new impetus to the movement. Up to that year, Spiritualists, and professional mediums especially, with their “controls” and “guides,” could hardly find words of vituperation strong enough to brand the “adepts” and deride their “supposed powers.” But

since the Herodic “slaughter of the Innocents,” when the S.P.R. turned from the Theosophical to the Spiritualistic phenomena, most of the “dear departed” ones took to their heels. The angels from the “Summer Land” are going out of fashion just now, for Spiritualists begin to know better and to discriminate. But because the “adept” idea, or rather their philosophy, begins to gain ground, this is no reason why pretenders of every description should travesty in their ungrammatical productions the teachings, phraseology, and Sanskrit terms out of theosophical books; or why, again, they should turn round and make people believe that these were given them by other “Hierophants,” in their opinion, far higher, nobler and grander than our teachers.

The great evil of the whole thing is, not that the truths of Theosophy are adopted by these blind teachers, for we should gladly welcome any spread, by whatever means, of ideals so powerful to wean the world from its dire materialism—but that they are so interwoven with misstatements and absurdities that the wheat cannot be winnowed from the chaff, and ridicule, if not worse, is

THE YEAR IS DEAD, LONG LIVE THE YEAR!

283

brought to bear upon a movement which is beginning to exercise an influence, incalculable in its promise of good, upon the tendency of modern thought. How shall men discern good from evil, when they find it in its close embrace? The very words, “Arhat,” “Karma,” “Maya,” “Nirvana,” must turn enquirers from our threshold when they have been taught to associate them with such a teeming mass of ignorance and presumption. But a few years ago, all these Sanskrit terms were unknown to them, and even now they repeat them phonetically, parrot-like, and without any understanding. And yet they will cram them into their silly books and pamphlets, and fill these with denunciations against great men, the soles of whose feet they are unworthy to gaze upon!

Though false coin is the best proof of the existence of genuine gold, yet, the false deceives the unwary. Were the “pretensions” of the T.S. in this direction founded on mere hypothesis and sentimental gush, like the identification of many a materialized spirit, the theosophical “Mahatmas” and their society would have dissolved long ago like smoke in space under the desperate attacks of the holy alliance of Missionaries and *pseudo*-Scientists, helped by the half-hearted and misinformed public. That the Society has not only survived but become thrice stronger in numbers and power, is a good proof again of its own intrinsic merit. Moreover, it has gained also in wisdom; that practical, matter-of-fact wisdom which teaches, through the mouth of the great Christian “Mahatma,” not to scatter pearls before swine, nor to attempt to put new wine into old bottles.

Therefore, let us, in our turn, recite a heartfelt conjuration (the ancient name for prayer), and invoke the help of the powers that be, to deliver us from the painful necessity of exposing those sorry “make-believes” in *Lucifer* once again. Let us ring the theosophical *Angelus* thrice for the convocation of our theosophical friends and readers. If we would draw on us the attention of *Sol* on High, we must repeat that which the ancients did and

which was the origin of the R.C. *Angelus*. The first stroke of the bell announced the *coming of Day*; the

appearance of *Gabriel*, the morning messenger, with the early Christians, of *Lucifer*, the morning star, with their predecessors. The second bell, at noon, saluted the glory and exalted position of the *Sun*, King of Heavens; and the third bell announced the approach of *Night*, the Mother of Day, the Virgin, Isis-Mary, or the Moon. Having accomplished the prescribed duty, we pour our complaint and say:—

Turn thy flaming eye, O SOL, thou, golden-haired God, on certain trans-atlantic mediums, who play at being thine Hierophants! Behold, they whose brain is not fit to drink of the cup of wisdom, but who, mounting the quack's platform, and offering for sale bottled-up wisdom, and the *homunculi* of Paracelsus, assure those of the gaping mouths that it is the true Elixir of *Amrita*, the water of immortal life! Oh, bright Lord, is not thine eye upon those barefaced robbers and iconoclasts of the systems of the land whence thou risest? Hear their proud boasting: "We teach men the science to *make man*"(!). The lucrative trade of vendors of Japanese amulets and *Taro* cards, with indecent double bottoms, having been cut off in its full blossom in Europe, the Eastern Wisdom of the Ages is now abandoned. According to their declarations, China, Japan, old India and even the Swedenborgian "land of the Lost Word" have suddenly become barren; they yield no more their crop of true adepts; it is America, they say, the land of the Almighty Dollar, which has suddenly opened her bowels and given birth to full-blown Hierophants, who now beckon to the "Awakened." *Mirabile dictu!* But if so, why should thy self-styled priests, O great SUN, still offer as a bait a mysterious *Dwija*, a "twice born," who can only be the product of the land of Manu? And why should those pretended and bumptious servants of thine, oh Sûrya-Vikartana, whose rich crop of national adepts, *if* "home-made," must rejoice as a natural rule in purely Anglo-Saxon and Celto-German names, still change their Irish patronymics for those of a country which, they say, is effete and sterile, and whose nations are "dying out"? Has another Hindu name and names been discovered in the Great

"THE EMPTY VESSEL MAKES THE GREATEST SOUND"

285

Hub, as a peg and pegs whereon to hang the modest pretensions of the Solar Magi? Yea, they belie truth, O Lord, and they bend their tongues like quill pens for lies. But—"the false prophets shall become wind, for the word *is not* in them."

TO DARE, TO WILL, TO ACHIEVE AND KEEP SILENT is the motto of the true Occultist, from the first adept of our fifth Race down to the last Rosecroix. True Occultism, *i.e.*,

genuine *Raj-Yoga* powers, are not pompously boasted of, and advertised in “Dailies” and monthlies, like Beecham’s pills or Pears’ soap. “Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes; for the wise man feareth *and keeps silent* but the fool layeth open his folly.”

Let us close by expressing a hope that our Theosophist brothers and sisters in America will pause and think before they risk going into a “Solar” fire. Above all, let them bear in mind that true occult knowledge can never be bought. He who has anything to teach, unless like Peter to Simon he says to him who offers him money for his knowledge—“Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of (*our inner*) God may be purchased with money”—is either a black magician or an IMPOSTOR. Such is the first lesson taught by *Lucifer* to his readers in 1889.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
January, 1889

**“THE EMPTY VESSEL MAKES
THE GREATEST SOUND”**

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 17, January, 1889, pp. 436-437]

Miss Susie C. Clark, of Cambridgeport, Mass., says in substance:

“I am a mental healer . . . Of late rumours reach me of prominent theosophists who are confirmed invalids, of others who use quinine for ailments, not scorning to lean on the arm of the servant—matter—when the infinite resources of the Master (Spirit) are at their command.

286

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

Even *Lucifer* countenances the use of mineral and other remedies. If the ‘Truth maketh free,’ why not free from all physical bondage? Why are we, on the lower rounds of the ladder, freer than those who have climbed higher? I have been raised from invalidism to immaculate health.” She then goes on to ask us for our views on what she calls “metaphysical thought” in America, and wishes us to exclude what is known there as “Christian science,” on the ground that it “has not yet grown to recognise or to hold to proper conceptions of the Wisdom Religion.”

ANSWER. This reply is not exhaustive of the subject but will cover the inquiry. We cannot give the “views” asked for, since it is not clear what is wanted. The correspondent speaks of “metaphysical thought” evidently meaning the strained use made in America of the term. As we do not wish to pronounce on this without experience on the spot, the writer’s wish cannot be gratified. But we cannot help noticing that she claims for her branch of this so-called “Science” a pre-eminence over a rival in the field, namely “Christian Science,” the latter being the same as the other however, except that it is more or less closely attached to Christianity. As our correspondent infers that because she has been cured “the infinite resources of the Master are at her command,” those resources and that Master (or Spirit) could easily show her that Christian science is just as good as her own.

We know little of either, except, perhaps, that both show an arrogance in their supposed superiority over Science, Theosophy, and everything else in creation with results that do not seem to us proportionate with the loud claims made. We have received,

however, a letter from a prominent Christian Scientist who is as distinguished a metaphysician as she is a valuable and good a theosophist; and we mean to treat of it at length in our next number. Meanwhile, we must reply a few words to Miss S. Clark's queries.

The main question with her is, why do prominent, or any, theosophists use medicine for cure of disease? We think all theosophists have the right to do so or not, as theosophy is not a system of diet, or that which is simply to help our bodies, but is a metaphysical and ethical system intended to bring about among men a right thought to be followed by action. There are deep questions involved in the matter: deeper than our correspondent will solve in one life. We have no objections against anyone getting cured in any way they think good, but we have decided objections to “mind-curers” or “metaphysicians,” taking theosophists to task for not adopting their system and at once discarding all remedies. They argue that because they were thus cured, others must go the same road. This is our present difference with mental healers, and our correspondent should know that theosophists grant to all the right to use or dispense with medicine and claim for themselves similar privileges. They do not meddle with other persons' liberty of thought, and demand the same independence for themselves.

Evidently Miss Clark has not reflected that “prominent theosophists” use medicine because of some bearings of Karma upon their lives and on account of its occult properties; nor has she, apparently, thought of what is called “delayed Karma”; nor that, perhaps, through too much attention to her body she is reaping a temporary enjoyment now, for which, in subsequent lives, she will have to pay; nor that again, by using her mind so strangely to cure her body she may have removed her infirmities from the plane of matter to that of the mind; the first effects of which we can trace dimly in her strictures on “Christian Science,” as she has acquired a slant, as it were, against the latter and in favour of her own, and a tone of lofty superiority with the Theosophists.

The claim that “the infinite resources of the Master” are within our present reach is not tenable, and the use of the text, “Truth shall make us free,” to show freedom from ills is not permissible. At any rate, *truth* does not

seem to have made *all* mental Scientists free from conceit and prejudice. The man who uttered the words had, himself, a certain infirmity, and we think freedom of mind and soul is meant only. The acceptance of Truth and the practice of virtue cannot avert Karma waiting from other lives, but can produce good effects in lives to come, and what the

extreme practice of mental curing does is to stave off for a time an amount of Karma which will, later on, reach us. We prefer to let it work out naturally through the material part of us and to expel it quickly if we may with even mineral remedies. But for all that we have no quarrel with mental healing at all, but leave each one to his or her own judgment.

Finally we would say that whenever it shall be proved to us and the world in general that among all the hosts of Mental curers, Mind healers, Christian Scientists, *et hoc genus omne*, there is even a large *majority* in *perfect bodily health*, instead of as at present only a minority, though a noisy and boastful one—then will we admit the justice of the arrogant claims made by our correspondent.

Cures—real, undeniable cures have been effected at Lourdes also, but is that any reason why we should all become Roman Catholics?

“When you begin with so much pomp and show,
Why is the end so little and so low?”

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
January, 1889

LODGES OF MAGIC

289

LODGES OF MAGIC

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 17, January, 1889, pp. 437-438]

MADAM,

I have only two remarks on your notes to my letter published in the December Number of *Lucifer*.—(1) I do not “hope” to see spooks by the help of the Theosophical Society. My baser part sometimes desires manifestation, but I recognize such desire to be impure. I earnestly trust no Member of the Society will ever indulge in the evocation of phenomena, whether for curiosity, or for the gratification of the intellect.

(2) I asked if the worship of the One God in spirit and in truth was the aim of the Society. You reply with the motto of the Society. But your real answer appears to be in the opening article of the Magazine on Denunciation.

I candidly think the formation of the Society was a mistake. Not a mistake in motive, but a mistake in generalship. The speed of the slowest ship marks the rate of progress of a fleet. The weak ones of the Society mark its position in the world. But if the Society has only helped *one* brother to right living, then it has done much to justify its existence, and I have naught to say.

My real reason in again addressing you is to call your attention to a Novel written by A. de Grasse Stevens.* At page 141 is a reference to yourself as a Russian spy who was ejected from India by Lord Dufferin.

I have never before seen this curious slander in print, and, although you may consider it beneath contempt, I think it a pity to allow it altogether to escape notice.

The reprehensible conduct of the Publishers in allowing an Author to libel a living person, and that person a woman, is such that I do not care to express my opinion on paper more fully than in this letter.

I am, your most *faithful* servant,

A. E.

* [Entitled: *Miss Hildreth*.]

REPLY

The Theosophical Society has “helped “ many and many of its “brothers” to “right living”—and this is its proudest boast.

I thank our Correspondent for his kind remarks about me. With regard to publishers in general, their “reprehensible conduct” may perhaps find an excuse in the great law of the “struggle for life”; this species having always been known to feed and thrive on the carrion of murdered reputations. As to the authoress of this would-be politico-social novel, a rather *green* than young American, it is said, her exceptional claim to distinction from other trans-Atlantic writers of her sex, would seem to be an intimate acquaintance with the lobby and the back stairs of politics.

Apart from the half-dozen living people whose reputations she slaughters on a single page, what this political Amazon invents is that:—

“. . . Mme. Blavatsky, for many years carried on a secret correspondence with Monsieur Zinovief [?!], chief of the Asiatic Department,” and that “but *for Lord Dufferin’s clear-sightedness* Madame might still be carrying on her patriotic work”—presumably in India.

LIES from the first word to the last. I never knew a “Monsieur Zinovief,” nor corresponded with one at any time. I *defy* any government in the world to produce the slightest evidence, *even inferential*, that I have ever been a spy, or corresponded *secretly* with any Russian authority. As to Lord Dufferin he reached India only after I left it. As I have answered fully the infamous libel in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of January 3, I hope the public will leave this fresh lie to share the fate of the many that preceded it—in the waste-paper basket of literature.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
January, 1889

ARE ALL RUSSIAN LADIES RUSSIAN AGENTS?

291

ARE ALL RUSSIAN LADIES RUSSIAN AGENTS?

WHAT MADAME BLAVATSKY HAS TO SAY

[*Pall Mall Gazette*, London, Vol. XLIX, January 3, 1889, p. 7] *

A certain young lady, by name A. de Grasse Stevens, has excited no small indignation in the Russian camp by putting into literary form in her novel, *Miss Hildreth*, the popular delusion as to the political machinations of all Russian ladies who may happen to find themselves outside the frontier of their own country. This indiscreet young lady in the first volume of her novel makes Count Melikoff address the following remarks to Mr. Tremain:

Our agents of the first section are generally well known; as a rule they make no secret of their connection with the Imperial Chancellerie, and they consist of both sexes and of all classes. Indeed, we find our cleverest work often accomplished by ladies. I need but mention Madame Novikoff, whose influence and power over a certain Premier of England is but a matter of common *on dits*, and who at one time seriously affected the foreign policy of Great Britain. That work accomplished, she has wrought further mischief to her Majesty's Government by encompassing the defection of Dhuleep Singh, and enlisting him under Russia's flag. It is not beside the question, Sir, if, in the future, he does not become a source of trouble to the British authorities at Calcutta. That, Sir, is one woman's work. On the Continent, again, I could point out to you, in almost every city of importance, a like emissary. In Paris there was the charming Princess Lise Troubetskoi, followed now by the Marquis de—— and his fascinating wife, whose hotel is the gathering-place of all the élite, and whose identity is as strictly unknown now as when they first startled all Paris by the magnificence of their entertainments. At Brussels you will find Madame de M——; at Dresden, the Countess de B——; in Switzerland, the Prince A. P.——; and at Rome, the Marquise di P——. Even Egypt is not forgotten, and in the Countess J—— Russia finds an able coadjutor, whose position as lady-in-waiting to the Vice-Queen gains for us many secrets communicated by the British Government to the Khedive. And, even you, Sir,

* [This is the article referred to by H. P. B. in the closing paragraph of "Lodges of Magic," which immediately precedes the present one.—*Compiler*.]

must remember the great noise regarding Madame Blavatsky, who, as the priestess of theosophy, for many years carried on a secret correspondence with M. Zinovieff, then Chief of the Asiatic Department of the Foreign Office, and with Prince Doudaroff Korsakoff, Governor-General of the Caucasus. But for Lord

Dufferin's clear-sightedness, Madame might still be carrying on her patriotic work.

What she says about Madame Novikoff is too utterly absurd to require even a word of disclaimer—it can be passed over in silence—but Madame Blavatsky, who is the other Russian lady named in full, is very indignant, as we stated the other day, and is assured by her lawyers that she is distinctly libelled in the publication, and that no jury on earth, no matter how prejudiced they might be against her as a Russian, and a Theosophist, and the editor of *Lucifer*, could refuse to return a verdict against the novelist.

On applying to Madame Blavatsky, however, for her view of the matter, she replied to us as follows:

“There are only three or four lines which refer to me. The dozen other persons who are lied about in this work of unique fiction are invited to take care of themselves. As for me it is enough for me to answer the four distinct falsehoods and the libel for which the author is responsible on my account alone. These falsehoods are based on no foundation whatever, save perhaps on public gossip and the efforts of those good souls who think that the best way of ‘entertaining people’ is to serve them with slices of freshly murdered reputations. This particular calumny is an ancient three-years-old slander, picked up from the gutters of Anglo-Indian hill stations, and revived to serve a special purpose by one who, unknown to the world the day before, has since made himself famous in the annals of the world’s iniquitous verdicts by playing at the detective on false scents. But if the originator of this vile invention is not the authoress of *Miss Hildreth*, she is still the first one who has had the impudence of recording it in a novel, adding to it, moreover, a flavour of her own venom. It is, therefore, to her that I address the following refutations.

ARE ALL RUSSIAN LADIES RUSSIAN AGENTS?

293

“1. I have never corresponded, whether secretly or openly, with a ‘Monsieur Zinovief’; nor with the General of this name; nor have I ever been accused before to my knowledge of having done so.

“2. I have never written in all my life on politics, of which I know nothing. I take no interest in political intrigues, regarding them as the greatest nuisance and a bore, the most false of all systems in the code of ethics. I feel the sincerest pity for those diplomats who, being honourable men, are nevertheless obliged to deceive all their lives, and to embody a living, walking LIE.

“3. Ten years ago, the Anglo-Indian Government, acting upon a false, malicious insinuation, mistook me for a spy; but after the Police had shadowed me for over eight months—without unearthing a trace of the charge brought against me—it found to its great sorrow that it had made an April-fool of itself. Yet the Anglo-Indian Government acted, after that, in the most honourable way. In November, 1879, Lord Lytton issued an order to the Political Department that Colonel Olcott and myself should be no longer subjected to the insulting surveillance of the Anglo-Indian Police. (Vide the *Allahabad Pioneer*, November 11, 1879.) From that day we were no longer annoyed.

“4. Prince Doudaroff Korsakoff stands probably as the cunning anagram of Prince Dondoukoff-Korsakoff? This gentleman has been a friend of my family and myself since 1846; yet beyond two or three letters exchanged, I have never corresponded with him. It was Mr. Primrose, Lord Lytton’s Secretary, who was the first to write to him, in order to sift to the bottom another *mystery*. The Anglo-Indian Mrs. Grundy had mistaken me for my ‘twin-brother’ apparently, and people wanted to know which of us was drowned in the washtub during our infancy—myself or that ‘twin-brother,’ as in the fancy of the immortal Mark Twain. Hence the correspondence for purposes of identification.

“5. Lord Dufferin’s ‘clear-sightedness’ is no doubt a fact of history. But why endow his Lordship with soothsaying? Doomed by my physicians to certain death unless

I left India (I have their medical certificate), I was leaving Madras for Europe almost on the day of Lord Dufferin’s arrival at Calcutta. But then perhaps Lord Dufferin stands in the novel only cabalistically for Lord Ripon? In such case, as all three Viceroys—from 1879 to 1888—are now in Europe, it is easy to learn the truth, especially from the Marquis of Ripon who remained Viceroy during almost the whole period of my stay in India. Let the Press inquire, from itself or its Secretaries, whether it has been ever proven by any of their respective Governments that I was a political agent whatever may be the malicious society gossip of my enemies. Nor do I feel so certain yet, unless this disgraceful rumour is sufficiently refuted, that I will not appeal directly to the justice and honour of these three noblemen. *Nobless oblige*. The least of beggars has a right to seek redress from law, and to appeal to the evidence of the highest in the land, if that evidence can save his honour and reputation, especially in a case like this, when truth can be made known with one simple word from these high witnesses—a yea or a nay.

“I say it again, Miss de Grasse Stevens and her publishers stand accused of an uncalled for libel. I may or may not be endowed by nature with the potentiality or even the commission of every mortal sin. But it so happens that I have never meddled in politics, am innocent of any knowledge of political intrigues, never bothered myself with this special science at any time of my long life, and that ‘where there is nothing, the King himself loses all rights.’ The ‘spy’ charge was thus at all times a mare’s nest.

“In closing I would offer a bit of advice to my last slanderer. Since the authoress of *Miss Hildreth* seems chronically afflicted with the political microbe, let her try her hand at something she knows more about than subterranean Russia and its agents. Her book is not only libellous, it is absurd and ridiculous. To make Count Melikoff talk in a drawing-room of our ‘little Father’ (read the Tzar!!!) is as correct as it would be to address Miss Stevens au *sérieux* as ‘the great Mother-Squaw’ in

London. Let her turn to the realistic beauties of her native lobbyism for which she seems admirably fitted; otherwise she will soon come to grief.”

Collected Writings VOLUME X

January, 1889

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

[*Lucifer*, Vol. III, No. 17, January, 1889, pp. 359, 431, 435]

Kindly condescending to notice, and even to review (!) our December number of *Lucifer*, the *Saturday Review*, in its issue of December 22nd, 1888, writes as follows in reference to a story called “Accursed,” translated from the Russian:—“. . . there came a thunderstorm and the cross was knocked off by lightning. . . . That same flash knocked off all the letters (of the deceased woman’s name) except the first two of Acsenia, the first two and the fourth of Cuprianovna, and the first three of Sedminska, which spell ‘Accursed.’ ‘This coincidence,’ observes Vera Jelihovsky, the author, ‘was stranger than all!’” “But it was stranger still,” remarks the sagacious critic in the *Saturday Review*. . . . “that the lightning should have spoken English when the defunct sinner was some kind of Pole.”

And this remark, we may say, in our turn, is stranger still. Had the story been originally written in English, it might have necessitated some explanation with regard to such linguistic capacity on the part of the lightning. As the story, however, first appeared in Russian, in the St. Petersburg *Grajdanine*, whence it was translated by us with the author’s permission, it does not require an excessive amount of very ordinary penetration to *guess* that the name had to be changed in order to be adapted to the English word “accursed.” Had we written the word “*proklyata*,” the Russian for “accursed,” the “coincidence” would have had no meaning. The story is half fiction, both in the original and in the translation; but it is based on a true and *historical* fact, as explained at its close. But since the real names had to

be withheld, any names would do in order to set forth the strange and to this day inexplicable fact, which has become since its occurrence one of the prominent legends of the country where it happened.

[The following notes are appended by H. P. B. to her translation of a French letter received from Madame Camille Lemaître on the subject of what Theosophy and the Theosophical Society should be. The first note refers to the Scriptural parable of scattering the seeds and their falling on stony or fertile ground:]

This is just the policy of the T. S. from its beginning. Its visible leaders are unable to always distinguish the good from the bad, to see still dormant evil in the hearts of those who apply to join our Society, and the *real* Founders—those behind the screen—will

denounce or accuse no living man. *All are given a chance.* Gladly would our Society abolish even the small entrance fee, had it any funds, however small, to carry on the work which increases daily, and many branches have already done so. For several years no initiation fees were paid; but our scanty and even joint means were found insufficient to maintain the Headquarters, pay the stationery, and the ever-increasing postage, and feed and lodge all those who volunteered to work *gratis* for theosophy. Thus, the fees were re-established. Other Societies beg for, and are given, large sums of money, but the T. S. never does. Nevertheless, the taunt that the Founders *sell Theosophy*, creating Theosophists *for* £1 or twenty shillings, a head, is being repeatedly thrust into our faces! And yet the poor are never made to pay anything at all. And if those who have the means will refuse to help to do good to the disinherited and the suffering, what are those who have given all they had, and have nothing now to give but their services, to do?

[The closing note has reference to various dangers to which the incautious student is exposed, who is desirous to acquire magical powers:]

It is to preserve Theosophists from such dangers that the “Esoteric Section” of the T.S. has been founded

Its *Preliminary Rules* and Bylaws prove that the way to the acquisition of occult powers and the conquest of the secrets of Nature leads through the Golgotha and the Crucifixion of the personal self. The selfish and the faint-hearted need not apply.

[The translation of Madame Camille Lemaître’s Letter, together with H. P. B.’s comments, was also published in *Theosophical Siftings* (T.P.S.), Vol. II, 1889-90. London: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 7, Duke Street, Adelphi, W.C.]

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
January, February, March, 1889

**TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY
LODGE OF THE
THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY**

[Approximately in March 1890, and again in January 1891, the Theosophical Publishing Society, located at the time at 7, Duke Street, Adelphi, London, published two separate thin volumes under the title, *Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge of The Theosophical Society*, Parts I and II. They were also issued by William Quan Judge, 132 Nassau Street, New York. They contained discussions on some of the Stanzas of the First Volume of *The Secret Doctrine*, during certain meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge in London, when H. P. B. answered some rather abstruse questions regarding the teachings of the Esoteric Philosophy.

Part I deals with the meetings held on January 10, 17, 24 and 31, 1889, at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, when Stanzas I and II were discussed. An Appendix gives under the title of "Dreams" a "Summary of the teachings during several meetings which preceded the Transactions. . .", namely those of December 20 and 27, 1888. This material will be found earlier in the present volume, in its correct chronological order.

Part II deals with the meetings held at the same address on February 7, 14, 21 and 28, and on March 7 and 14, 1889. At these gatherings Stanzas II, III and IV were discussed.

A Prefatory Note states that "the answers in all cases are based on the shorthand Reports, and are those of Esoteric Philosophy as given by H.P.B. herself."

A review of Part I of the *Transactions* (*Lucifer*, London, Vol. VI, April 1890, pp. 173-74) states, among other things, that "enough matter remains for five more numbers on the same subject." This statement may have had reference to the material contained in Part II, and which, at the time when the review was written, had not yet been published.

But what is much more difficult to understand is the fact that the Prefatory Note of *both volumes* or parts of the *Transactions* states that these are compiled "from shorthand notes taken at the meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge of the Theosophical Society, from January 10th to *June 20th*, 1889. . ." (italics ours).

It would appear, therefore, that there were similar meetings held *later* than March 14th, 1889, which is the date of the last printed discussion. Up to the middle of the Summer of 1889, H.P.B. was in London; in July, 1889, she made a trip to France, writing the greater part of *The Voice of the Silence* at Fontainebleau. She then

TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE

299

went to St. Heliers, Jersey, and did not return to London until the middle of August. It is quite probable, therefore, that meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge continued up to the time of her departure for France, and that such meetings consisted of similar discussions to those embodied in the printed *Transactions*.

In November, 1889, prior therefore to the publication of Part I of the *Transactions*, George R.S. Mead, in his capacity of Secretary of the Blavatsky Lodge, published (*Lucifer*, Vol. V, p. 178) a "Notice to Those Interested in the 'Transactions of the Blavatsky Lodge'." It runs as follows:

"The discussions on the first volume of *The Secret Doctrine* which have been reported by a stenographer were of so difficult a nature that much of the substance, as it stands, is entirely useless. The revision and rewording of these reports, which had to be undertaken by one of the busiest of the 17 Lansdowne Road household, is progressing, but it has to be again revised and prepared for press,

and this no one can do but H.P.B.; owing, however, to her multifarious duties the work can progress but slowly. It is to be hoped that the anxiety of our friends will be relieved by the above explanation.”

It is of course evident that a certain portion of the MS. spoken of by Mead consisted of material taken down during the discussions at the meetings of January, February and early March, 1889, later published as *Transactions*, Parts I and II. But as this Notice appeared quite some time *after* the meetings of late March, April, May and June, 1889, it is most probable that he also had before him material pertaining to these later gatherings, especially when we bear in mind what is stated in the Prefatory Note to both volumes.

This is strongly supported by the fact that in *Lucifer*, Vol. VII, October 15th, 1890, p. 165, *i.e.*, after the appearance of Part I, and before the publication of Part II, of the *Transactions*, it is stated that the reports of the *Transactions* “consist of twenty-four large longhand folios, four of which have been already printed.” If *four* of these folios went to make Part I of the *Transactions* (published March, 1890), with or without the essay on “Dreams,” and if Part II (published in January, 1891) was smaller than Part I, it is obvious, of course, that a considerable portion of the twenty-four folios has never been issued in printed form.

As an additional proof of this fact, we should bear in mind the direct statement of Mrs. Alice Leighton Cleather, who, writing her periodical Letter from London, under date of February, 1891, says: “The second part of the ‘Transactions—Blavatsky Lodge,’ is now out, and the third will shortly follow” (*The Theosophist*, Vol. XII, April, 1891, p. 438).

Almost two years after the passing of H.P.B., the Editors of *Lucifer* published in its pages some material from H.P.B.’s pen, under the

general title of “Notes on the Gospel According to John” (Vol. XI, No. 66, February, 1893, pp. 449-56, and Vol. XII, No. 67, March, 1893, pp. 20-30). In a brief Introductory Note to this series in two instalments, George R. S. Mead states that “the following notes formed the basis of discussion at the meetings of the Blavatsky Lodge, in October, 1889. . .” As these “Notes” on St. John’s Gospel quote in one place from G.R.S. Mead’s own translation of the Gnostic *Pistis-Sophia*, namely from the first instalment thereof, published in *Lucifer*, Vol. VI, April, 1890, and actually give this magazine reference in a footnote, it would seem that these “Notes” were worked over and edited either *after* April, 1890, or possibly even after H.P.B.’s passing in May, 1891.

It would appear from the date mentioned by G.R.S. Mead, namely, October, 1889, that these “Notes” formed the basis of discussions at the Blavatsky Lodge *after* H.P.B.’s return from her trip to France. Even if the MS. of this material were to be considered as forming part of the “twenty-four large longhand folios” spoken of before, which is most unlikely, considering the various dates referred to, we still face the fact that some of the material of the *Transactions* is missing for one reason or another, and has most certainly never appeared in print.

As to the authenticity of this entire material, we quote below an important passage from a letter written by William Kingsland, one of the very close associates of H.P.B. in London, to Dr. Henry T. Edge, one of her personal pupils, later of Point Loma, California. The letter is dated from Claremont, The Strand, Ryde, I.W., 7th October, 1931, and the passage is as follows:

“. . . To the best of my recollection H.P.B. was present at every one of these meetings. The “Transactions” were partly compiled from notes taken of the answers at the time; but every one of them were revised by H.P.B. before they were printed. They are not verbatim as given by her at the time. They are in every way authentic as her own answers. . .”

—*Compiler.*]

I

*Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on
January 10th, 1889, at 8:30 p.m., Mr. T.B.
Harbottle in the chair.*

Subject:

**THE STANZAS OF THE SECRET
DOCTRINE—VOL. I**

STANZA I.

Sloka (1). THE ETERNAL PARENT (Space), WRAPPED IN HER EVER INVISIBLE ROBES,
HAD SLUMBERED ONCE AGAIN FOR SEVEN ETERNITIES.

Q. Space in the abstract is explained in the Proem (pp. 8-9) as follows:—

. Absolute Unity cannot pass to infinity; for infinity presupposes the limitless extension of *something*, and the duration of that “something”; and the One All is like Space—which is its only mental and physical representation on this Earth, or our plane of existence—neither an object of, nor a subject to, perception. If one could suppose the Eternal Infinite All, the Omnipresent Unity, instead of being in Eternity, becoming through periodical manifestation a manifold Universe or a multiple personality, that Unity would cease to be one. Locke’s idea that “pure Space is capable of neither resistance nor Motion”—is incorrect. Space is neither a “limitless void,” nor a “conditioned fulness,” but both: being, on the plane of absolute abstraction, the ever-incognisable Deity, which is void only to finite minds, and on that of *mayavic* perception, the Plenum, the absolute Container of all that is, whether manifested or unmanifested; it is, therefore, that ABSOLUTE ALL. There is no difference between the Christian Apostle’s “In Him we live and move and have our being,” and the Hindu Rishi’s, “The Universe lives in, proceeds from, and will return to, Brahma (Brahmâ):” for Brahma (neuter), the unmanifested, is that Universe *in abscondito*, and Brahmâ, the manifested, is the Logos, made male-female in the symbolical orthodox dogmas. The God of the Apostle-Initiate and of the Rishi being both the Unseen and the Visible SPACE. Space is called, in the esoteric symbolism “The Seven-Skinned Eternal Mother-Father.” It is composed from its undifferentiated to its differentiated surface of seven layers.

“What is that which was, is, and will be, whether there is a Universe or not; whether there be gods or none?” asks the esoteric Senzar Catechism. And the answer made is SPACE.*

But why is the Eternal parent, Space, spoken of as feminine? A. Not in all cases, for in the above extract Space is called the “Eternal Mother-Father”; but when it is so spoken of the reason is that though it is impossible to define Parabrahm, yet once that we speak of

that first something which *can* be conceived, it has to be treated of as a feminine principle. In all cosmogonies the first differentiation was considered feminine. It is Mulaprakriti which conceals or veils Parabrahm; Sefhira the *light* that emanates first from Ain-Soph; and in Hesiod it is Gaea who springs from Chaos, preceding Eros (*Theogony*, 201-246). This is repeated in all subsequent and less abstract material creations, as witnessed by Eve, created from the rib of Adam, etc. It is the goddess and goddesses who come first. The first emanation becomes the immaculate Mother from whom proceed all the gods, or the anthropomorphized creative forces. We have to adopt the masculine or the feminine gender, for we cannot use the neuter *it*. From IT, strictly speaking, nothing can proceed, neither a radiation nor an emanation.

Q. Is this first emanation identical with the Egyptian Neith?

A. In reality it is beyond Neith, but in one sense or in a lower aspect it is Neith.

Q. Then the IT itself is not the “Seven-Skinned Eternal Mother-Father”?

A. Assuredly not. The IT is, in the Hindu philosophy, Parabrahm, that which is beyond Brahmâ, or, as it is now called in Europe, the “unknowable.” The space of which we speak is the female aspect of Brahmâ, the male. At the first flutter of differentiation, the Subjective proceeds to emanate, or fall, like a shadow into the Objective, and becomes what was called the Mother Goddess, from whom proceeds the Logos, the Son and Father God at the same time, both unmanifested, one the Potentiality, the other

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, pp. 8-9.

the Potency. But the former must not be confounded with the manifested Logos, also called the “Son” in all cosmogonies.

Q. Is the first differentiation from the absolute IT always feminine?

A. Only as a figure of speech; in strict philosophy it is sexless; but the female aspect is the first it assumes in human conceptions, its subsequent materialisation in any philosophy depending on the degree of the spirituality of the race or nation that produced the system. For instance: in the Kabbala of the Talmudists IT is called AIN-SOPH, the endless, the boundless, the infinite (the attribute being always negative), which *absolute* Principle is yet referred to as *He!!* From it, this negative, Boundless Circle of Infinite Light, emanates the first Sefhira, the Crown, which the Talmudists call “Torah,” the law, explaining that she is the wife of Ain-Soph. This is anthropomorphising the Spiritual with a vengeance.

Q. Is it the same in the Hindu Philosophies?

A. Exactly the opposite. For if we turn to the Hindu cosmogonies, we find that Parabrahm is not even mentioned therein, but only Mulaprakriti. The latter is, so to speak, the lining or aspect of Parabrahm in the invisible universe. Mulaprakriti means the Root of Nature or Matter. But Parabrahm cannot be called the “Root,” for it is the absolute

Rootless Root of all. Therefore, we must begin with Mulaprakriti, or the Veil of this unknowable. Here again we see that the first is the Mother Goddess, the reflection of the subjective root, on the first plane of Substance. Then follows, issuing from, or rather residing in, this Mother Goddess, the unmanifested Logos, he who is both her Son and Husband at once, called the “concealed Father.” From these proceeds the first-manifested Logos, or Spirit, and the Son from whose substance emanate the Seven Logoi, whose synthesis, viewed as one collective Force, becomes the Architect of the Visible Universe. They are the Elohim of the Jews.

Q. What aspect of Space, or the unknown deity, called in the Vedas “THAT,” which is mentioned further on, is here called the “Eternal Parent”?

A. It is the Vedantic Mulaprakriti, and the Svabhavat of the Buddhists, or that androgynous *something* of which we have been speaking, which is both differentiated and undifferentiated. In its first principle it is a pure abstraction, which becomes differentiated only when it is transformed, in the process of time, into Prakriti. If compared with the human principles it corresponds to Buddhi, while Atma would correspond to Parabrahm, Manas to Mahat, and so on.

Q. What, then, are the seven layers of Space, for in the “Proem” we read about the “Seven-skinned Mother-Father”?

A. Plato and Hermes Trismegistus would have regarded this as the *Divine Thought*, and Aristotle would have viewed this “Mother-Father” as the “privation” of matter. It is that which will become the seven planes of being, commencing with the spiritual and passing through the psychic to the material plane. The seven planes of thought or the seven states of consciousness correspond to these planes. All these septenaries are symbolized by the seven Skins.

Q. The divine ideas in the Divine Mind? But the Divine Mind is not yet.

A. The Divine Mind *is*, and must be, before differentiation takes place. It is called the divine Ideation, which is eternal in its Potentiality and periodical in its Potency, when it becomes *Mahat, Anima Mundi* or Universal Soul. But remember that, however you name it, each of these conceptions has its most metaphysical, most material, and also intermediate aspects.

Q. What is the meaning of the term “Ever invisible robes”?

A. It is of course, as every allegory in the Eastern philosophies, a figurative expression. Perhaps it may be the hypothetical Protyle that Professor Crookes is in search of, but which can certainly never be found on this our earth or plane. It is the non-differentiated substance or spiritual matter.

Q. Is it what is called “Laya”?

A. “Robes” and all are in the *Laya* condition, the point from which, or at which, the primordial substance

begins to differentiate and thus gives birth to the universe and all in it.

Q. Are the “invisible robes” so called because they are not objective to any differentiation of consciousness?

A. Say rather, invisible to finite consciousness, if such consciousness were possible at that stage of evolution. Even for the Logos, Mulaprakriti is a veil, the Robes in which the Absolute is enveloped. Even the Logos cannot perceive the Absolute, say the Vedantins.*

Q. Is Mulaprakriti the correct term to use?

A. The Mulaprakriti of the Vedantins is the Aditi of the Vedas. The Vedanta philosophy means literally “the end or Synthesis of all knowledge.” Now there are six schools of Hindu philosophy, which, however, will be found, on strict analysis, to agree perfectly in substance. Fundamentally they are identical, but there is such a wealth of names, such a quantity of side issues, details, and ornamentations—some emanations being their own fathers, and fathers born from their own daughters—that one becomes lost as in a jungle. State anything you please from the esoteric standpoint to a Hindu, and, if he so wishes, he can, from his own particular system, contradict or refute you. Each of the six schools has its own peculiar views and terms. So that unless the terminology of one school is adopted and used throughout the discussion, there is great danger of misunderstanding.

Q. Then the same identical term is used in quite a different sense by different philosophies? For instance, Buddhi has one meaning in the Esoteric and quite a different sense in the Sankhya philosophy. Is not this so?

A. Precisely, and quite a different sense in the *Vishnu-Purâna*, which speaks of seven Prakritis emanating from Mahat, and calls the latter Maha-Buddhi. Fundamentally, however, the ideas are the same, though the terms differ with each school, and the correct sense is lost in this maze of personifications. It would, perhaps,

* *Vide* Mr. Subba Row’s four Lectures, *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*.

if possible, be best to invent for ourselves a new nomenclature. Owing, however, to the poverty of European languages, especially English, in philosophical terms, the undertaking would be somewhat difficult.

Q. Could not the term “Protyle” be employed to represent the Laya condition?

A. Scarcely; the Protyle of Professor Crookes is probably used to denote homogeneous matter on the most material plane of all, whereas the *substance* symbolized by the “Robes” of the “Eternal Parent” is on the seventh plane of matter counting upwards, or rather from

without within. This can never be discovered on the lowest, or rather most outward and material plane.

Q. Is there, then, on each of the seven planes, matter relatively homogeneous for every plane?

A. That is so; but such matter is homogeneous only for those who are on the same plane of perception; so that if the Protyle of modern science is ever discovered, it will be homogeneous only to us. The illusion may last for some time, perhaps until the sixth race, for humanity is ever changing, physically and mentally, and let us hope spiritually too, perfecting itself more and more with every race and sub-race.

Q. Would it not be a great mistake to use any term which has been used by scientists with another meaning? Protoplasm had once almost the same sense as Proyle, but its meaning has now become narrowed.

A. It would most decidedly; the *Hyle* (à80) of the Greeks, however, most certainly did not apply to the matter of this plane, for they adopted it from the Chaldean cosmogony, where it was used in a highly metaphysical sense.

Q. But the word Hyle is now used by the materialists to express very nearly the same idea as that to which we apply the term Mulaprakriti.

A. It may be so; but Dr. Lewins and his brave half-dozen of Hylo-Idealists are hardly of this opinion, for in their system the metaphysical meaning is entirely disregarded and lost sight of.

Q. Then perhaps after all Laya is the best term to use?

A. Not so, for Laya does not mean any particular something or some plane or other, but denotes a state or condition. It is a Sanskrit term, conveying the idea of something in an undifferentiated and changeless state, a zero point wherein all differentiation ceases.

Q. The first differentiation would represent matter on its seventh plane: must we not, therefore, suppose that Professor Crookes' Protyle is also matter on its seventh plane?

A. The ideal Protyle of Professor Crookes is matter in that state which he calls the "zero-point."

Q. That is to say, the Laya point of this plane?

A. It is not at all clear whether Professor Crookes is occupied with other planes or admits their existence. The object of his search is the protylic atom, which, as no one has ever seen it, is simply a new working hypothesis of Science. For what in reality is an atom?

Q. It is a convenient definition of what is supposed to be, or rather a convenient term to divide up, a molecule.

A. But surely they must have come by this time to the conclusion that the atom is no more a convenient term than the supposed seventy odd elements. It has been the custom to laugh at the four and five elements of the ancients; but now Professor Crookes has come to the conclusion that, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as a chemical element at all. In fact, so far from discovering the atom, a single simple molecule has not yet been arrived at.

Q. It should be remembered that Dalton, who first spoke on the subject, called it the "Atomic Theory."

A. Quite so; but, as shown by Sir W. Hamilton, the term is used in an erroneous sense by the modern schools of science, which, while laughing at metaphysics, apply a purely metaphysical term to physics, so that nowadays "theory" begins to usurp the prerogatives of "axiom."

Q. What are the "Seven Eternities," and how can there be such a division in Pralaya, when there is no one to be conscious of time?

A. The modern astronomer knows the "ordinances of Heaven" by no means better than his ancient brother did. If asked whether he could "bring forth Mazzaroth

in his season," or if he was with "him" who "spread out the sky," he would have to answer sadly, just as Job did, in the negative. Yet this in no wise prevents him from speculating about the age of the Sun, Moon, and Earth, and "calculating" geological periods from that time when there was not a living man, with or without consciousness, on earth. Why, therefore, should not the same privilege be granted to the ancients?

Q. But why should the term "Seven Eternities" be employed?

A. The term "Seven Eternities" is employed owing to the invariable law of analogy. As Manvantara is divided into seven periods, so is Pralaya; as day is composed of twelve hours so is night. Can we say that because we are asleep during the night and lose consciousness of time, that therefore the hours do not strike? Pralaya is the "Night" after the Manvantaric "Day." There is no one by, and consciousness is asleep with the rest. But since it exists, and is in full activity during Manvantara; and since we are fully alive to the fact that the law of analogy and periodicity is immutable, and, being so, that it must act equally at both ends, why cannot the phrase be used?

Q. But how can an eternity be counted?

A. Perhaps the query arises owing to the general misunderstanding of the term "Eternity." We Westerners are foolish enough to speculate about that which has neither beginning nor end, and we imagine that the ancients must have done the same. They did not, however: no philosopher in days of old ever took "Eternity" to mean beginningless and endless duration. Neither the Aeons of the Greeks nor the Neroses convey this meaning. In fact, they had no word to convey this precise sense. Parabrahm, Ain-Soph, and the *Zeruana-Akerne* of the *Avesta* alone represent such an Eternity; all the other periods are finite and astronomical, based on tropical years and other enormous cycles. The word Aeon, which in the Bible is translated by Eternity, means not only a finite period, but also an angel and being.

Q. But is it not correct to say that in Pralaya too there is the "Great Breath"?

A. Assuredly: for the “Great Breath” is ceaseless, and is, so to speak, the universal and eternal *perpetuum mobile*.

Q. If so, it is impossible to divide it into periods, for this does away with the idea of absolute and complete nothingness. It seems somewhat incompatible that any “number” of periods should be spoken of, although one might speak of so many out-breathings and indrawings of the “Great Breath.”

A. This would make away with the idea of absolute Rest, were not this absoluteness of Rest counteracted by the absoluteness of Motion. Therefore one expression is as good as the other. There is a magnificent poem on Pralaya, written by a very ancient Rishi, who compares the motion of the Great Breath during Pralaya to the rhythmical motions of the Unconscious Ocean.

Q. The difficulty is when the word “eternity” is used instead of “Aeon.”

A. Why should a Greek word be used when there is a more familiar expression, especially as it is fully explained in *The Secret Doctrine*? You may call it a *relative*, or a Manvantaric and Pralayic eternity, if you like.

Q. Is the relation of Pralaya and Manvantara strictly analogous to the relations between sleeping and waking?

A. In a certain sense only; during night we all exist personally, and *are* individually, though we sleep and may be unconscious of so living. But during Pralaya everything differentiated, as every unit, disappears from the phenomenal universe and is merged in, or rather transferred into, the One noumenal. Therefore, *de facto*, there is a great difference.

Q. Sleep has been called the “shady side of life”; may Pralaya be called the shady side of Cosmic life?

A. It may in a certain way be called so. Pralaya is dissolution of the visible into the invisible, the heterogeneous into the homogeneous—a time of rest, therefore. Even cosmic matter, indestructible though it be in its essence, must have a time of rest, and return to its *Laya* state. The absoluteness of the all-containing One essence has to manifest itself equally in rest and activity.

Sloka (2). TIME WAS NOT, FOR IT LAY ASLEEP IN THE INFINITE BOSOM OF DURATION.

Q. What is the difference between Time and Duration?

A. Duration *is*; it has neither beginning nor end. How can you call that which has neither beginning nor end, Time? Duration is beginningless and endless; Time is finite.

Q. Is, then, Duration the infinite, and Time the finite conception?

A. Time can be divided; Duration—in our philosophy, at least—cannot. Time is divisible in Duration—or, as you put it, the one is something *within* Time and Space, whereas the other is outside of both.

Q. The only way one can define Time is by the motion of the earth.

A. But we can also define Time in our conceptions.

Q. Duration, rather?

A. No, Time; for as to Duration, it is impossible to divide it or set up landmarks therein. Duration with us is the one eternity, not relative, but absolute.

Q. Can it be said that the essential idea of Duration is existence?

A. No; existence has limited and definite periods, whereas Duration, having neither beginning nor end, is a perfect abstraction which contains Time. Duration is like Space, which is an abstraction too, and is equally without beginning or end. It is in its concreteness and limitation only that it becomes a representation and something. Of course the distance between two points is called space; it may be enormous or it may be infinitesimal, yet it will always be space. But all such specifications are divisions in human conception. In reality Space is what the ancients called the One invisible and unknown (now unknowable) Deity.

Q. Then Time is the same as Space, being one in the abstract?

A. As two abstractions they may be one; but this would apply to Duration and Abstract Space rather than to Time and Space.

Q. Space is the objective and Time the subjective side of all manifestation. In reality they are the only attributes of the infinite; but attribute is perhaps a bad term to use, inasmuch as they are, so to speak, co-extensive with the infinite. It may,

however, be objected that they are nothing but the creations of our own intellect; simply the forms in which we cannot help conceiving things.

A. That sounds like an argument of our friends the Hylo-idealists; but here we speak of the noumenal and not of the phenomenal universe. In the occult catechism (*Vide Secret Doctrine*) it is asked: "What is that which always IS, which you cannot imagine as not being, do what you may?" The answer is—SPACE. For there may not be a single man in the universe to think of it, not a single eye to perceive it, nor a single brain to sense it, but still Space *is, ever was, and ever will be*, and you cannot make away with it.

Q. Because we cannot help thinking of it, perhaps?

A. Our thinking of it has nothing to do with the question. Try, rather, if you can think of anything with Space excluded and you will soon find out the impossibility of such a conception. Space exists where there is nothing else, and must so exist whether the Universe is one absolute vacuum or a full Pleroma.

Q. Modern Philosophers have reduced it to this, that space and time are nothing but attributes, nothing but accidents.

A. And they would be right, were their reduction the fruit of true science instead of being the result of *Avidya* and *Maya*. We find also Buddha saying that even Nirvâna, after all, is but *Maya*, or an illusion; but the Lord Buddha based what he said on *knowledge*, not *speculation*.

Q. But are eternal Space and Duration the only attributes of the Infinite?

A. Space and Duration, being eternal, cannot be called attributes, as they are only the *aspects* of that Infinite. Nor can that Infinite, if you mean by it The Absolute Principle, have any attributes whatever as only that which is itself finite and conditioned can have any relation to something else. All this is philosophically wrong.

Q. We can conceive of no matter which is not extended, no extension which is not extension of something. Is it the same on higher planes? And if so, what is the substance which fills absolute space, and is it identical with that space?

A. If your “trained intellect” cannot conceive of any other kind of matter, perhaps one less trained but more open to spiritual perceptions can. It does not follow, because you say so, that such a conception of Space is the only one possible, even on our Earth. For even on this plane of ours there are other and various intellects, besides those of man, in creatures visible and invisible, from minds of subjective high and low Beings to objective animals and the lowest organisms, in short, “from the Deva to the elephant, from the elemental to the ant.” Now, in relation to its own plane of conception and perception, the ant has as good an intellect as we have ourselves, and a better one; for though it cannot express it in words, yet, over and above instinct, the ant shows very high reasoning powers, as all of us know. Thus finding on our own plane—if we credit the teachings of Occultism—so many and such varied states of consciousness and intelligence, we have no right to take into consideration and account only our own human consciousness, as though no other existed outside of it. And if we cannot presume to decide how far insect consciousness goes, how can we limit consciousness, of which Science knows nothing, to this plane.

Q. But why not? surely natural science can discover all that has to be discovered, even in the ant?

A. Such is your view; to the occultist, however, such confidence is misplaced, in spite of Sir John Lubbock’s labours. Science may speculate, but, with its present methods, will never be able to prove the certitude of such speculations. If a scientist could become an ant for a while, and think as an ant, and remember his experience on returning to his own sphere of consciousness, then only would he know something for certain of this interesting insect. As it is, he can only speculate, making inferences from the ant’s behaviour.

Q. The ant’s conception of time and space are not our own, then. Is it this that you mean?

A. Precisely; the ant has conceptions of time and space which are its own, not ours; conceptions which are entirely on another plane; we have, therefore, no right to

deny *a priori* the existence of other planes only because we can form no idea of them, but which exist nevertheless—planes higher and lower than our own by many degrees, as witness the ant.

Q. The difference between the animal and man from this point of view seems to be that the former is born more or less with all its faculties, and, generally speaking, does not appreciably gain on this, while the latter is gradually learning and improving. Is not that really the point?

A. Just so; but you have to remember why: not because man has one “principle” more than the tiniest insect, but because man is a perfected animal, the vehicle of a fully developed *monad*, self-conscious and deliberately following its own line of progress, whereas in the insect, and even the higher animal, the higher triad of principles is absolutely dormant.

Q. Is there any consciousness, or conscious being, to cognize and make a division of time at the first flutter of manifestation? In his “Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita,” Mr. Subba Row, in speaking of the First Logos, seems to imply both consciousness and intelligence.

A. But he did not explain which Logos was referred to, and I believe he spoke in general. In the Esoteric Philosophy the First is the unmanifested, and the Second the manifested Logos. Iswara stands for that Second, and Nârâyana for the unmanifested Logos. Subba Row is an Adwaiter and a learned Vedantin, and explained from his standpoint. We do so from ours. In *The Secret Doctrine*, that from which the manifested Logos is born is translated by the “Eternal Mother-Father”; while in the *Vishnu-Purâna* it is described as the Egg of the World, surrounded by seven skins, layers or zones. It is in this Golden Egg that Brahmâ, the male, is born and that Brahmâ is in reality the Second Logos or even the Third, according to the enumeration adopted; for a certainty he is not the First or highest, the point which is everywhere and nowhere. Mahat, in the Esoteric interpretations, is in reality the Third Logos or the Synthesis of the Seven creative rays, the Seven Logoi. Out of the seven so-called Creations, Mahat is the third, for it is the

Universal and Intelligent Soul, Divine Ideation, combining the ideal plans and prototypes of all things in the manifested objective as well as subjective world. In the Sâmkhya and Purânic doctrines Mahat is the first product of Pradhâna, informed by Kshetrajñâ, “Spirit-Substance.” In Esoteric philosophy Kshetrajñâ is the name given to our informing EGOS.

Q. Is it then the first manifestation in our objective universe?

A. It is the first Principle in it, made sensible or perceptible to divine though not human senses. But if we proceed from the Unknowable, we will find it to be the third, and corresponding to Manas, or rather Buddhi-Manas.

Q. Then the First Logos is the first point within the circle?

A. The point within the circle which has neither limit nor boundaries, nor can it have

any name or attribute. This first unmanifested Logos is simultaneous with the line drawn across the diameter of the Circle. The first line or diameter is the Mother-Father; from it proceeds the Second Logos, which contains in itself the Third Manifested Word. In the *Purânas*, for instance, it is again said that the first production of Akâsa is Sound, and Sound means in this case the “Word,” the expression of the unuttered thought, the manifested Logos, that of the Greeks and Platonists and St. John. Dr. Wilson and other Orientalists speak of this conception of the Hindus as an absurdity, for according to them Akâsa and Chaos are identical. But if they knew that Akâsa and Pradhâna are but two aspects of the same thing, and remember that Mahat, the *divine ideation on our plane*—is that manifested *Sound* or Logos, they would laugh at themselves and their own ignorance.

Q. With reference to the following passage, what is the consciousness which takes cognizance of time? Is the consciousness of time limited to the plane of waking physical consciousness or does it exist on higher planes? In “The Secret Doctrine,” I, 37, it is said that:—“Time is only an illusion produced by the succession of our states of consciousness as we travel through eternal duration, and it does not exist where no consciousness exists. . . .”

A. Here consciousness only on our plane is meant, not the eternal *divine* Consciousness which we call the Absolute. The consciousness of time, in the present sense of the word, does not exist even in sleep; much less, therefore, can it exist in the essentially absolute. Can the sea be said to have a conception of time in its rhythmical striking on the shore, or in the movement of its waves? The Absolute cannot be said to have a consciousness, or, at any rate, a consciousness such as we have here. It has neither consciousness, nor desire, nor wish, nor thought, because it is absolute thought, absolute desire, absolute consciousness, absolute “all.”

Q. Is it what we refer to as BE-NESS, or SAT?

A. Our kind critics have found the word “Be-ness” very amusing, but there is no other way of translating the Sanskrit term, *Sat*. It is not existence, for existence can only apply to phenomena, never to *noumena*, the very etymology of the Latin term contradicting such assertion, as *ex* means “from” or “out of,” and *sistere* “to stand”; therefore, something appearing being then [there?] where it was not before. Existence, moreover, implies something having a beginning and an end. How can the term, therefore, be applied to that which ever was, and of which it cannot be predicated that it ever issued from something else?

Q. The Hebrew Jehovah was “I am.”

A. And so was Ormuzd, the Ahura-Mazda of the old Mazdeans. In this sense every man as much as every God can boast of his existence, saying “I am that I am.”

Q. But surely “Be-ness” has some connection with the word “to be”?

A. Yes; but “Be-ness” is not *being*, for it is equally *non-being*. We cannot conceive it, for our intellects are finite and our language far more limited and conditioned even than

our minds. How, therefore, can we express that which we can only conceive of by a series of negatives?

Q. A German could more easily express it by the word “sein”; “das sein” would be a very good equivalent of “Be-ness”; the latter term may sound absurd to unaccustomed English ears,

but “das sein” is a perfectly familiar term and idea to a German. But we were speaking of consciousness in Space and Time.

A. This Consciousness is finite, having beginning and end. But where is the word for such finite Consciousness which still, owing to *Mâya*, believes itself infinite? Not even the Devachanee is conscious of time. All is present in Devachan; there is no past, otherwise the *Ego* would recall and regret it; no future, or it would desire to have it. Seeing, therefore, that Devachan is a state of bliss in which everything is present, the Devachanee is said to have no conception or idea of time; everything is to him as in a vivid dream, a reality.

Q. But we may dream a lifetime in half a second, being conscious of a succession of states of consciousness, events taking place one after the other.

A. After the dream only; no such consciousness exists while dreaming.

Q. May we not compare the recollection of a dream to a person giving the description of a picture, and having to mention all the parts and details because he cannot present the whole before the mind’s eye of the listener?

A. That is a very good analogy.

Collected Writings VOLUME X
January, February, March, 1889

II

*Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on
January 17th, 1889, Mr. T.B. Harbottle in the Chair.*

STANZA I (continued)

Sloka (3). . . . UNIVERSAL MIND WAS NOT, FOR THERE WERE NO AH-HI (celestial beings) TO CONTAIN (hence to manifest) IT.

Q. This sloka seems to imply that the Universal Mind has no existence apart from the Ah-hi; but in the Commentary it is stated that:

A noumenon can become a phenomenon on any plane of existence only by manifesting on that plane through an appropriate basis

or vehicle; and during the long night of rest called Pralaya, when all the existences are dissolved, the “UNIVERSAL MIND” remains as a permanent possibility of mental action, or as that abstract absolute thought, of which mind is the concrete relative manifestation. The AH-HI (Dhyan-Chohans) are the collective hosts of spiritual beings who are the vehicles for the manifestation of the divine or universal thought and will. They are the Intelligent Forces that give to and enact in Nature her “Laws,” while themselves acting according to laws imposed upon them in a similar manner by still higher Powers; This hierarchy of spiritual Beings, through which the Universal Mind comes into action, is like an army—a “Host,” truly.
.*

The Commentary suggests that the Ah-hi are not themselves the Universal Mind, but only the vehicle for its manifestation.

A. The meaning of this sloka is, I think, very clear; it means that, as there are no finite differentiated minds during Pralaya, it is just as though there were no mind at all, because there is nothing *to contain or perceive it*. There is nothing to receive and reflect the ideation of the Absolute Mind; therefore, *it is not*. Everything outside of the Absolute and immutable Sat (Be-ness), is necessarily finite and conditioned, since it has beginning and end. Therefore, since the “Ah-hi were not,” there was no Universal Mind as a manifestation. A distinction had to be made between the Absolute Mind, which is ever present, and its reflection and manifestation in the Ah-hi, who, being on the highest plane, reflect the universal mind collectively at the first flutter of Manvantara. After which they

begin the work of evolution of all the lower forces throughout the seven planes, down to the lowest—our own. The Ah-hi are the primordial seven rays, or *Logoi*, emanated from the first Logos, *triple*, yet one in its essence.

Q. Then the Ah-hi and Universal Mind are necessary complements of one another?

A. Not at all: Universal or Absolute Mind always *is* during Pralaya as well as Manvantara; it is immutable. The Ah-hi are the highest Dhyanis, the Logoi as just

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 38.

said, those who begin the downward evolution, or emanation. During Pralaya there are no Ah-hi, because they come into being only with the first *radiation* of the Universal Mind, which, *per se*, cannot be differentiated, and the radiation from which is the first *dawn* of Manvantara. The Absolute is dormant, latent mind, and cannot be otherwise in true metaphysical perception; it is only Its shadow which becomes differentiated in the collectivity of these Dhyanis.

Q. Does this mean that it was absolute consciousness, but is so no longer?

A. It is *absolute consciousness* eternally, which consciousness becomes *relative consciousness* periodically, at every “Manvantaric dawn.” Let us picture to ourselves this latent or potential consciousness as a kind of vacuum in a vessel. Break the vessel, and what becomes of the vacuum; where shall we look for it? It has disappeared; it is everywhere and nowhere. It is something, yet *nothing*: *a vacuum*, yet a *plenum*. But what in reality is a vacuum as understood by Modern Science—a homogeneous something, or what? Is not absolute Vacuum a figment of our fancy? A pure negation, a supposed Space where nothing exists? This being so, destroy the vessel, and—to our perceptions at any rate—nothing exists. Therefore, the Stanza puts it very correctly; “Universal Mind was not,” because there was no vehicle to contain it.

Q. What are the higher powers which condition the Ah-hi?

A. They cannot be called powers; *power* or perhaps Potentiality would be better. The Ah-hi are conditioned by the awakening into manifestation of the periodical, universal LAW, which becomes successively active and inactive. It is by this law that they are conditioned or formed, not created. “Created” is an impossible term to use in Philosophy.

Q. Then the power or Potentiality which precedes and is higher than the Ah-hi, is the law which necessitates manifestation?

A. Just so; periodical manifestation. When the hour strikes, the law comes into action, and the Ah-hi appear on the first rung of the ladder of manifestation.

Q. But surely this is THE law and not A law?

A. Precisely, since it is absolute and “Secondless”— therefore it is not an attribute, but that Absoluteness itself.

Q. The great difficulty is to account for this law?

A. That would be trying to go beyond the first manifestation and supreme causality. It will take all our limited intellect to vaguely understand even the latter; try as we may, we can never, limited as we are, approach the Absolute, which is to us, at our present stage of mental development, merely a logical speculation, though dating back to thousands and thousands of years.

Q. With reference to the sloka under discussion, would not “cosmic mind” be a better term than “Universal mind”?

A. No; cosmic mind appears at the third stage, or degree, and is confined or limited to the manifested universe. In the *Purânas* Mahat (the “great” Principle of mind, or Intellect) appears only at the third of the Seven “Creations” or stages of evolution. Cosmic Mind is Mahat, or divine ideation in active (creative) operation, and thus only the periodical manifestation *in time* and *in actu* of the Eternal Universal Mind—*in potentia*. In strict truth, Universal Mind, being only another Name for the Absolute, *out of time and Space*, this Cosmic Ideation, or Mind, is not an evolution at all (least of all a “creation”), but simply one of the aspects of the former, which knows no change, which ever was, which is, and will be. Thus, I say again, the sloka implies that universal ideation was not, *i.e.*, did not exist for perception, because there were no minds to perceive it, since Cosmic Mind was still latent, or a mere potentiality. As the stanzas speak of manifestation, we are compelled so to translate them, and not from any other standpoint.

Q. We use the word “cosmic” as applied to the manifested universe in all its forms. The sloka apparently does not refer to this, but to the first absolute Consciousness, or Non-consciousness, and seems to imply that the absolute consciousness could not be that universal mind because it was not, or could not be, expressed: there was, therefore, no expression for it. But it may be objected

that though there was no expression for it, still it was there. Can we say that, like Sat, it was and was not?

A. That will not help the interpretation.

Q. When it is said that it was not, the idea conveyed then is that it was not in the Absolute?

A. By no means; simply “it was not.”

Q. There seems to be a distinction, certainly; for if we could say “it was,” it would be taking a very one-sided view of the idea of Sat, and equivalent to saying that Sat was

BEING. *Still, someone may say that the phrase “Universal Mind was not,” as it stands, suggests that it is a manifestation, but mind is not a manifestation.*

A. Mind, in the act of ideation, is a manifestation; but Universal Mind is not the same thing, as no conditioned and relative act can be predicated of that which is Absolute. Universal ideation was as soon as the Ah-hi appeared, and continues throughout the Manvantara.

Q. To what cosmic plane do the Ah-hi, here spoken of, belong?

A. They belong to the first, second, and third planes—the last plane being really the starting point of the primordial manifestation—the objective reflection of the unmanifested. Like the Pythagorean *Monas*, the first Logos, having emanated the first triad, disappears into silence and darkness.

Q. Does this mean that the three Logoi emanated from the primordial Radiation in Macrocosm correspond to Atma, Buddhi, and Manas, in the Microcosm?

A. Just so; they correspond, but must not be confounded with them. We are now speaking of the Macrocosm at the first flutter of Manvantaric dawn, when evolution begins, and not of Microcosm or Man.

Q. Are the three planes to which the three Logoi belong simultaneous emanations, or do they evolve one from another?

A. It is most misleading to apply mechanical laws to the higher metaphysics of cosmogony, or to space and time, as we know them for neither existed then. The reflection of the triad in space and time or the objective universe comes later.



COLONEL HENRY STEEL OLCOTT

Originally published in *The Word*, Vol. XXII, October, 1915.

Q. Have the Ah-hi been men in previous Manvantaras, or will they become so?

A. Every living creature, of whatever description, was, is, or will become a human being in one or another Manvantara.

Q. But do they in this Manvantara remain permanently on the same very exalted plane during the whole period of the life-cycle?

A. If you mean by “life cycle” a duration of time which extends over fifteen figures, then my answer is most decidedly—no. The “Ah-hi” pass through all the planes, beginning to manifest on the third. Like all other Hierarchies, on the highest plane they are *arupa*, *i.e.*, formless, bodiless, without any substance, mere breaths. On the second plane, they first approach to Rupa, or form. On the third, they become Manasaputras, those who became incarnated in men. With every plane they reach they are called by different names—there is a continual differentiation of their original homogeneous substance; we call it substance, although in reality it is no substance of which we can conceive. Later, they become Rupa—ethereal forms.

Q. Then the Ah-hi of this Manvantara. ?

A. Exist no longer; they have long ago become Planetary, Solar, Lunar, and lastly, incarnating Egos, for, as said, “they are the collective hosts of spiritual beings.”

Q. But it was stated above that the Ah-hi did not become men in this Manvantara.

A. Nor do they as the formless “Ah-hi.” But they do as their own transformations. The Manvantaras should not be confounded. The fifteen-figure Manvantaric cycle applies to the solar system; but there is a Manvantara which relates to the whole of the objective universe, the Mother-Father, and many minor Manvantaras. The slokas relating to the former have been generally selected, and only two or three relating to the latter given. Many slokas, therefore, have been omitted because of their difficult nature.

Q. Then, on reawakening, will the men of one Manvantara have to pass through a state corresponding to the Ah-hi stage in the next Manvantara?

A. In some of the Manvantaras, the tail is in the mouth of the serpent. Think over this Symbolism.

Q. A man can choose what he will think about; can the analogy be applied to the Ah-hi?

A. No; because a man has free will and Ah-hi have none. They are obliged to act simultaneously, for the law under which they must act gives them the impulse. Free will can only exist in a Man who has both mind and consciousness, which act and make him perceive things both within and without himself. The “Ah-hi” are Forces, not human Beings.

Q. But are they not conscious agents in the work?

A. Conscious in as far as they act within the universal consciousness. But the consciousness of the Manasa-putra on the third plane is quite different. It is only then that they become *Thinkers*. Besides, Occultism, unlike modern Science, maintains that every

atom of matter, when once differentiated, becomes endowed with *its own* kind of Consciousness. Every *cell* in the human body (as in every animal) is endowed with its own peculiar discrimination, instinct, and, speaking relatively, with intelligence.

Q. Can the Ah-hi be said to be enjoying bliss?

A. How can they be subject to bliss or non-bliss? Bliss can only be appreciated, and becomes such when suffering is known.

Q. But there is a distinction between happiness and bliss.

A. Granting that there may be, still there can be neither happiness nor bliss without a contrasting experience of suffering and pain.

Q. But we understand that bliss, as the state of the Absolute, was intended to be referred to.

A. This is still more illogical. How can the ABSOLUTE be said to *feel*? The Absolute can have no condition nor attribute. It is only that which is finite and differentiated which can have any feeling or attitude predicated of it.

Q. Then the Ah-hi cannot be said to be conscious intelligences, when intelligence is so complex?

A. Perhaps the term is erroneous, but owing to the poverty of European languages there seems to be no other choice.

Q. But perhaps a phrase would represent the idea more correctly? The term seems to mean a force which is a unity, not a complex action and reaction of several forces, which would be implied by the word "intelligence." The noumenal aspect of phenomenal force would perhaps better express the idea.

A. Or perhaps we may represent to ourselves the idea as a flame, a unity; the rays from this flame will be complex, each acting in its own straight line.

Q. But they only become complex when they find receptacles in lower forms.

A. Just so; still the Ah-hi are the flame from which the rays stream forth, becoming more and more differentiated as they fall deeper into matter, until they finally reach this world of ours, with its teeming millions of inhabitants and sensuous beings, and then they become truly complex.

Q. The Ah-hi, then, considered as a primary essence, would be unity? Can we regard them as such?

A. You may; but the strict truth is that they only proceed from unity, and are the first of its seven rays.

Q. Then can we call them the reflection of unity?

A. Are not the prismatic rays fundamentally one single white ray? From the one they become three; from the three, seven; from which seven primaries they fall into infinitude. Referring back to the so-called "consciousness" of the Ah-hi, that consciousness cannot be judged by the standard of human perceptions. It is on quite another plane.

Q. "During deep sleep, mind is not on the material plane"; is it therefore to be inferred

that during this period mind is active on another plane? Is there any definition of the characteristics which distinguish mind in the waking state from mind during the sleep of the body?

A. There is, of course; but I do not think that a discussion upon it would be pertinent or useful now; suffice to say that often the reasoning faculty of the higher mind may be asleep, and the instinctual mind be fully awake. It is the physiological distinction between the cerebrum and the cerebellum; the one sleeps and the other is awake.

Q. What is meant by the term instinctual mind?

A. The instinctual mind finds expression through the cerebellum, and is also that of the animals. With man during sleep the functions of the cerebrum cease, and the cerebellum carries him on to the Astral plane, a still more unreal state than even the waking plane of illusion; for so we call this state which the majority of you think so real. And the Astral plane is still more deceptive, because it reflects indiscriminately the good and the bad, and is so chaotic.

Q. The fundamental conditions of the mind in the waking state are space and time: do these exist for the mind (Manas) during the sleep of the physical body?

A. Not as we know them. Moreover, the answer depends on which *Manas* you mean—the higher or the lower. It is only the latter which is susceptible of hallucinations about space and time; for instance, a man in the dreaming state may live in a few seconds the events of a life-time. * For the perceptions and apprehensions of the Higher Ego there is neither space nor time.

Q. Manas is said to be the vehicle of Buddhi, but the universal mind has been spoken of as a Maha-Buddhi. What then is the distinction between the terms Manas and Buddhi, employed in a universal sense, and Manas and Buddhi as manifested in man?

A. Cosmic Buddhi, the emanation of the Spiritual Soul *Alaya*, is the vehicle of Mahat only when that Buddhi corresponds to Prakriti. Then it is called Maha-Buddhi. This Buddhi differentiates through seven planes, whereas the Buddhi in man is the vehicle of Atman, which vehicle is of the essence of the highest plane of Akaśa and therefore does not differentiate. The difference between Manas and Buddhi in man is the same as the difference between the Manasa-putra and the Ah-hi in Kosmos.

* See the discussion on dreams appended to the first No. of the *Transactions*.

[This will be found in its correct chronological order in the earlier portion of the present Volume.—*Compiler*.]

Q. Manas is mind, and the Ah-hi, it is said, can no more have any individual Mind, or that which we call mind, on this plane than Buddhi can. Can there be Consciousness without Mind?

A. Not on this plane of matter. But why not on some other and higher plane? Once we postulate a Universal Mind, both the brain, the mind's vehicle, and Consciousness, its faculty, must be quite different on a higher plane from what they are here. They are nearer to the *Absolute ALL*, and must therefore be represented by a substance infinitely more homogeneous; something *sui generis*, and entirely beyond the reach of our intellectual perceptions. Let us call or imagine it an incipient and incognizable state of primeval differentiation. On that higher plane, as it seems to me, Mahat—the great *Manvantaric* Principle of Intelligence—acts as a Brain, through which the Universal and Eternal Mind radiates the Ah-hi, representing the resultant consciousness or ideation. As the shadow of this primordial *triangle* falls lower and lower through the descending planes, it becomes with every stage more material.

Q. It becomes the plane on which Consciousness perceives objective manifestations. Is it so?

A. Yes. But here we come face to face with the great problem of Consciousness, and shall have to fight Materialism. For what is Consciousness? According to modern Science it is a faculty of the Mind like volition. We say so too; but add that while Consciousness is not a thing *per se*, Mind is distinctly—in its Manvantaric functions at least—an Entity. Such is the opinion of all the Eastern Idealists.

Q. It is, however, the fashion nowadays to speak slightingly of the idea that the mind is an entity.

A. Nevertheless, mind is a term perfectly synonymous with Soul. Those who deny the existence of the latter will of course contend that there is no such thing as consciousness apart from brain, and at death consciousness ceases. Occultists, on the contrary, affirm that consciousness exists after death, and that then only the real consciousness and freedom of the Ego commences, when it is no longer impeded by terrestrial matter.

Q. Perhaps the former view arises from limiting the meaning of the term "consciousness" to the faculty of perception?

A. If so, occultism is entirely opposed to such a view.

*Sloka (4) THE SEVEN WAYS TO BLISS (Moksha or Nirvana) WERE NOT. * THE GREAT CAUSES OF MISERY (Nidana and Maya) WERE NOT, FOR THERE WAS NO ONE TO PRODUCE AND GET ENSNARED BY THEM.*

Q. What are the seven ways to bliss?

A. They are certain faculties of which the student will know more when he goes deeper into occultism.

Q. Are the Four Truths of the Hinayâna school the same as those mentioned by Sir

Edwin Arnold in "The Light of Asia"; the first of which is the Path of Sorrow; the second of Sorrow's cause: the third of Sorrow's ceasing; and the fourth is the WAY?

A. All this is theological and exoteric, and to be found in all the Buddhist scriptures; and the above seems to be taken from Singhalese or Southern Buddhism. The subject, however, is far more fully treated of in the Aryasangha School. Still even there the four truths have one meaning for the regular priest of the Yellow Robe, and quite another for the real Mystics.

Q. Are Nidâna and Maya (the great causes of misery) aspects of the Absolute?

A. Nidâna means the concatenation of cause and effect; the twelve Nidânas are the enumeration of the chief causes which produce the severest reaction or effects under the Karmic law. Although there is no connection between the terms Nidâna and Maya in themselves, Maya being simply illusion, yet if we consider the universe as Maya or illusion, then certainly the Nidânas, as being moral agents in the universe, are included in Maya. It is Maya, illusion or ignorance, which awakens Nidânas; and the cause or causes having been produced, the effects follow according to Karmic law. To take an instance: we all regard ourselves as Units, although essentially we are one indivisible Unit, drops in the ocean of Being, not to be distinguished from other drops. Having then produced

* Vide *The Voice of the Silence: Fragment III, "The Seven Portals."*

this cause, the whole discord of life follows immediately as an effect; in reality it is the endeavour of nature to restore harmony and maintain equilibrium. It is this sense of separateness which is the root of all evil.

Q. Perhaps it would therefore be better to separate the two terms, and state whether Maya is an aspect of the Absolute?

A. This can hardly be so, since Maya is the Cause, and at the same time an aspect, of differentiation, if of anything. Moreover, the Absolute can never be differentiated. Maya is a manifestation; the Absolute can have no manifestation, but only a reflection, a shadow which is radiated periodical]y from it—not by it.

Q. Yet Maya is said to be the Cause of manifestation or differentiation?

A. What of that? Certainly if there were no Maya there would be no differentiation, or, rather, no objective universe would be perceived. But this does not make of it an aspect of the Absolute, but simply something coeval and coexistent with the manifested Universe or the heterogeneous differentiation of pure Homogeneity.

Q. By a parity of reason, then, if no differentiation, no Maya? But we are speaking of Maya now as THE CAUSE of the Universe, so that the moment we get behind differentiation, we may ask ourselves—Where is Maya?

A. Maya is everywhere, and in every *thing* that has a beginning and an end; therefore,

every *thing* is an *aspect* of that which is eternal, and in that sense, of course Maya itself is an aspect of SAT, or that which *is* eternally present in the universe, whether during Manvantara or Mahapralaya. Only remember that it has been said of even Nirvâna that it is only Maya when compared with the Absolute.

Q. Is then Maya a collective term for all manifestations?

A. I do not think this would explain the term. Maya is the perceptive faculty of every Ego which considers itself a Unit separate from, and independent of, the One infinite and eternal SAT, or “Be-ness.” Maya is explained in *exoteric* philosophy and the *Purânas*, as the personified active Will of the Creative God—the latter being but a personified Maya himself—a passing deception of the

senses of man, who began anthropomorphising pure abstraction from the beginning of his speculations. Maya, in the conception of an orthodox Hindu, is quite different from the Maya of a Vedantin Idealist or an Occultist. The Vedanta states that Maya, or the deceptive influence of illusion alone, constitutes belief in the *real* existence of matter or anything differentiated. The *Bhagavata Purana* identifies Maya with Prakriti (manifested nature and matter). Do not some advanced European metaphysicians, such as Kant, Schopenhauer, and others, assert the same? Of course they got their ideas about it from the East—especially from Buddhism; yet the doctrine of the unreality of this universe has been pretty correctly worked out by our philosophers—on general lines, at any rate. Now, although no two people can see things and objects in exactly the same way, and that each of us sees them in his own way, yet all labour more or less under illusions, and chiefly under the great illusion (Maya) that they are, as personalities, distinct beings from other beings, and that even their *Selves* or Egos will prevail in the eternity (or sempiternity, at any rate) as such; whereas not only we ourselves, but the whole visible and invisible universe, are only a temporary part of the one beginningless and endless WHOLE, or that which ever was, is, and will be.

Q. The term seems to apply to the complex points of differentiation: differentiation applying to the unit and Maya to the collection of units. But we may now put e side question.

With regard to the preceding part of the discussion, reference has been made to the cerebrum and cerebellum, and the latter described as the instinctual organ. An animal is supposed to have an instinctive mind; but the cerebellum is said to be simply the organ of vegetative life, and to control the functions of the body alone; whereas the sensual mind is the mind into which the senses open, and there can be no thought or ideation, nothing of which we predicate intellect or instinct anywhere, except in that part of the brain assigned to such functions, namely, the cerebrum

A. However that may be, this cerebellum is the organ of instinctual animal functions, which reflect themselves in, or produce, dreams which for the most part are chaotic and inconsequent. Dreams, however, which are

remembered, and present a sequence of events, are due to the vision of the higher Ego.

Q. Is not the cerebellum what we may call the organ of habit?

A. Being instinctual, it may very well be called so, I believe.

Q. Except that habit may be referred to what we may call the present stage of existence, and instinct to a past stage.

A. Whatever the name may be, the cerebellum alone—as you were already told (*vide* “On dreams,” *Appendix*)*—functions during sleep, not the cerebrum; and the dreams, or emanations, or instinctive feelings, which we experience on waking, are the result of such activity.

Q. The consecutiveness is brought about entirely by the coordinating faculty. But surely the cerebrum also acts, a proof of which is that the nearer we approach the sleep-waking state the more vivid our dreams become.

A. Quite so, *when you* are waking; but not before. We may compare this state of the cerebellum to a bar of metal, or something of the same nature, which has been heated during the day and emanates or radiates heat during the night; so the energy of the brain radiates unconsciously during the night.

Q. Still we cannot say that the brain is incapable of registering impressions during sleep. A sleeping man can be awakened by a noise, and when awake will be frequently able to trace his dream to the impression caused by the noise. This fact seems to prove conclusively the brain’s activity during sleep.

A. A mechanical activity certainly; if under such circumstances there is the slightest perception, or the least glimpse of the dream state, memory comes into play, and the dream can be reconstructed. In the discussion on dreams, the dream state passing into the waking state was compared to the embers of a dying fire; we may very well continue the simile, and compare the play of the memory to a current of air re-kindling them. That is to say that

* [The essay on “Dreams” will be found in its correct chronological order in the earlier portion of the present Volume.—*Compiler*.]

the waking consciousness recalls to activity the cerebellum, which was fading below the threshold of consciousness.

Q. But does the cerebellum ever cease functioning?

A. NO; but it is lost in the functions of the cerebrum.

Q. That is to say that the stimuli which proceed from the cerebellum during waking life fall below the threshold of waking consciousness, the field of consciousness being entirely occupied by the cerebrum, and this continues till sleep supervenes, when the stimuli from the cerebellum begin in their turn to form the field of consciousness. It is not, therefore, correct to say that the cerebrum is the only seat of consciousness.

A. Quite so; the function of the cerebrum is to polish, perfect, or co-ordinate ideas, whereas that of the cerebellum produces conscious desires, and So on.

Q. Evidently we have to extend our idea of consciousness. For instance, there is no reason why a sensitive plant should not have consciousness. Du Prel, in his "Philosophie der Mystik," cites some very curious experiments showing a kind of local consciousness, perhaps a kind of reflex connection. He even goes further than this, demonstrating, from a large number of well authenticated cases, such as those of clairvoyants, who can perceive by the pit of the stomach, that the threshold of consciousness is capable of a very wide extension, far wider than we are accustomed to give to it, both upwards and downwards.

A. We may congratulate ourselves on the experiments of Du Prel as an antidote to the theories of Professor Huxley, which are absolutely irreconcilable with the teachings of occultism.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

January, February, March, 1889

III

Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on January 24th, 1889; MR. T. B. HARBOTTLE in the Chair.

STANZA I (continued) .

Sloka (5).—DARKNESS ALONE FILLED THE BOUNDLESS ALL, FOR FATHER, MOTHER AND SON WERE ONCE MORE ONE, AND THE SON HAD NOT AWAKENED YET FOR THE NEW WHEEL AND HIS PILGRIMAGE THEREON.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE

331

Q. Is "Darkness" the same as the "Eternal Parent Space" spoken of in Sloka (1)?

A. Not at all. Here "the boundless all" is the "Parent Space"; and Cosmic Space is something already with attributes, at least potentially. "Darkness," on the other hand, and in this instance, is that of which no attributes can be postulated: it is the Unknown Principle filling Cosmic Space.

Q. Is Darkness, then, used in the sense of the opposite pole to Light?

A. Yes, in the sense of the Unmanifested and the Unknown as the opposite pole to manifestation, and that which falls under the possibility of speculation.

Q. Darkness is not opposed to Light, then, but to differentiation; or rather, may it not be taken as the symbol of Negativeness?

A. The "Darkness" here meant can be opposed to neither Light nor Differentiation, as both are the legitimate effects of the Manvantaric evolution—the cycle of Activity. It is the "Darkness upon the face of the Deep," in *Genesis*: Deep being here "the bright son of the Dark Father"—Space.

Q. Is it that there is no Light or simply nothing to manifest, and no one to perceive it?

A. Both. In the sense of objectivity, both light and darkness are illusions—*maya*; in this case, it is not Darkness as absence of Light, but as one incomprehensible primordial Principle, which, being Absoluteness itself, has for our intellectual perceptions neither form, colour, substantiality, nor anything that could be expressed by words.

Q. When does Light proceed from that Darkness?

A. Subsequently, when the first hour for manifestation strikes.

Q. Light, then, is the first manifestation?

A. It is, after differentiation has begun and at the third stage of evolution only. Bear in

mind that in philosophy we use the word “Light” in a dual sense: one to signify eternal, absolute light, *in potentia*, ever present in the bosom of the unknown Darkness, coexistent and coeval with the latter in Eternity, or in other words, identical with it; and the other as a Manifestation of heterogeneity and a contrast

to it. For one who reads the *Vishnu-Purâna*, for instance, understandingly, will find the difference between the two terms well expressed in Vishnu; one with Brahmâ, and yet distinct from him. There, Vishnu is the eternal *x*, and at the same time every term of the equation. He is Brahma (neuter) essentially matter and Spirit, which are Brahma’s two primordial aspects—Spirit being the abstract light.* In the *Vedas*, however, we find Vishnu held in small esteem, and no mention made whatever of Brahmâ (the male).

Q. What is the meaning of the sentence, “Father, Mother and Son were once more one”?

A. It means that the three Logoi—the unmanifested “Father,” the semi-manifested “Mother” and the Universe, which is the third *Logos* of our philosophy or Brahmâ, were during the (periodical) *pralaya* once more *one*; differentiated essence had rebecome undifferentiated. The sentence, “Father, Mother, and Son,” is the antetype

* In the second chapter of the *Vishnu-Purâna* (Wilson’s translation) we read—“*Parâbra* said: Glory to the unchangeable, holy, eternal, supreme *VishṢu*, of one universal nature, the mighty over all: to him who is *HiraṢyagarbha*, *Hari*, and *Bankara*, the creator, the preserver, and destroyer of the world: to *Vâsudeva*, the liberator of his worshippers: to him whose essence is both single and manifold; who is both subtile and corporeal, indiscrete and discrete: to *Vishnu*, the cause of final emancipation. Glory to the supreme *VishṢu*, the cause of the creation, existence, and end of this world; who is the root of the world, and who consists of the world.”

And again: “Who can describe him who is not to be apprehended by the senses: who is the best of all things; the supreme soul, self-existent: who is devoid of all the distinguishing characteristics of complexion, caste, or the like; and is exempt from birth, vicissitude, death, or decay: who is always, and alone: who exists everywhere, and in whom all things here exist; and who is, thence, named *Vâsudeva*? He is Brahma [neuter], supreme, lord, eternal, unborn, imperishable, undecaying; of one essence; ever pure, as free from defects. He, that Brahma, was [is] all things; comprehending in his own nature the indiscrete and discrete.”

[This subject is treated in Book I, ch. ii, of *VishṢu-PurâṢa*, and may be found on pp. 13-15, and 17-18 of Wilson’s translation.—*Compiler*.]

of the Christian type—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—the last of which was, in early

Christianity and Gnosticism, the female “Sophia.” It means that all creative and sensitive forces and the effects of such forces which constitute the universe had returned to their primordial state: *all* was merged into one. During the Mahapralayas naught but the Absolute is.

Q. What are the different meanings of Father, Mother and Son? In the Commentary, they are explained as (a) Spirit, Substance and Universe, (b) Spirit, Soul and Body, (c) Universe, Planetary Chain and Man.

A. I have just completed it with my extra definition, which is clear, I think. There is nothing to be added to this explanation, unless we begin to anthropomorphise abstract conceptions.

Q. Taking the last terms of the three series, do the ideas Son, Universe, Man, Body correspond with one another?

A. Of course they do.

Q. And are these terms produced from the remaining pair of terms of each trinity; for instance, the Son from the Father and Mother, the men from the Chain and the Universe, etc., etc., and finally in Pralaya is the son merged back again into its parents?

A. Before the question is answered, you must be reminded that the period preceding so-called Creation is not spoken about; but only that when matter had begun to differentiate, but had not yet assumed form. Father-Mother is a compound term which means primordial Substance or Spirit-matter. When from Homogeneity it begins through differentiation to fall into Heterogeneity, it becomes positive and negative; thus from the “Zero-state” (or *laya*) it becomes active and passive, instead of the latter alone; and, in consequence of this differentiation (the resultant of which is evolution and the subsequent Universe),—the “Son” is produced, the Son being that same Universe, or manifested Kosmos, till a new *Mahapralaya*.

Q. Or—the ultimate state in laya, or in the zero point, as in the beginning before the stage of the Father, Mother and Son?

A. There is but slight reference to that which was before the Father-Mother period in *The Secret Doctrine*. If there

is Father-Mother, there can, of course, be no such condition as *Laya*.

Q. Father, Mother are therefore later than the Laya condition?

A. Quite so; individual objects may be in *Laya*, but the Universe cannot be so when Father-Mother appears.

Q. Is Fohat one of the three, Father, Mother and Son?

A. Fohat is a generic term and used in many senses. He is the *light* (*Daiviprakriti*) of all the three *logoi*—the personified symbols of the three *spiritual stages* of Evolution. Fohat is the aggregate of all the spiritual creative ideations *above*, and of all the electro-dynamic and creative forces *below*, in Heaven and on Earth. There seems to be great confusion and misunderstanding concerning the First and Second Logos. The first is the already present

yet still unmanifested potentiality in the bosom of Father-Mother; the Second is the abstract collectivity of creators called “Demiurgi” by the Greeks or the Builders of the Universe. The *third logos* is the ultimate differentiation of the Second and the individualization of Cosmic Forces, of which Fohat is the chief; for Fohat is the synthesis of the Seven Creative Rays or Dhyān Chohans which proceed from the third Logos.

Q. During Manvantara when the Son is in existence or awake, does the Father-Mother exist independently or only as manifested in the Son?

A. In using the terms Father, Mother, and Son, we should be on our guard against anthropomorphising the conception; the two former are simply centrifugal and centripetal forces and their product is the “Son”; moreover, it is impossible to exclude either of these factors from the conception in the Esoteric Philosophy.

Q. If so then comes this other point: it is possible to conceive of centripetal and centrifugal forces existing independently of the effects they produce. The effects are always regarded as secondary to the cause or causes.

A. But it is very doubtful whether such a conception can be maintained in, and applied to, our Symbology; if these forces exist they must be producing effects, and if the effects cease, the forces cease with them, for who can know of them?

Q. But they exist as separate entities for mathematical purposes, do they not?

A. That is a different thing; there is a great difference between nature and science, reality and philosophical symbolism. For the same reason we divide man into seven principles, but this does not mean that he has, as it were, seven skins, or entities, or souls. These principles are all aspects of one principle, and even this principle is but a temporary and periodical ray of the One eternal and infinite Flame or Fire.

Sloka (6). THE SEVEN SUBLIME LORDS AND THE SEVEN TRUTHS HAD CEASED TO BE, AND THE UNIVERSE, THE SON OF NECESSITY, WAS IMMERSSED IN PARANISHPANNA (absolute perfection, Paranirvana, which is Yong-Grub), TO BE OUT-BREATHED BY THAT WHICH IS AND YET IS NOT.

NAUGHT WAS.

Sloka (7). THE CAUSES OF EXISTENCE HAD BEEN DONE AWAY WITH; THE VISIBLE THAT WAS, AND THE INVISIBLE THAT IS, RESTED IN ETERNAL NON-BEING, THE ONE BEING.

Q. If the “Causes of existence” had been done away with how did they come again into existence? It is stated in the Commentary that the chief cause of existence is “the desire to exist,” but in the sloka, the universe is called the “son of necessity.”

A. “The causes of existence had been done away with” refers to the last Manvantara, or age of Brahmâ, but the cause which makes the Wheel of Time and Space run into Eternity, which is out of Space and Time, has nothing to do with finite causes or what we call Nidânas. There seems to me no contradiction in the statements.

Q. There certainly is a contrast. If the causes of existence had been done away with, how did they come into existence again? But the answer removes the difficulty, for it is stated that one Manvantara had disappeared into Pralaya, and that the cause which led

the previous Manvantara to exist is now behind the limits of Space and Time, and therefore causes another Manvantara to come into being.

A. Quite so. This one eternal and therefore, “causeless cause” is immutable and has nothing to do with the causes on any of the planes which are concerned with finite and conditioned being. The cause can therefore be no

means be a finite consciousness or desire. It is an absurdity to postulate desire or necessity of the Absolute; the striking of a clock does not suggest the desire of the clock to strike.

Q. But the clock is wound up, and needs a Winder?

A. The same may be said of the universe and this cause, the Absolute containing both clock and Winder, once it is the Absolute; the only difference is that the former is wound up in Space and Time and the latter out of Space and Time, that is to say in Eternity.

Q. The question really requests an explanation of the cause, in the Absolute, of differentiation.

A. That is outside the province of legitimate speculation. Parabrahm is not a cause, neither is there any cause that can compel it to emanate or create. Strictly speaking, Parabrahm is not even the Absolute but *Absoluteness*. Parabrahm is not the cause, but the causality, or the propelling but not volitional power, in every manifesting Cause. We may have some hazy idea that there is such a thing as this eternal Causeless Cause or Causality. But to define it is impossible. In the “*Lectures on the Bhagavad Gita*,” by Mr. Subba Row, it is stated that logically even the First Logos cannot cognize Parabrahm, but only Mulaprakriti, its veil. When, therefore, we have yet no clear idea of Mulaprakriti, the first basic aspect of Parabrahm, what can we know of that Supreme Total which is veiled by *Mulaprakriti* (the root of nature or Prakriti) even to the Logos.

Q. What is the meaning of the expression in sloka (7), “the visible that was, and the invisible that is”?

A. “The visible that was” means the universe of the past Manvantara which had passed into Eternity and was no more. “The invisible that is” signifies the eternal, ever-present and ever-invisible deity, which we call by many names, such as abstract Space, Absolute Sat, etc., and know, in reality, nothing about it.

Sloka (8). ALONE THE ONE FORM OF EXISTENCE STRETCHED BOUNDLESS, INFINITE, CAUSELESS, IN DREAMLESS SLEEP; AND LIFE PULSATED UNCONSCIOUS IN UNIVERSAL SPACE, THROUGHOUT THAT ALL-PRESENCE WHICH IS SENSED BY THE “OPENED EYE” OF THE DANGMA.

Q. Does the “Eye” open upon the Absolute: or are the “one form of existence” and the “All-Presence” other than the Absolute, or various names for the same Principle?

A. It is all one, of course; simply metaphorical expressions. Please notice that the “Eye” is not said to “see”; it only “sensed” the “All-Presence.”

Q. It is through this “Eye” then, that we receive such sense, or feeling, or consciousness?

A. Through that “Eye,” most decidedly; but then one must have such an “Eye” before he can see, or become a *Dangma*, or a Seer.

Q. The highest spiritual faculty, presumably?

A. Very well; but where, at that stage, was the happy possessor of it? There was no *Dangma* to sense the “All-Presence,” because there were as yet no men.

Q. With reference to sloka (6), it was stated that the cause of Light was Darkness?

A. Darkness has, here again, to be read in a metaphorical sense. It is Darkness most unquestionably to our intellect, inasmuch as we can know nothing of it. I told you already that neither Darkness nor Light are to be used in the sense of opposites, as in the differentiated world. Darkness is the term which will give rise to the least misconceptions. For instance, if the term “Chaos” were used, it would be liable to be confounded with chaotic matter.

Q. The term light was, of course, never used for physical light?

A. Of course not. Here light is the first potentiality awakening from its *laya* condition to become a potency; it is the first flutter in undifferentiated matter which throws it into objectivity and into a plane from which will start manifestation.

Q. Later on in “The Secret Doctrine,” it is stated that light is made visible by darkness, or rather that darkness exists originally, and that light is the result of the presence of objects to reflect it, that is of the objective world. Now if we take a globe of water and pass an electric beam through it, we shall find that this beam is invisible, unless there are opaque particles in the water, in which case, specks of light will be seen. Is this a good analogy?

A. It is a very fair illustration, I believe.

Q. Is not Light a differentiation of vibration?

A. So we are told in Science; and Sound is also. And so we see that the senses are to a certain extent interchangeable. How would you account, for instance, for the fact that in trance a clairvoyant can read a letter, sometimes placed on the forehead, at the soles of the feet, or on the stomach-pit?

Q. That is an extra sense.

A. Not at all; it is simply that the sense of seeing can be interchanged with the sense of touch.

Q. But is not the sense of perception the beginning of the sixth sense?

A. That is going beyond the present case, which is simply the interchanging of the

senses of touch and sight. Such clairvoyants, however, will not be able to tell the contents of a letter which they have not seen or been brought into contact with; this requires the exercise of the sixth sense, the former is an exercise of senses on the physical plane, the latter of a sense on a higher plane.

Q. It seems very probable from physiology that every sense may be resolved into the sense of touch, which may be called the co-ordinating sense. This deduction is made from embryological research, which shows that the sense of touch is the first and primary sense, and that all the rest are evolved from it. All the senses, therefore, are more highly specialised or differentiated forms of touch.

A. This is not the view of Eastern philosophy; in the *Anugita*, we read of a conversation between “Brahman” and his wife concerning the senses, seven are spoken of, “mind and understanding” being the other two, according to Mr. Trimbak Telang and Professor Max Müller’s translation; these terms, however, do not convey the correct meaning of the Sanskrit terms. Now, the first sense, according to the Hindus, is connected with sound. This can hardly be the sense of touch.

Q. By touch most probably sensibility, or some sense medium, is meant?

A. In the Eastern philosophy, however, the sense of sound is first manifested, and next the sense of sight, sounds passing into colours. Clairvoyants can *see* sounds and detect every note and modulation far more distinctly than

they would by the ordinary sense of sound—vibration, or hearing.

Q. Is it, then, that sound is perceived as a sort of rhythmic movement?

A. Yes; and such vibrations can be seen at a greater distance than they can be heard.

Q. But supposing the physical hearing were stopped, and a person perceived sounds clairvoyantly, could not this sensation be translated into clairaudience as well?

A. One sense must certainly merge at some point into the other. So also sound can be translated into taste. There are sounds which taste exceedingly acid in the mouths of some sensitives, while others generate the taste of sweetness, in fact, the whole scale of senses is susceptible of correlations.

Q. Then there must be the same extension of the sense of smell?

A. Very naturally, as has been already shown before. The senses are interchangeable once we admit correlation. Moreover they can all be intensified or modified very considerably. You will now understand the reference in the *Vedas* and *Upanishads*, where sounds are said to be perceived.

Q. There was a curious story in the last number of “Harper’s Magazine” of a tribe on an island in the South Seas which has virtually lost the art and habit of speaking and conversing. Yet, they appeared to understand one another and see plainly what each other thought.

A. Such a “Palace of Truth” would hardly suit modern society. However, it was by just such means that the early races are said to have communicated with one another, thought

taking an objective form, before speech developed into a distinct spoken language. If so, then there must have been a period in the evolution of the human races when the whole Humanity was composed of sensitives and clairvoyants.

IV

Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on January 31st, 1889; MR. T. B. HARBOTTLE in the Chair.

STANZA I (continued).

Q. With reference to sloka (6), where it speaks of the "Seven Lords," since confusion is apt to arise as to the correct application of the terms, what is the distinction between Dhyan-Chohans, Planetary Spirits, Builders and Dhyani-Buddhas?

A. As an additional two volumes of *The Secret Doctrine* would be required to explain all the Hierarchies; therefore, much relating to them has been omitted from the Stanzas and Commentaries. A short definition may, however, be tried. Dhyan-Chohan is a generic term for all Devas, or celestial beings. A Planetary Spirit is a Ruler of a planet, a kind of finite or personal god. There is a marked difference, however, between the Rulers of the Sacred Planets and the Rulers of a small "chain" of worlds like our own. It is no serious objection to say that the earth has, nevertheless, six invisible companions and four different planes, as every other planet, for the difference between them is vital in many a point. Say what one may, our Earth was never numbered among the seven *sacred* planets of the ancients, though in exoteric, popular astrology it stood as a substitute for a secret planet now lost to astronomy, yet well known to initiated specialists. Nor were the Sun or the Moon in that number, though accepted in our day by modern astrology; for the Sun is a Central *Star*, and the Moon a dead planet.

Q. Were none of the six globes of the "terrene" chain numbered among the sacred planets?

A. None. The latter were all planets on *our* plane, and some of them have been discovered later.

Q. Can you tell us something of the planets for which the Sun and the Moon were substitutes?

A. There is no secret in it, though our modern astrologers are ignorant of these planets. One is an intra-mercurial planet, which is supposed to have been discovered, and named by anticipation Vulcan, and the other a

planet with a retrograde motion, sometimes visible at a certain hour of night and apparently near the moon. The occult influence of this planet is transmitted by the moon.

Q. What is it that made these planets sacred or secret?

A. Their occult influences, as far as I know

Q. Then do the Planetary Spirits of the Seven Sacred Planets belong to another hierarchy than to that of the earth?

A. Evidently; since the terrestrial spirit of the earth is not of a very high grade. It must be remembered that the planetary spirit has nothing to do with the spiritual man, but with things of matter and cosmic beings. The gods and rulers of our Earth are cosmic Rulers; that is to say, they form into shape and fashion cosmic matter, for which they were called *Cosmocratores*. They never had any concern with spirit; the Dhyani-Buddhas, belonging to quite a different hierarchy, are especially concerned with the latter.

Q. These seven Planetary Spirits have therefore nothing really to do with the earth except incidentally?

A. On the contrary, the “Planetary”—who are not the Dhyani-Buddhas—have everything to do with the earth, physically and morally. It is they who rule its destinies and the fate of men. They are Karmic agencies.

Q. Have they anything to do with the fifth principle—the higher Manas?

A. No: they have no concern with the three higher principles; they have, however, something to do with the fourth. To recapitulate, therefore; the term “Dhyani-Chohan” is a generic name for all celestial beings. The “Dhyani-Buddhas” are concerned with the human higher triad in a mysterious way that need not be explained here. The “Builders” are a class called, as I already explained, *Cosmocratores*, or the invisible but intelligent Masons, who fashion matter according to the ideal plan ready for them in that which we call Divine and Cosmic ideation. They were called by the early Masons the “Grand Architect of the Universe” *collectively*: but now the modern Masons make of their G. A. O. T. U. a personal and singular Deity.

Q. Are they not also Planetary Spirits?

A. In a sense they are—as the Earth is also a Planet—but of a lower order.

Q. Do they act under the guidance of the Terrestrial Planetary Spirit?

A. I have just said that they were collectively that Spirit themselves. I wish you to understand that they are not an Entity, a kind of a personal God, but Forces of nature acting under one immutable Law, on the nature of which it is certainly useless for us to speculate.

Q. But are there not Builders of Universes, and Builders of Systems, as there are Builders of our earth?

A. Assuredly there are.

Q. Then the terrestrial Builders are a Planetary “Spirit” like the rest of them, only inferior in kind?

A. I would certainly say so.

Q. Are they inferior according to the size of the planet or inferior in quality?

A. The latter, as we are taught. You see the ancients lacked our modern, and especially theological, conceit, which makes of this little speck of mud of ours something ineffably grander than any of the stars and planets known to us. If, for instance, Esoteric Philosophy teaches that the “Spirit” (collectively again) of Jupiter is far superior to the Terrestrial Spirit, it is not because Jupiter is so many times larger than our earth, but because its substance and texture are so much finer than, and superior to, that of the earth. And it is in proportion to this quality that the Hierarchies of respective “Planetary Builders” reflect and act upon the ideations they find planned for them in the Universal Consciousness, the real great Architect of the Universe.

Q. The soul of the World, or “Anima Mundi”?

A. Call it so, if you like. It is the Antetype of these Hierarchies, which are its differentiated types. The one *impersonal* Great Architect of the Universe is MAHAT, the Universal Mind. And Mahat is a symbol, an abstraction, an aspect which assumed a hazy, entitative form in the all-materializing conceptions of men.

Q. What is the real difference between the Dhyani-Buddhas in the orthodox and the esoteric conceptions?

A. A very great one philosophically. They are—as higher Devas—called by the Buddhists, Bodhisattvas. Exoterically they are five in number, whereas in the esoteric schools they are seven, and not single Entities but *Hierarchies*. It is stated in *The Secret Doctrine* that five Buddhas have come and that two are to come in the sixth and seventh races. Exoterically their president is Vajrasattva, the “Supreme Intelligence” or “Supreme Buddha,” but more transcendent still is Vajradhara, even as Parabrahm transcends Brahmâ or Mahat. Thus the exoteric and occult significations of the Dhyani-Buddhas are entirely different. Exoterically each is a trinity, three in one, all three manifesting simultaneously in three worlds—as a human Buddha on earth, a Dhyani-Buddha in the world of astral forms, and an arupa, or formless, Buddha in the highest Nirvanic realm. Thus for a human Buddha, an incarnation of one of these Dhyanis, the stay on earth is limited from seven to seven thousand years in various bodies, since as men they are subjected to normal conditions, accidents and death. In Esoteric philosophy, on the other hand, this means that only five out of the “Seven Dhyani-Buddhas”—or, rather, the Seven Hierarchies of these Dhyanis, who, in Buddhist mysticism, are identical with the higher incarnating Intelligences, or the Kumâras of the Hindus—five only have hitherto appeared on earth in regular succession of incarnations, the last two having to come during the sixth and seventh Root-Races. This is, again, semi-allegorical, if not entirely so. For the sixth and seventh Hierarchies have been already incarnated on this earth together with the rest. But as they have reached “Buddhaship,” so called, almost from the beginning of the fourth Root-Race, they are said to rest since then in conscious bliss and freedom till the beginning

of the Seventh Round, when they will lead Humanity as a new race of Buddhas. These Dhyanis are connected only with Humanity, and, strictly speaking, only with the highest “principles” of men.

Q. Do the Dhyani-Buddhas and the Planetary Spirits in charge of the globes go into pralaya when their planets enter that state?

A. Only at the end of the seventh Round, and not between each round, for they have to watch over the working of the laws during these minor pralayas. Fuller details on this subject have already been written in the third volume of the *Secret Doctrine*.* But all these differences in fact are merely functional, for they are all aspects of one and the same Essence.

Q. Does the hierarchy of Dhyanis, whose province it is to watch over a Round, watch during its period of activity, over the whole series of globes, or only over a particular globe?

A. There are incarnating and there are watching Dhyanis. Of the functions of the former you have just been told; the latter appear to do their work in this wise. Every class or hierarchy corresponds to one of the Rounds, the first and lowest hierarchy to the first and less developed Round, the second to the second, and so on till the seventh Round is reached, which is under the supervision of the highest Hierarchy of the Seven Dhyanis. At the last, they will appear on earth, as also will some of the Planetary, for the whole humanity will have become Bodhisattvas, their own “sons,” *i.e.*, the “Sons” of their own Spirit and Essence or—themselves. Thus there is only a functional difference between the Dhyanis and the Planetary. The one are entirely divine, the other *sidereal*. The former only are called *Anupadaka*, parentless,† because they radiated directly from that which is neither Father nor Mother but the unmanifested Logos. They are, in fact, the spiritual

* [No material on this subject is at present known to exist. The volume published in 1897 and entitled “The Secret Doctrine, Volume III,” does not contain anything treating even remotely of this general theme. H. P. B.’s statement seems to confirm the belief that certain other manuscripts existed at one time, though their ultimate fate remains entirely undetermined.—*Compiler*.]

† [This Sanskrit term appears in a misspelled form in many places throughout H. P. B.’s writings. Its correct form is *Anupapâdaka*, from *an*—not, *upa*—according to, and the causative form of the verb-root *pad*—to proceed. This term means therefore “one who does not proceed according to regular succession,” *i.e.*, self-born, or parentless.—*Compiler*.]

aspect of the seven Logoi; and the Planetary Spirits are in their totality, as the seven Sephiroth (the three higher being supercosmic abstractions and *blinds* in the Kabala), and constitute the Heavenly man, or Adam Kadmon; *Dhyani* is a generic name in Buddhism, an abbreviation for all the gods. Yet it must be ever remembered that though they are “gods,” still they are not to be worshipped.

Q. Why not, if they are gods?

A. Because Eastern philosophy rejects the idea of a personal and extra-cosmic deity. And to those who call this *atheism*, I would say the following. It is illogical to worship one such god, for, as said in the Bible, “There be Lords many and Gods many.” Therefore, *if* worship is desirable, we have to choose either the worship of many gods, each being no better or less limited than the other, *viz.*, polytheism and idolatry, or choose, as the Israelites have done, one tribal or racial god from among them, and while believing in the existence of many gods, ignore and show contempt for the others, regarding our own as the highest and the “God of Gods.” But this is logically unwarrantable, for such a god can be neither infinite nor absolute, but must be finite, that is to say, limited and conditioned by space and time. With the Pralaya the tribal god disappears, and Brahmâ and all the other Devas, and the gods are merged into the Absolute. Therefore, occultists do not worship or offer prayers to them, because if we did, we should have either to worship many gods, or pray to the Absolute, which, having no attributes, can have no ears to hear us. The worshipper even of many gods must of necessity be unjust to all the other gods; however far he extends his worship it is simply impossible for him to worship each severally; and in his ignorance, if he choose out any one in particular, he may by no means select the most perfect. Therefore, he would do better far to remember that every man has a god within, a direct ray from the Absolute, the celestial ray from the One; that he has his “god” *within*, not outside of, himself.

Q. Is there any name that can be applied to the planetary Hierarchy or spirit, which watches over the entire evolution of our own globe, such as Brahma for instance?

A. None, except the generic name, since it is a septenary and a Hierarchy; unless, indeed, we call it as some Kabalists do—“the Spirit of the Earth.”

Q. It is very difficult to remember all these infinite Hierarchies of gods.

A. Not more so than to a chemist to remember the endless symbols of chemistry, if he is a Specialist. In India, alone, however, there are over 300 millions of gods and goddesses. The Manus and Rishis are also planetary gods, for they are said to have appeared at the beginning of the human races to watch over their evolution, and to have incarnated and descended on earth subsequently in order to teach mankind. Then, there are the *Sapta Rishis*, the “Seven Rishis,” said exoterically to reside in the constellation of the Great Bear. There are also planetary gods.

Q. Are they higher than Brahma?

A. It depends in what aspect one views Brahmâ. In esoteric philosophy he is the

synthesis of the seven *logoi*. In exoteric theology he is an aspect of Vishnu with the Vaishnavas, with others something else, as in the *Trimurti*, the Hindu Trinity, he is the chief creator, whereas Vishnu is the Preserver, and Siva the Destroyer. In the Kabala he is certainly Adam Kadmon—the “male-female” man of the first chapter of *Genesis*. For the Manus proceed from Brahmâ as the Sephiroth proceed from Adam Kadmon, and they are also *seven* and *ten*, as circumstances require.

But we may just as well pass on to another Sloka of the Stanzas you want explained.

Sloka (9). —BUT WHERE WAS THE DANGMA WHEN THE ALAYA OF THE UNIVERSE (*Soul as the basis of all, Anima Mundi*) WAS IN PARAMARTHA (*Absolute Being and Consciousness which are Absolute Non-Being and Unconsciousness*) AND THE GREAT WHEEL WAS ANUPADAKA?

Q. Does “Alaya” mean that which is never manifested and dissolved, and is it derived from “a,” the negative particle, and “laya”?

A. If it is so etymologically—and I am certainly not prepared to answer you one way or the other—it would

mean the reverse, since *laya* itself is just that which is not manifested; therefore it would signify *that which is not unmanifested* if anything. Whatever may be the etymological vivisection of the word, it is simply the “Soul of the World,” *Anima Mundi*. This is shown by the very wording of the Sloka, which speaks of Alaya being in *Paramartha*—*i.e.*, in Absolute Non-Being and Unconsciousness, being at the same time absolute perfection or Absoluteness itself. This word, however, is the bone of contention between the Yogâchârya and the Madhyamika schools of Northern Buddhism. The scholasticism of the latter makes of *Paramartha* (*Satya*) something dependent on, and, therefore, relative to other things, thereby vitiating the whole metaphysical philosophy of the word Absoluteness. The other school very rightly denies this interpretation.

Q. Does not the Esoteric Philosophy teach the same doctrines *as the Yogâchârya School*?

A. Not quite. But let us go on.

STANZA II.

Sloka (1) WHERE WERE THE BUILDERS, THE LUMINOUS SONS OF MANVANTARIC DAWN? IN THE UNKNOWN DARKNESS IN THEIR AH-HI (*Chohanic, Dhyani-Buddhic*) PARANISHPANNA, THE PRODUCERS OF FORM (*rupa*) FROM NO-FORM (*arupa*), THE ROOT OF THE WORLD—THE DEVAMATRI AND SVABHAVAT, RESTED IN THE BLISS OF NONBEING.

Q. Are the “luminous sons of manvantaric dawn” perfected human spirits of the last

Manvantara, or are they on their way to humanity in this or a subsequent Manvantara?

A. In this case, which is that of a *Maha-manvantara* after a *Maha-pralaya*, they are the latter. They are the primordial seven rays from which will emanate in their turn all the other luminous and non-luminous lives, whether Archangels, Devils, men or apes. Some have been and some will only now become human beings. It is only after the differentiation of the seven rays and after the seven forces of nature have taken them in hand and

worked upon them, that they become cornerstones, or rejected pieces of clay. Everything, therefore, is in these seven rays, but it is impossible to say at this stage in which, because they are not yet differentiated and individualized.

Q. In the following passage:—

The “Builders,” the “Sons of Manvantaric Dawn,” are the real creators of the Universe; and in this doctrine, which deals only with our Planetary System, they, as the architects of the latter, are also called the “Watchers” of the Seven Spheres, which exoterically are the Seven planets, and esoterically the seven earths or spheres (planets) of our chain also.*

By planetary system is the solar system meant or the chain to which our earth belongs?

A. The Builders are those who build and fashion things into a form. The term is equally applied to the Builders of the Universe and to the small globes like those of our chain. By planetary system our solar system alone is meant .

Sloka (2) WHERE WAS SILENCE? WHERE WERE THE EARS TO SENSE IT? NO! THERE WAS NEITHER SILENCE, NOR SOUND

Q. With reference to the following passage:—

The idea that things can cease to exist and still BE, is a fundamental one in Eastern psychology. Under this apparent contradiction in terms, there rests a fact in Nature to realize which in the mind rather than to argue about words, is the important thing. A familiar instance of a similar paradox is afforded by chemical combination. The question whether Hydrogen and Oxygen cease to exist, when they combine to form water, is still a moot one. . . .†

Would it be correct to say that what we perceive is a different “element” of the same substance? For example, when a substance is in the gaseous state, could we say that it is the element Air which is perceived, and that when combined to form water, oxygen and hydrogen appear under the guise of the Element Water, and when in the solid state, ice, we then perceive the element Earth?

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 53.

† *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 54.

A. The ignorant judge of all things by their appearance and not by what they are in reality. On this earth, of course, water is an element quite distinct from any other element, using the latter term in the sense of different manifestations of the one element. The root elements, Earth, Water, Air, Fire, are far more comprehensive states of differentiation. Such being the case, in Occultism Transubstantiation becomes a possibility, seeing that nothing which exists is in reality that which it is supposed to be.

Q. But oxygen which is usually found in its gaseous state, may be liquified and even solidified. When oxygen, then, is found in the gaseous condition, is it the occult element Air which is perceived, and when in the liquid condition the element Water, and in the solid state the element Earth?

A. Most assuredly: we have first of all the Element Fire, not the common fire, but the Fire of the Mediaeval Rosicrucians, the one flame, the fire of Life. In differentiation this becomes fire in different aspects. Occultism easily disposes of the puzzle as to whether oxygen and hydrogen cease to exist when combined to form water. Nothing that is in the Universe can disappear from it. For the time being, then, these two gases when combined to form water, are *in abscondito*, but have not ceased to *be*. For, had they been annihilated, Science, by decomposing the water again into oxygen and hydrogen, would have created something out of nothing, and would, therefore, have no quarrel with Theology. Therefore, water is an element, if we choose to call it so, on this plane only. In the same way, oxygen and hydrogen in their turn can be split up into other more subtle elements, all being differentiations of one element or universal essence.

Q. Then all substances on the physical plane are really so many correlations or combinations of these root elements, and ultimately of the one element?

A. Most assuredly. In occultism it is always best to proceed from universals to particulars.

Q. Apparently, then, the whole basis of occultism lies in this, that there is latent within every man a power which can give him true knowledge, a power of perception of truth, which enables him to

deal first hand with universals if he will be strictly logical and face the facts. Thus we can proceed from universals to particulars by this innate spiritual force which is in every man.

A. Quite so: this power is inherent in all, but paralyzed by our methods of education, and especially by the Aristotelian and Baconian methods. Hypothesis now reigns triumphant.

Q. It is curious to read Schopenhauer and Hartmann and mark how, step by step, by

strict logic and pure reason, they have arrived at the same bases of thought that had been centuries ago adopted in India, especially by the Vedantin System. It may, however, be objected that they have arrived at this by the inductive method. But in Schopenhauer's case at any rate it was not so. He acknowledges himself that the idea came to him like a flash; having thus got his fundamental idea he set to work to arrange his facts, so that the reader imagines that what was in reality an intuitive idea, is a logical deduction drawn from the facts.

A. This is not only true of the Schopenhauerian philosophy, but also of all the great discoveries of modern times. How, for instance, did Newton discover the law of gravity? Was it not by the simple fall of an apple, and not by an elaborate series of experiments. The time will come when the Platonic method will not be so entirely ignored and men will look with favour on methods of education which will enable them to develop this most spiritual faculty.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
January, February, March, 1889

V

Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on February 7th, 1889; MR. W. KINGSLAND in the Chair.

STANZA II (*continued*).

Sloka (3). THE HOUR HAD NOT YET STRUCK; THE RAY HAD NOT YET FLASHED INTO THE GERM; THE MATRI-PADMA (*mother lotus*) HAD NOT YET SWOLLEN.

“The ray of the ‘Ever-Darkness’ becomes, as it is emitted, a ray of effulgent light or life, and flashes into

the ‘Germ’—the point in the Mundane Egg, represented by matter in its abstract sense.”*

Q. Is the Point in the Mundane Egg the same as the Point in the Circle, the Unmanifested Logos?

A. Certainly not: the Point in the Circle is the Unmanifested Logos, the Manifested Logos is the Triangle. Pythagoras speaks of the never manifested Monad which lives in solitude and darkness; when the hour strikes it radiates from itself ONE, the first number. This number descending, produces Two, the second number, and Two, in its turn, produces THREE, forming a triangle, the first complete geometrical figure in the world of form. It is this ideal or abstract triangle which is the Point in the Mundane Egg, which, after gestation, and in the third remove, will start from the Egg to form the Triangle. This is Brahmâ-Vâch-Virâj in the Hindu Philosophy and Kether-Chochmah-Binah in the *Zohar*. The First Manifested Logos is the Potentia, the unrevealed Cause; the Second, the still latent thought; the Third, the Demiurgus, the active Will evolving from its universal Self the active effect, which, in its turn, becomes the cause on a lower plane.

Q. What is Ever-Darkness in the sense used here?

A. Ever-Darkness means, I suppose, the ever-unknowable mystery, behind the veil—in fact, Parabrahm. Even the Logos can see only Mulaprakriti, it cannot see that which is beyond the veil. It is that which is the “Ever-unknowable Darkness.”

Q. What is the Ray in this connection?

A. I will recapitulate. We have the plane of the circle, the face being black, the point in the circle being potentially white, and this is the first possible conception in our minds of the invisible Logos. “Ever-Darkness” is eternal, the Ray periodical. Having flashed out from this central point and thrilled through the Germ, the Ray is withdrawn again within this point and the Germ develops into the Second Logos, the triangle within the Mundane Egg.

* [*The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 57.]

Q. What, then, are the stages of manifestation?

A. The first stage is the appearance of the potential point in the circle—the unmanifested Logos. The second stage is the shooting forth of the Ray from the potential white point, producing the first point, which is called, in the *Zohar*, Kether or Sefhira. The third stage is the production from Kether of Chochmah, and Binah, thus constituting the first triangle, which is the Third or manifested Logos—in other words, the subjective and objective Universe. Further, from this manifested Logos will proceed the Seven Rays, which in the *Zohar* are called the lower Sephiroth and in Eastern occultism the primordial seven rays. Thence will proceed the innumerable series of Hierarchies.

Q. Is the Triangle here mentioned that which you refer to as the Germ in the Mundane Egg?

A. Certainly it is. But you must remember that there are both the Universal and Solar Eggs (as well as others), and that it is necessary to qualify any statement made concerning them. The Mundane Egg is an expression of Abstract Form.

Q. May Abstract Form be called the first manifestation of the eternal female principle?

A. It is the first manifestation not of the female principle, but of the Ray which proceeds from the central point which is perfectly sexless. There is no eternal female principle, for this Ray produces that which is the united potentiality of both sexes but is by no means either male or female. This latter differentiation will only appear when it falls into matter, when the Triangle becomes a Square, the first Tetraktys.

Q. Then the Mundane Egg is as sexless as the Ray?

A. The Mundane Egg is simply the first stage of manifestation, undifferentiated primordial matter, in which the vital creative Germ receives its first spiritual impulse; Potentiality becomes Potency.

Matter, by convenience of metaphor only, is regarded as feminine, because it is receptive of the rays of the sun which fecundate it and so produce all that grows on its surface, *i.e.*, on this, the lowest plane. On the other hand

primordial matter should be regarded as substance, and by no means can be spoken of as having sex.

Thus the Egg, on whatever plane you speak of, means the ever-existing undifferentiated matter which strictly is not matter at all, but, as we call it, the Atoms. Matter is destructible in form while the Atoms are absolutely indestructible, being the quintessence of Substances. And here, I mean by “atoms” the primordial divine Units, not the “atoms” of modern Science.

Similarly the “Germ” is a figurative expression; the germ is everywhere, even as the circle whose circumference is nowhere and whose centre is everywhere. It therefore means all germs, that is to say, unmanifested nature, or the whole creative power which will emanate, called by the Hindus Brahmâ, though on every plane it has a different name.

Q. Is the Matri-Padma the eternal or the periodical Egg?

A. The eternal Egg; it will become periodical only when the ray from the first Logos shall have flashed from the latent Germ in the Matri-Padma which is the Egg, the Womb of the Universe which is to be. By analogy, the physical germ in the female cell could not be called eternal, though the latent spirit of the germ concealed within the male cell in nature, may be so called.

Sloka (4). HER HEART HAD NOT YET OPENED FOR THE ONE RAY TO ENTER, THENCE TO FALL AS THREE INTO FOUR IN THE LAP OF MAYA.

“But, as the hour strikes and it becomes receptive of the Fohatic impress of the Divine Thought (the Logos, or the male aspect of the Anima Mundi, Alaya)—its heart opens.” *

Q. Does not the Fohatic impress of the Divine Thought apply to a later stage of differentiation?

A. Fohat, as a distinct force or entity, is a later development. “Fohatic” is an adjective and may be used in a more wide sense; Fohat, as a substantive, or Entity,

* The Secret Doctrine, Vol. I, p. 58.

springs from a Fohatic attribute of the Logos. Electricity cannot be generated from that which does not contain an electric principle or element. The divine principle is eternal, the gods are periodical. Fohat is the Sakti or force of the divine mind; Brahmâ and Fohat are both aspects of the divine mind.

Q. Is it not the intention in the Commentaries to this Stanza to convey some idea of the subject by speaking of correspondences in a much later stage of evolution?

A. Exactly so; it has several times been stated that the Commentaries on the First Volume are almost entirely concerned with the evolution of the solar system only. The beauty and wisdom of the Stanzas consist in this, that they may be interpreted on seven different planes, the last reflecting, by the universal law of correspondences and analogy, in its most differentiated, gross and physical aspect, the process which takes place on the first or purely spiritual plane. I may state here once and for all that the first Stanzas treat of the awakening from Pralaya and are not concerned with the Solar system alone, while Vol. II deals only with our Earth.

Q. Can you say what is the real meaning of the word Fohat?

A. The word is a Turanian compound and its meanings are various. In China *Pho*, or *Fo*, is the word for “animal soul,” the vital *Nephesh* or the breath of life. Some say that it is derived from the Sanskrit “*Bhu*,” meaning existence, or rather the essence of existence. Now *Svâyambhû* means *Brahmâ* and *Man* at the same time. It means self-existence and self-existing, that which is everlasting, the eternal breath. If *Sat* is the potentiality of Being, *Pho* is the potency of Being. The meaning, however, entirely depends upon the position of the accent. Again, *Fohat* is related to *Mahat*. It is the reflection of the Universal Mind, the synthesis of the “Seven” and the intelligences of the seven creative Builders, or, as we call them, *Cosmocratores*. Hence, as you will understand, life and electricity are one in our philosophy. They say life is electricity, and if so, then the One Life is the essence and root of all the electric and magnetic phenomena on this manifested plane.

Q. How is it that Horus and the other “Sun-Gods” are said to be born “through an immaculate Mother”?

A. On the first plane of differentiation there is no sex—to use the term for convenience’s sake—but both sexes exist potentially in primordial matter. Matter is the root of the word “Mother” and therefore female; but there are two kinds of matter. The undifferentiated, primordial matter is not fecundated by some act in space and time, fertility and productiveness being inherent in it. Therefore that which emanates or is *born* out of that inherent virtue is not born from, but through, it. In other words, that virtue or quality is the sole cause that this something manifests through its vehicle; whereas on the physical plane, Mother-matter is not the active cause but the passive means and instrument of an independent cause.

In the Christian doctrine of the Immaculate Conception—a materializing of the metaphysical and spiritual conception—the mother is first fecundated by the Holy Ghost and the Child born from, and not through, her. “From” implies that there is a limited and conditioned source to start from, the act having to take place in Space and Time. “Through” is applicable to Eternity and Infinity as well as to the Finite. The Great Breath thrills through Space, which is boundless, and is *in*, not *from*, eternity.

Q. How does the Triangle become the Square, and the Square the six-faced Cube?

A. In occult and Pythagorean geometry the Tetrad is said to combine within itself all

the materials from which Kosmos is produced. The Point or One, extends to a Line—the Two; a Line to a Superficies, Three; and the Superficies, Triad or Triangle, is converted into a Solid, the Tetrad or Four, by the point being placed over it. Kabalistically Kether, or Sefhira, the Point, emanates Chochmah and Binah, which two, are the synonym of *Mahat*, in the Hindu *Purânas*, and this Triad, descending into matter, produces the Tetragrammaton, *Tetraktys*, as also the lower Tetrad. This number contains both the productive and produced numbers. The Duad

doubled makes a Tetrad and the Tetrad doubled forms a Hebdomad.* From another point of view it is the Spirit, Will, and Intellect animating the four lower principles.

Q. Then how does the Square become the six-faced Cube.?

A. The Square becomes the Cube when each point of the triangle becomes dual, male or female. The Pythagoreans said “Once One, Twice Two. and there ariseth a Tetrad, having on its top the highest Unit; it becomes a Pyramid whose base is a plane Tetrad—divine light resting on it, makes the abstract Cube.”

The surface of the Cube is composed of six squares, and the Cube unfolded gives the Cross, or the vertical Four, barred by the horizontal Three; the six thus making Seven, the seven principles or the Pythagorean seven properties in man. See the excellent explanation given of this in Mr. J. R. Skinner’s *Source of Measures*.

Thus is repeated on earth the mystery enacted, according to the Seers, on the divine plane. The “Son” of the immaculate Celestial Virgin (or the undifferentiated cosmic protyle, Matter in its infinitude) is born again on Earth as the Son of the terrestrial Eve—our mother Earth, and becomes Humanity as a total—past, present and future—for Jehovah or Jod-he-vau-he is androgyne, or both male and female. Above, the Son is the whole KOSMOS; below, he is MANKIND. The triad or triangle becomes Tetraktys, the Sacred Pythagorean number, the perfect Square, and a six-faced cube on Earth. The Macroprosopus (the Great Face) is now Microprosopus (the lesser face); or, as the Kabalists have it, the “Ancient of Days,” descending on Adam Kadmon whom he uses as his vehicle to manifest through, gets transformed into Tetragrammaton. It is now in the “Lap of Maya,” the Great Illusion, and between itself and the Reality has the Astral Light, the great Deceiver of man’s limited senses, unless Knowledge through Paramarthasatya comes to the rescue.†

That is to say, the Logos becomes a Tetragrammaton; the Triangle, or the Three becomes the Four.

* [A Tetrad doubled would be eight or an *Ogdoad*, while a Hebdomad would imply *seven*. This may be a typographical error, unless some other meaning is implied. We leave it unaltered.—*Compiler*.]

† *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 60.

Q. Is the Astral Light used here in the sense of Maya?

A. Certainly. It is explained further on in *The Secret Doctrine* that practically there are only four planes belonging to the planetary chains. The three higher planes are absolutely *Arupa* and outside our comprehension.

Q. Then the Tetraktys is entirely different from Tetragrammaton?

A. The Tetraktys by which the Pythagoreans swore, was not the Tetragrammaton, but on the contrary, the higher or superior Tetraktys. In the opening chapters of *Genesis* we have a clue to the discovery of this lower Tetragrammaton. We there find Adam, Eve, and Jehovah who becomes Cain. The further extension of Humanity is symbolised in Abel, as the human conception of the higher. Abel is the daughter and not the son of Eve, and symbolises the separation of the sexes; while the murder of Abel is symbolical of marriage. The still more human conception is found at the end of the fourth Chapter, when speaking of Seth, to whom was born a son Enos, after which men began—not, as translated in *Genesis*, to “call upon the Lord”—but to be called *Jod-He-Vau*, meaning males and females.

The Tetragrammaton, therefore, is simply Malkuth; when the bridegroom comes to the bride on Earth, then it becomes Humanity. The seven lower Sephiroth must all be passed through, the Tetragrammaton becoming more and more material. The Astral Plane lies between the *Tetraktys* and Tetragrammaton.

Q. Tetraktys appears to be used here in two entirely different senses?

A. The true Pythagorean Tetraktys was the Tetraktys of the invisible Monad, which produces the first Point, the second and the third and then retires into the darkness and everlasting silence; in other words the Tetraktys is the first Logos. Taken from the plane of matter, it is among other things, the lower Quarternary, the man of flesh or matter.

VI

Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on February 14th, 1889; MR. W. KINGSLAND in the chair..

STANZA III.

Sloka (1). THE LAST VIBRATION OF THE SEVENTH ETERNITY THRILLS THROUGH INFINITUDE. THE MOTHER SWELLS, EXPANDING FROM WITHIN WITHOUT LIKE THE BUD OF THE LOTUS .

“The seemingly paradoxical use of the sentence ‘Seventh Eternity,’ thus dividing the

indivisible, is sanctified in esoteric philosophy. The latter divides boundless duration into unconditionally eternal and universal Time and a conditioned one (*Khandakâla*). One is the abstraction or noumenon of infinite time (Kâla); the other its phenomenon appearing periodically, as the effect of *Mahat* (the Universal Intelligence limited by Manvantaric duration).” *

Q. Does the commencement of Time as distinguished from Duration, correspond to the appearance of the manifested Logos?

A. Certainly, it cannot do so earlier. But “the seventh vibration” applies to both the First, and to the manifested Logos—the first out of Space and Time, the second, when Time has commenced. It is only when “the mother swells” that differentiation sets in, for when the first Logos radiates through primordial and undifferentiated matter there is as yet no action in Chaos. “The last vibration of the Seventh Eternity” is the first which announces the Dawn, and is a synonym for the First or unmanifested Logos. There is no Time at this stage. There is neither Space nor Time when beginning is made; but it is all in Space and Time, once that differentiation sets in. At the time of the primordial radiation, or when the Second Logos emanates, it is Father-Mother potentially,

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 62.

but when the Third or manifested Logos appears, it becomes the Virgin-Mother. The “Father and the Son” are one in all the world Theogonies; hence, the expression corresponds to the appearance of both the unmanifested and the manifested Logos one at the beginning, the other at the end, of the “Seventh Eternity.”

Q. Can you, then, speak of Time as existing from the appearance of the Second or Unmanifested-Manifested Logos?

A. Assuredly not, but from the appearance of the Third. It is here that the great difference between the two lies, as just shown. The “last vibration” begins outside of Time and Space, and ends with the third Logos, when Time and Space begin, *i.e.*, periodical time. The Second Logos partaking of both the essences or natures of the first and the last. There is no differentiation with the First Logos; differentiation only begins in latent World-Thought, with the Second Logos, and receives its full expression, *i.e.*, becomes the “Word” made flesh—with the Third.

Q. How do the terms “Radiation” and “Emanation” differ in the Secret Doctrine?

A. They express, to my mind, two entirely different ideas, and are the best apologies for the original terms that could be found; but if the ordinary meanings are attached to them the idea will be missed. Radiation is, so to say, the unconscious and spontaneous shooting forth, the action of a something from which this act takes place; but emanation is something from which another thing issues in a constant efflux, and emanates consciously.

An orthodox Occultist goes so far as to say that the smell of a flower emanates from it “consciously”—absurd as it may seem to the profane. Radiation *can* come from the Absolute; Emanation *cannot*. One difference exists in the idea that Radiation is sure, sooner or later, to be withdrawn again while Emanation runs into other emanations and is thoroughly separated and differentiated. Of course at the end of the cycle of time emanation will also be withdrawn into the One Absolute; but meanwhile, during the entire cycle of changes emanation will persist. One thing emanates from the other, and, in fact, from

one point of view, emanation is equivalent to Evolution; while “radiation” represents to my mind—in the pre-cosmic period, of course—an instantaneous action like that of a piece of paper set on fire under a burning glass, of which act the Sun knows nothing. Both terms, of course, are used for want of better.

*Q. What is meant by prototypes existing in the Astral Light? **

A. Astral Light is here used as a convenient phrase for a term very little understood, viz: “the realm of Akâsa, or primordial Light manifested through the divine Ideation.” The latter must be accepted in this particular case as a generic term for the universal and divine mind reflected in the waters of Space or Chaos, which is the Astral Light proper, and a mirror reflecting and reversing a higher plane. In the ABSOLUTE or Divine Thought everything exists and there has been no time when it did not so exist; but Divine Ideation is limited by the Universal Manvantaras. The realm of Akâsa is the undifferentiated noumenal and abstract Space which will be occupied by *Chidakasam*, the field of primordial consciousness. It has several degrees, however, in Occult philosophy; in fact, “seven fields.” The first is the field of latent consciousness which is coeval with the duration of the first and second unmanifested Logoi. It is the “Light which shineth in darkness and the darkness comprehended it not” of St. John’s Gospel. When the hour strikes for the Third Logos to appear, then from the latent potentiality there radiates a lower field of differentiated consciousness, which is Mahat, or the entire collectivity of those Dhyana-Chohans of *sentient life* of which Fohat is the representative on the objective plane and the Manasaputras on the subjective. The Astral Light is that which mirrors the three higher planes of consciousness, and is above the lower, or terrestrial plane; therefore it does not extend beyond the fourth plane, where, one may say, the Akâsa begins.

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 63.

There is one great difference between the Astral Light and the Akâsa which must be remembered. The latter is eternal, the former periodic. The Astral Light changes not only with the Maha manvantaras but also with every sub-period and planetary cycle or Round.

Q. Then do the prototypes exist on a plane higher than that of the Astral Light?

A. The prototypes or ideas of things exist first on the plane of Divine eternal Consciousness and thence become reflected and reversed in the Astral Light, which also reflects on its lower individual plane the life of our Earth, recording it on its “tablets.” Therefore, is the Astral Light called illusion. It is from this that we, in our turn, get our prototypes. Consequently unless the Clairvoyant or SEER can get beyond this plane of illusion, he can never see the Truth, but will be drowned in an ocean of self-deception and hallucinations.

Q. And what is the Akâsa proper?

A. The Akâsa is the eternal divine consciousness which cannot differentiate, have qualities, or act; action belongs to that which is reflected or mirrored from it. The unconditioned and infinite can have no relation with the finite and conditioned. The Astral Light is the Middle Heaven of the Gnostics, in which is Sophia Achamoth, the mother of the seven builders or Spirits of the Earth, which are not necessarily good, and among which the Gnostics placed Jehovah, whom they called Ildabaoth. (*Sophia Achamoth must not be confounded with the divine Sophia.*) We may compare the Akâsa and the Astral Light, with regard to these prototypes, to the germ in the acorn. The latter, besides containing in itself the astral form of the future oak, conceals the germ from which grows a tree containing millions of forms. These forms are contained in the acorn potentially, yet the development of each particular acorn depends upon extraneous circumstances, physical forces, etc.

Q. But how does this account for the endless varieties of the Vegetable Kingdom?

A. The different variations of plants, etc., are the broken rays of one Ray. As the ray passes through the

seven planes, it is broken on every plane into thousands and millions of rays down to the world of forms, every ray breaking into an intelligence on its own plane. So that we see every plant has an intelligence, or its own purpose of life, so to speak, and its own free will, to a degree. This is how, I, at any rate, understand it. A plant can be receptive or non-receptive, though *every plant without an exception* feels and has a consciousness of its own. But besides the latter, every plant—from the gigantic tree down to the minutest fern or blade of grass—has, Occultism teaches us, an Elemental entity of which it is the outward clothing on this plane. Hence, the Kabalists and the mediaeval Rosicrucians are always found talking of Elementals. According to them, everything possessed an Elemental sprite.

Q. What is the difference between an Elemental and a Dhyan-Chohan or

Dhyani-Buddha?

A. The difference is very great. Elementals are attached only to the four terrestrial Elements and only to the two lower kingdoms of nature—the mineral and the vegetable—in which they *inmetalize* and *inherbalize*, so to speak. The Hindu term *Deva* may be applied to them, but not that of *Dhyani-Chohan*. The former have a kind of Kosmic intelligence; but the latter are endowed with a supersensuous intellect, each of its kind. As to the Dhyani-Buddhas, they belong to the highest Divine (or omniscient) Intelligences, answering best, perhaps, to the Roman Catholic Archangels.

Q. Is there an evolution of types through the various planes of the Astral Light?

A. You must follow out the simile of the evolution of the acorn. From the acorn will grow an oak and this oak, as a tree, may have a thousand forms, all of which vary the one from the other. All these forms are contained within the acorn, and though the form which the tree will take depends on extraneous circumstances, yet that, which Aristotle called the “privation of matter” exists beforehand in the Astral waves. But the noumenal germ of the oak exists beyond the plane of the Astral Light; it is only the subjective picture of it that already

exists in the Astral Light, and the development of the oak tree is the result of the developed prototype in the Astral Light, which development proceeds from higher to lower planes, until on the lowest plane it has its last consolidation and development of form. And here is the explanation of the curious fact according to the Vedantin assertion that each plant has its Karma and that its growth is the result of Karma. This Karma proceeds from the lower Dhyani-Chohans who trace out and plan the growth of the tree.

Q. What is the real meaning of Manvantara or rather Manu-antara?

A. It means really “Between two Manus,” of which there are fourteen in every “Day of Brahmâ,” such a “Day” consisting of 1,000 aggregates of four ages or 1,000 “Great Ages,” Mahayugas. When the word “Manu” is analysed it is found that Orientalists state that it is from the root “Man,” to think, hence the thinking man. But, esoterically every Manu, as an anthropomorphized patron of his special cycle, or Round, is but the personified idea of the “Thought Divine” (like the Hermetic Pymander). Each of the Manus, therefore, is the special god, the creator and fashioner of all that appears during his own respective cycle of being or Manvantara.

Q. Is Manu a unity also of human consciousness personified, or is it the individualization of the Thought Divine for manvantaric purposes?

A. Of both, since “human consciousness” is but a Ray of the divine. Our *Manas*, or Ego, proceeds from, and is the Son (figuratively) of Mahat. Vaivasvata Manu (the Manu of our own fifth race and Humanity in general) is the chief personified representative of the *thinking* Humanity of the fifth Root-race; and therefore he is represented as the eldest Son of the Sun and an *Agnishwatta* Ancestor. As “*Manu*” is derived from *Man*, to think, the idea is clear. Thought in its action on human brains is endless. Thus Manu is, and contains

the potentiality of all the thinking forms which will be developed on earth from this particular source. In the

exoteric teaching he is the beginning of this earth, and from him and his daughter Ila humanity is born; he is a unity which contains all the pluralities and their modifications. Every Manvantara has thus its own Manu and from this Manu the various Manus or rather all the *Manasa* of the Kalpas will proceed. As an analogy he may be compared to the white light which contains all the other rays, giving birth to them by passing through the prism of differentiation and evolution. But this pertains to the esoteric and metaphysical teachings.

Q. Is it possible to say that Manu stands in relation to each Manvantara as does the First Logos to the Maha manvantara?

A. It is possible to say so, if you like.

Q. Is it possible to say that Manu is an individuality?

A. In the abstract sense certainly not, but it is possible to apply an analogy. Manu is the synthesis perhaps of the *Manasa*, and he is a single consciousness in the same sense that while all the different cells of which the human body is composed are different and varying consciousnesses, there is still a unit of consciousness which is the man. But this unit, so to say, is not a single consciousness: it is a reflection of thousands and millions of consciousnesses which a man has absorbed.

But Manu is not really an individuality, it is the whole of mankind. You may say that Manu is a generic name for the Pitris, the progenitors of mankind. They come, as I have shown, from the Lunar Chain. They give birth to humanity, for, having become the first men, they give birth to others by evolving their shadows, their astral selves. They not only give birth to humanity but to animals and all other creatures. In this sense it is said in the *Puranas* of the great Yogis that they gave birth, one to all the serpents, another to all the birds, etc. But, as the moon receives its light from the Sun, so the descendants of the Lunar Pitris receive their higher mental light from the Sun or the “Son of the Sun.” For all you know Vaivasvata Manu may be an *Avatar* or a personification of MAHAT, commissioned by the Universal Mind to lead and guide thinking Humanity onwards.

Q. We learn that the perfected humanity of one Round becomes the Dhyani-Buddhas and the guiding rulers of the next Manvantara. What bearing then has Manu on the hosts of the Dhyani-Buddhas?

A. He has no bearing at all—in exoteric teachings. But I may tell you that the Dhyani-Buddhas have nothing to do with the lower practical work of the earth-plane. To

use an illustration: the Dhyani-Buddha may be compared to a great ruler of any condition of life. Suppose that it were merely that of a house; the great ruler has nothing directly to do with the dirty work of a kitchen-maid. The higher Dhyanis evolve lower and lower hierarchies of Dhyanis more and more consolidated and more material until we arrive at this chain of Planets, some of the latter being the Manus, Pitris and Lunar Ancestors. As I show in the Second Volume of *The Secret Doctrine*, these Pitris have the task of giving birth to man. They do this by projecting their shadows and the first humanity (if indeed it can be called humanity) are the astral Chhayas of the Lunar Ancestors over which physical nature builds the physical body, which at first is formless. The Second Race is more and more formed and is sexless. In the Third Race they become bi-sexual and hermaphrodite and then finally separating, the propagation of humanity proceeds in diverse manners.

Q. Then what do you mean by the term Manvantara, or as you have explained it Manu-antara, or "between two Manus"?

A. It simply means a period of activity and is not used in any limited and definite sense. You have to gather from the context of the work you are studying what the meaning of the Manvantara is, remembering also that what is applicable to a lesser period applies also to a greater, and conversely.

*Q. Is "Water" as used here purely symbolical or has it a correspondence in the evolution of the elements?**

A. It is necessary to be very careful not to confuse the universal with the terrestrial elements. Nor again

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 64.

do the terrestrial elements mean what is known as the chemical elements. I would call the cosmic, universal elements the noumena of the terrestrial elements, and add that cosmic is not confined to our little Solar System.

Water is the first cosmic element and the terms "darkness" and "chaos" are used to denote the same "element." There are seven states of matter of which three are generally known, *viz.*, solid, liquid, and gaseous. It is necessary to consider everything cosmic and terrestrial as existing in variations of these seven states. But it is impossible for me to speak in terms which are unknown to you, and therefore impossible to understand. Thus "water," the "hot and moist principle" of the philosophers, is used to denote that which is not yet solid matter, or rather that which does not yet possess the solidity of matter, as we understand it. It is rendered rather more difficult by the use of the term "water" as a subsequent "element" in the series of ether, fire and air. But ether contains in itself all the others and their properties, and it is this ether which is the hypothetical agent of physical science: moreover it is the lowest form of Akâsa, the one agent and universal element.

Thus water is used here to denote matter in its precosmic state.

Q. What relation have the elements to the Elementals?

A. The same relation as the earth has to man. As physical man is the quintessence of the Earth, so Air or Fire, or Water, an Elemental (called Sylph, Salamander, Undine, etc.) is of the quintessence of its special element. Every differentiation of substance and matter evolves a kind of intelligent Force, and it is these which the Rosicrucians called Elemental or Nature spirits. Everyone of us can believe in Elementals which we can create for ourselves. But this latter class of elemental creation has no existence outside our own imagination. It will be an intelligence, a Force, good or bad, but the form given to it and its attributes will be of our own creation, while at the same time it will have an intelligence derived also from us.

Q. Are the “Virgin-Egg” and the “Eternal Egg” the same thing, or are they different stages of differentiation?

A. The eternal egg is a pre-differentiation in a laya or zero condition; thus, before differentiation it can have neither attributes nor qualities. The “virgin egg” is already qualified and therefore differentiated, although in its essence it is the same. No one thing can be separated from another thing, in its abstract essential nature. But in the world of illusion, in the world of forms, of differentiation, everything, ourselves included, *seems* to be so separated.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**
January, February, March, 1889

VII

Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on February 21st, 1889; MR. W. KINGSLAND in the chair.

STANZA III (*continued*).

Sloka (2). THE VIBRATION SWEEPS ALONG, TOUCHING WITH ITS SWIFT WING (*simultaneously*) THE WHOLE UNIVERSE, AND THE GERM THAT DWELLETH IN DARKNESS: THE DARKNESS THAT BREATHES (*moves*) OVER THE SLUMBERING WATERS OF LIFE.

Q. How are we to understand the expression that the vibration touches the whole universe and also the germ?

A. First of all the terms used must be defined as far as possible, for the language used is purely figurative. The Universe does not mean the Kosmos or world of forms but the formless space, the future vehicle of the Universe which will be manifested. This space is synonymous with the “waters of space,” with (to us) eternal darkness, in fact with Parabrahm. In short the whole *Sloka* refers to the “period” before there was any manifestation whatever. In the same way the Germ—the Germ is eternal, the undifferentiated atoms of future matter—is one with space, as infinite as it is indestructible, and as eternal as space itself. Similarly with “vibration,” which corresponds with the Point, the unmanifested Logos.

It is necessary to add one important explanation. In using figurative language, as has been done in *The Secret Doctrine*, analogies and comparisons are very frequent. Darkness for instance, as a rule, applies only to the unknown totality, or Absoluteness. Contrasted with eternal darkness, the first Logos is certainly Light; contrasted with the second or third, the manifested Logos, the first is Darkness, and the others are Light.

Sloka (3). “DARKNESS” RADIATES LIGHT, AND LIGHT DROPS ONE SOLITARY RAY INTO THE WATERS, INTO THE MOTHER DEEP. THE RAY SHOOTS THROUGH THE VIRGIN-EGG; THE RAY CAUSES THE ETERNAL EGG TO THRILL, AND DROP THE NON-ETERNAL (*periodical*) GERM, WHICH CONDENSES INTO THE WORLD EGG.

Q. Why is Light said to drop one solitary ray into the waters and how is this ray represented in connection with the Triangle?

A. However many the Rays may appear to be on this plane, when brought back to their original source they will finally be resolved into a unity, like the seven prismatic colours which all proceed from, and are resolved into the one white ray. Thus too, this one solitary Ray expands into the seven rays (and their innumerable subdivisions) on the plane of illusion only. It is represented in connection with the Triangle because the Triangle is the first perfect geometrical figure. As stated by Pythagoras, and also in the Stanza, the Ray (the Pythagorean Monad) descending from “no-place” (*Aloka*), shoots like a falling star through the planes of non-being into the first world of being, and gives birth to Number One; then branching off, to the right, it produces Number Two; turning again to form the base-line it begets Number Three, and thence ascending again to Number One, it finally disappears therefrom into the realms of non-being as Pythagoras shows.

Q. Why should Pythagorean teachings be found in old Hindu philosophies?

A. Pythagoras derived this teaching from India and in the old books we find him spoken of as the Yavanacharya or Greek Teacher. Thus we see that the Triangle is

the first differentiation, its sides however all being described by the one Ray.

Q. What is really meant by the term “planes of non-being”? A. In using the term “planes of non-being” it is necessary to remember that these planes are only to us spheres of non-being, but those of being and matter to higher intelligences than ourselves. The highest Dhyan-Chohans of the Solar System can have no conception of that which exists in higher systems, *i.e.*, on the second “septenary” Kosmic plane, which to the Beings of the ever *invisible* Universe is entirely subjective.

Sloka (4). (Then) THE THREE (triangle) FALL INTO THE FOUR (quaternary). THE RADIANT ESSENCE BECOMES SEVEN INSIDE, SEVEN OUTSIDE. THE LUMINOUS EGG (Hiranyagarbha), WHICH IN ITSELF IS THREE (the triple hypostases of Brahmâ, or Vishnu, the three “Avasthas”), CURDLES AND SPREADS IN MILK-WHITE CURDS THROUGHOUT THE DEPTHS OF MOTHER, THE ROOT THAT GROWS IN THE OCEAN OF LIFE.

Q. Is the Radiant Essence the same as the luminous Egg? What is the Root that grows in the ocean of life?

A. The radiant essence, luminous egg or Golden Egg of Brahmâ, or again, Hiranyagarbha, are identical. The Root that grows in the ocean of life is the potentiality that transforms into objective differentiated matter the universal, subjective, ubiquitous but homogeneous germ, or the eternal essence which contains the potency of abstract nature. The Ocean of Life is, according to a term of the Vedanta philosophy—if I mistake not—the “One Life,” Paramatma, when the transcendental supreme Soul is meant; and Jivatma, when we speak of the physical and animal “breath of life” or, so to speak, the differentiated soul, that life in short, which gives being to the atom and the universe, the

molecule and the man, the animal, plant, and mineral.

“The Radiant Essence curdled and spread through the depths of Space.” From an astronomical point of view this is easy of explanation: it is the Milky Way, the world-stuff, or primordial matter in its first form.

Q. Is the Radiant Essence, Milky Way, or world-stuff, resolvable into atoms or is it non-atomic?

A. In its precosmic state it is of course non-atomic if by atoms you mean molecules; for the hypothetical atom, a mere mathematical point, is not material or application* to matter, nor even to substance. The real atom does not exist on the material plane. The definition of a point as having position, must not, in Occultism, be taken in the ordinary sense of location; as the *real* atom is beyond space and time. The word molecular is really applicable to our globe and its plane, only: once inside of it, even on the other globes of our planetary chain, matter is in quite another condition, and non-molecular. The atom is in its eternal state invisible even to the eye of an Archangel; and becomes visible to the latter only periodically, during the life cycle. The particle, or molecule, *is not*, but exists periodically, and is therefore regarded as an illusion.

The world-stuff informs itself through various planes and cannot be said to be resolved into stars or to have become molecular until it reaches the plane of being of the visible or objective Universe.

Q. Can ether be said to be molecular in Occultism?

A. It entirely depends upon what is meant by the term. In its lowest strata, where it merges with the astral light, it may be called molecular on its own plane; but not for us. But the ether of which science has a suspicion, is the grossest manifestation of Akâsa, though on our plane, for us mortals, it is the seventh principle of the astral light, and three degrees higher than “radiant matter.” When it penetrates, or informs something, it may be molecular because it takes on the form of the latter, and its atoms inform the particles of that “something.” We may perhaps call matter “crystallised ether.”

Q. But what is an atom, in fact?

A. An atom may be compared to (and is for the Occultist) the seventh principle of a body or rather of

* [applicable?—*Comp.*]

a molecule. The physical or chemical molecule is composed of an infinity of finer molecules and these in their turn of innumerable and still finer molecules. Take for instance a molecule of iron and so resolve it that it becomes non-molecular; it is then, at once transformed into one of its seven principles, *viz.*, its astral body; the seventh of these is the atom. The analogy between a molecule of iron, before it is broken up, and this same molecule after resolution, is the same as that between a physical body before and after death. The principles remain minus the body. Of course this is occult alchemy, not modern chemistry.

Q. What is the meaning of the allegorical “churning of the ocean,” and “cow of plenty” of the Hindus, and what correspondence is there between them and the “war in heaven”?

A. A process which begins in the state of “non-being,” and ends with the close of Maha-Pralaya, can hardly be given in a few words or even volumes. It is simply an allegorical representation of the unseen and unknown primeval intelligences, the atoms of occult science, Brahmâ himself being called *Anu* or the Atom, fashioning and differentiating the shoreless ocean of the primordial radiant essence. The relation and correspondence between the “churning of the ocean” and the “war in heaven” is a very long and abstruse subject to handle. To give it in its lowest symbolical aspect, this “war in heaven” is going on eternally. Differentiation is contrast, the equilibrium of contraries: and so long as this exists there will be “war” or fighting. There are, of course, different stages and aspects of this war: such for instance as the astronomical and physical. For everyone and everything that is born in a Manvantara, there is “war in heaven” and also on the earth: for the fourteen Root and Seed-Manus who preside over our Manvantaric cycle, and for the countless *Forces*, human or otherwise, that proceed from them. There is a perpetual struggle of adjustment, for everything tends to harmonise and equilibrate; in fact it must do so before it can assume any shape. The elements of which we are formed, the particles of our bodies, are in a continual war, one crowding out

the other and changing with every moment. At the “Churning of the Ocean” by the gods, the Nagas came and some stole of the Amrita—the water of Immortality,—and thence arose war between the gods and the Asuras, the *no*-gods, and the gods were worsted. This refers to the formation of the Universe and the differentiation of the primordial primeval matter. But you must remember, that this is only the cosmogonical aspect,—one out of the seven meanings. The war in heaven had also immediate reference to the evolution of the intellectual principle in mankind. This is the metaphysical key.

Q. Why are numbers so much used in the Stanzas; and what is really the secret of their being so freely used in the World-Scriptures—in the Bible and in the Purânas, by Pythagoras and by the Aryan Sages?

A. Balzac, the unconscious occultist of French literature, says somewhere, “the Number is to Mind the same as it is to matter, an incomprehensible agent.” But I would

answer—perhaps so to the profane, never to the initiated mind. Number is, as the great writer thought, an Entity, and at the same time, a Breath emanating from what he called God and what we call the ALL; the breath which alone could organise the physical Kosmos, “where nought obtains its form but through the Deity, which is an effect of Number.” * “God geometrizes,” says Plato.

Q. In what sense can numbers be called Entities?

A. When intelligent Entities are meant; when they are regarded simply as digits they are, of course, not Entities but symbolical signs.

Q. Why is the radiant essence said to become seven inside and seven outside?

A. Because it has seven principles on the plane of the manifested and seven on that of the unmanifested. Always argue on analogy and apply the old occult axiom “as above so below.”

Q. But are the planes of “non-being” also Septenary?

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 66.

A. Most undeniably. That which in *The Secret Doctrine* is referred to as the unmanifested planes, are unmanifested or planes of non-being only from the point of view of the finite intellect; to higher intelligences they would be manifested planes and so on to infinity, analogy always holding good.

VIII

Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on February 28th, 1889; MR. W. KINGSLAND in the chair.

STANZA III (*continued*).

Sloka (5). THE ROOT REMAINS, THE LIGHT REMAINS, THE CURDS REMAIN, AND STILL OEAOHOO IS ONE.

Q. What is meant by saying that these remain?

A. It means simply that whatever the plurality of manifestation may be, still it is all one. In other words these are all different aspects of the one element; it does not mean that they remain without differentiation.

The curds are the first differentiation, and probably refer also to that cosmic matter which is supposed to be the origin of the “Milky Way”—the matter we know. This “matter,” which, according to the revelation received from the primeval Dhyani-Buddhas, is, during the periodical sleep of the Universe, of the ultimate tenuity conceivable to the eye of the perfect Bodhisattva—this matter, radical* and cool, becomes, at the first re-awakening of cosmic motion, scattered through Space; appearing, when seen from the Earth, in clusters and lumps, like curds in thin milk. These are the seeds of the future worlds, the “Star-stuff.” †

Q. Is it to be supposed that the Milky Way is composed of matter in a state of differentiation other than that with which we are acquainted?

* [radiant?—Comp.]

† *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 69.

A. I thoroughly believe so. It is the store-house of the materials from which the stars, planets and other celestial bodies are produced. Matter in this state does not exist on earth; but that which is already differentiated and found on earth is also found on other planets and *vice-versa*. But, as I understand, before reaching the planets from its condition in the Milky Way, matter has first to pass through many stages of differentiation. The matter, for instance, within the Solar system is in an entirely different state from that which is outside or beyond the system.

Q. Is there a difference between the Nebulae and the Milky

A. The same, I should say, that there is between a highway road and the stones and mud upon that road. There must be, of course, a difference between the matter of the Milky Way and that of the various Nebulae, and these again must differ among themselves. But in all your scientific calculations and measurements it is necessary to consider that the light by which the objects are seen is a *reflected* light, and the optical illusion caused by the atmosphere of the earth renders it impossible that calculations of distances, etc., should be absolutely correct, in addition to the fact that it entirely alters observations of the matter of which the celestial bodies are composed, as it is liable to impose upon us a constitution similar to that of the earth. This is, at any rate, what the MASTERS teach us.

Sloka (6). THE ROOT OF LIFE WAS IN EVERY DROP OF THE OCEAN OF IMMORTALITY (Amrita) AND THE OCEAN WAS RADIANT LIGHT, WHICH WAS FIRE AND HEAT AND MOTION. DARKNESS VANISHED AND WAS NO MORE. IT DISAPPEARED IN ITS OWN ESSENCE, THE BODY OF FIRE AND WATER, OF FATHER AND MOTHER.

Q. What are the various meanings of the term “fire” on the different planes of Kosmos?

A. Fire is the most mystic of all the five elements, as also the most divine. Therefore to give an explanation of its various meanings on our plane alone, leaving all

the other planes entirely out of the question, would be much too arduous, in addition to its being entirely incomprehensible for the vast majority. Fire is the father of light, light the parent of heat and air (vital air). If the absolute deity can be referred to as Darkness or the Dark Fire, the light, its first progeny, is truly the first self-conscious god. For what is light in its primordial root but the world-illuminating and life-giving deity? Light is that, which from an abstraction has become a reality. No one has ever seen real or primordial light; what we see is only its broken rays or reflections, which become denser and less luminous as they descend into form and matter. Fire, therefore, is a term which comprehends ALL. Fire is the invisible deity, “the Father,” and the manifesting light is God “the Son,” and also the Sun. Fire—in the occult sense—is aether, and aether is born of motion, and motion is the eternal dark, invisible Fire. Light sets in motion and controls all in nature, from the highest primordial aether down to the tiniest molecule in Space. MOTION is eternal *per se*, and in the manifested Kosmos it is the Alpha and Omega of that which is called electricity, galvanism, magnetism, sensation—moral and physical—thought, and even life, on this plane. Thus fire, on our plane, is simply the manifestation of motion, or Life.

All cosmic phenomena were referred to by the Rosicrucians as “animated geometry.” Every polar function is only a repetition of primeval polarity, said the Fire-Philosophers. For motion begets heat, and aether in motion is heat. When it slackens its motion, then cold is generated, for “cold is aether, in a latent condition.” Thus the principal states of nature are three positive and three negative, synthesized by the primeval light. The three negative states are [1] Darkness; [2] Cold; [3] Vacuum or Voidness. The three positive are [1] Light (on our plane); [2] Heat; [3] All nature. Thus Fire may be called the unity of the Universe. Pure cosmic fire (without, so to speak, fuel) is Deity in its universality; for cosmic fire, or heat which it calls forth, is every atom of matter in manifested nature. There

is not a thing or a particle in the Universe which does not contain in it latent fire.

Q. Fire, then, may be regarded as the first Element?

A. When we say that fire is the first of the Elements, it is the first only in the visible universe, the fire that we commonly know. Even on the highest plane of our universe, the plane of Globe A or G, fire is in one respect only the fourth. For the Occultist, the Rosecroix of the Middle Ages, and even the mediaeval Kabalists, said that to our human perception and even to that of the highest “angels,” the universal Deity is darkness, and from this Darkness issues the Logos in the following aspects: [1] Weight [Chaos which becomes aether in its primordial state]; [2] Light; [3] Heat; [4] Fire.

Q. In what relation does the Sun, the highest form of Fire we can recognise, stand to Fire as you have explained it?

A. The Sun, as on our plane, is not even “Solar” fire. The Sun we see, gives nothing of itself, because it is a reflection; a bundle of electro-magnetic forces, one of the countless milliards of “Knots of Fohat.” Fohat is called the “Thread of primeval Light,” the “Ball of thread” of Ariadne, indeed, in this labyrinth of chaotic matter. This thread runs through the seven planes tying itself into knots. Every plane being septenary, there are thus forty-nine mystical and physical forces, [the] larger knots forming stars, suns and systems, the smaller, planets, and so on.

Q. In what respect is the Sun an illusion?

A. The electro-magnetic knot of our Sun is neither tangible nor dimensional, nor even as molecular as the electricity we know. The Sun absorbs, “psychizes” and vampirizes its subjects within its system. Further than this it gives out nothing of itself. It is an absurdity, therefore, to say that the solar fires are being consumed and gradually extinguished. The Sun has but one distinct function; it gives the impulse of life to all that breathes and lives under its light. The sun is the throbbing heart of the system; each throb being an impulse. But this heart is invisible: no astronomer will ever see it. That which is concealed in this heart and that which

we feel and see, its apparent flame and fires, to use a simile, are the nerves governing the muscles of the solar system, and nerves, moreover, outside of the body. This impulse is not mechanical but a purely spiritual, nervous impulse.

Q. What connection has “weight,” as you use it, with gravity?

A. By weight, gravity in the occult sense of attraction and repulsion is meant. It is one of the attributes of differentiation, and is a universal property. By attraction and repulsion between matter in various states it is possible, in most cases, to explain (whereas the “law of gravitation” is insufficient to do so) the relation which the tails of the comets assume when nearing the sun; seeing that they manifestly act contrary to this hypothesis.

Q. What is the meaning of water in this connection?

A. As Water, according to its atomic weight, is composed of one-ninth of Hydrogen (a very inflammable gas, as you know, and without which no organic body is found), and of eight-ninths of Oxygen (which produces combustion when too rapidly combined with any body), what can it be but one of the forms of primordial force or fire in a cold or latent and fluidic form? Fire bears the same relation to Water as Spirit to Matter.

*Sloka (7). BEHOLD, OH LANOO! THE RADIANT CHILD OF THE TWO, THE UNPARALLELED REFULGENT GLORY, BRIGHT SPACE, SON OF DARK SPACE, WHO EMERGES FROM THE DEPTHS OF THE GREAT DARK WATERS. IT IS OEAOHOO THE YOUNGER, THE * * * (whom thou knowest now as Swan-Shai-Yin.—Comment). HE SHINES FORTH AS THE SUN. HE IS THE BLAZING DIVINE DRAGON OF WISDOM. THE EKA IS CHATUR (four), AND CHATUR TAKES TO ITSELF THREE, AND THE UNION PRODUCES THE SAPTA (seven) IN WHOM ARE THE SEVEN WHICH BECOME THE TRIDASA (the thrice ten), THE HOSTS AND THE*

MULTITUDES. BEHOLD HIM LIFTING THE VEIL, AND UNFURLING IT FROM EAST TO WEST. HE SHUTS OUT THE ABOVE AND LEAVES THE BELOW TO BE SEEN AS THE GREAT ILLUSION. HE MARKS THE PLACES FOR THE SHINING ONES (*stars*)

AND TURNS THE UPPER (*space*) INTO A SHORELESS SEA OF FIRE, AND THE ONE MANIFESTED (*element*) INTO THE GREAT WATERS.

Kwan-Shai-Yin and Kwan-Yin are synonymous with fire and water. The two deities in their primordial manifestation are the dyadic or dual god, bi-sexual nature, Purusha and Prakriti.

Q. What are the terms corresponding to the three Logoi among the words Oeaohoo, the younger, Kwan-Shai-Yin, Kwan-Yin, Father-Mother, Fire and Water, Bright Space and Dark Space?

A. Everyone must work this out for himself, “Kwan-Shai-Yin marks the places for the shining ones, the stars, and turns the upper space into a shoreless sea of fire, and the one manifested into the great Waters.” Think well over this. Fire here stands for the concealed Spirit, Water is its progeny, or moisture, or the creative elements here on earth, the outer crust, and the evolving or creative principles within, or the innermost principles. Illusionists would probably say “above.”

Q. What is the veil which Oeaohoo, the youngest, lifts from East to West?

A. The veil of reality. It is the curtain which disappears in order to show the spectator the illusions on the stage of Being, the scenery and actors, in short, the universe of MAYA.

Q. What is the “upper space” and “shoreless sea of fire”?

A. The “upper space” is the space “within,” however paradoxical it may seem, for there is no *above* as no *below* in the infinitude; but the planes follow each other and solidify *from within without*. It is in fact, the universe as it first appears from its *laya* or “zero” state, a shoreless expanse of spirit, or “sea of fire.”

Q. Are the “Great Waters” the same as those on which the Darkness moved?

A. It is incorrect in this case to speak of Darkness “moving.” Absolute Darkness, or the Eternal Unknown, cannot be active, and moving *is* action. Even in *Genesis* it is stated that Darkness *was* upon the face of the deep,

but that which moved upon the face of the waters, was the “Spirit of God.” This means esoterically that in the beginning, when the Infinitude was without form, and Chaos, or the outer Space, was still void, darkness (*i.e.*, *Kâlahamsa Parabrahm*) alone *was*. Then, at the

first radiation of dawn, the “Spirit of God” (after the First and Second Logos were radiated), the Third Logos, or Narayan, began to move on the face of the Great Waters of the “Deep.” Therefore the question, to be correct, if not clear, should be, “Are the Great Waters the same as the Darkness spoken of?” The answer would then be in the affirmative. Kalahansa has a dual meaning. Exoterically it is Brahmâ who is the Swan, the “Great Bird,” the vehicle in which Darkness manifests itself to human comprehension as light, and this Universe. But esoterically, it is Darkness itself, the unknowable Absolute which is the Source, firstly of the radiation called the First Logos, then of its reflection, the Dawn, or the Second Logos, and finally of Brahmâ, the manifested Light, or the Third Logos. Let us remember, that under this illusion of manifestation, which we see and feel, and which, as we imagine, comes under our sensuous perceptions, is simply and in sober reality that which we neither hear, see, feel, taste nor touch at all. It is a gross illusion and nothing else.

Q. To return to an early question, in what sense can electricity be called an “entity”?

A. Only when we refer to it as Fohat, its primordial Force. In reality there is only one force, which on the manifested plane appears to us in millions and millions of forms. As said, all proceeds from the one universal primordial fire, and electricity is on our plane one of the most comprehensive aspects of this fire. All contains, and is, electricity, from the nettle which stings to the lightning which kills, from the spark in the pebble to the blood in the body. But the electricity which is seen, for instance, in an electric lamp, is quite another thing from Fohat. Electricity is the cause of the molecular motion in the physical universe, and hence also here, on earth. It is one of the “principles” of matter;

for generated as it is in every disturbance of equilibrium it becomes, so to say, the Kamic element of the object in which this disturbance takes place. Thus Fohat, the primeval cause of this force in its millions of aspects, and as the sum total of universal cosmic electricity is an “entity.”

Q. But what do you mean by this term? Is not electricity an entity also?

A. I would not call it so. The word Entity comes from the Latin root *ens*, “being,” of *esse*, “to be”; therefore everything independent of any other thing is an entity, from a grain of sand up to God. But in our case Fohat is alone an entity, electricity having only a relative significance, if taken in the usual, scientific sense.

Q. Is not cosmic electricity a son of Fohat, and are not his “Seven Sons” entities?

A. I am afraid not. Speaking of the Sun, we may call it an Entity but we would hardly call a sunbeam that dazzles our eyes, also an Entity. The “Sons of Fohat” are the various Forces having fohatic, or cosmic electric life in their essence or being, and in their various effects. An example: rub amber—a Fohatic Entity—and it will give birth to a “Son” who will attract straws: an apparently inanimate and inorganic object thus manifesting life! But rub a nettle between your thumb and finger and you will also generate a Son of Fohat, in the shape of a blister. In these cases, the blister is an Entity, but the attraction which draws the straw, is hardly one.

Q. Then Fohat is cosmic electricity and the “Son” is also electricity?

A. Electricity is the work of Fohat, but as I have just said, Fohat is *not* electricity. From an occult standpoint, electric phenomena are very often produced by the abnormal state of the molecules of an object or of bodies in space: electricity is life and it is death: the first being produced by harmony, the second by disharmony. Vital electricity is under the same laws as Cosmic electricity. The combination of molecules into new forms, and the bringing about of new correlations and disturbance

of molecular equilibrium is, in general, the work of, and generates, Fohat. The synthesized principle, or the emanation of the seven cosmic Logoi is beneficent only there where harmony prevails.

Sloka (8). WHERE WAS THE GERM, AND WHERE WAS NOW DARKNESS? WHERE IS THE SPIRIT OF THE FLAME THAT BURNS IN THY LAMP, OH LANOO? THE GERM IS THAT, AND THAT IS LIGHT; THE WHITE BRILLIANT SON OF THE DARK HIDDEN FATHER.

Q. Is the spirit of the flame that burns in the lamp of every one of us, our Heavenly Father, or Higher Self?

A. Neither one nor the other; the sentence quoted is merely an analogy and refers to a real lamp which the disciple may be supposed to be using.

Q. Are the elements the bodies of the Dhyan-Chohans, and are Hydrogen, Oxygen, Ozone and Nitrogen, the primordial elements on this plane of matter?

A. The answer to the first part of this question will be found by studying the symbolism of *The Secret Doctrine*.

With regard to the four elements named it is the case; but bear in mind that on a higher plane even volatile ether would appear to be as gross as mud. Every plane has its own denseness of substance or matter, its own colours, sounds, dimensions of space, etc., which are quite unknown to us on this plane; and as we have on earth intermediary beings, the ant for instance, a kind of transitional entity between two planes, so on the plane above us there are creatures endowed with senses and faculties unknown to the inhabitants of that plane.

There is a remarkable illustration of Elihu Vedder to the *Quatrains* of Omar Khayyam, which suggests the idea of the Knots of Fohat. It is the ordinary Japanese representation of clouds, single lines running into knots both in drawings and carvings. It is Fohat the “knottier,” and from one point of view it is the “world-stuff.”

Q. If the Milky Way is a manifestation of this “world-stuff” how is it that it is not seen over the whole sky?

A. Why should it not be the more contracted, and therefore, its condensed part which alone is seen? This

forms into “knots” and passes through the sun-stage, the cometary and planetary stages, until finally it becomes a dead body, or a moon. There are also various kinds of suns. The sun of the solar system is a reflection. At the end of the solar manvantara, it will begin to get less and less radiant, giving less and less heat, owing to a change in the real sun, of which the visible sun is the reflection. After the solar Pralaya, the present sun will, in a future Manvantara, become a cometary body, but certainly not during the life of our little planetary chain. The argument drawn from spectrum star-analysis is not solid, because no account is taken of the passage of light through cosmic dust. This does not mean to say that there is no real difference in the spectra of stars, but that the proclaimed presence of iron or sodium in any particular star may be owing to the modification of the rays of such a star by the cosmic dust with which the earth is surrounded.

Q. Does not the perceptive power of the ant—for instance, the way in which its perceptive faculties differ from our perceptive powers of colour—simply depend upon physiological conditions?

A. The ant can certainly appreciate the sounds that we do, and it can also appreciate sounds that we can never hear, therefore evidently, physiology has nothing whatever to do with the matter. The ant and ourselves possess different degrees of perception. We are on a higher scale of evolution than the ant, but, comparatively speaking, we are the ants to the plane above.

Q. When electricity is excited by rubbing amber, is there anything corresponding to an emanation from amber?

A. There is: the electricity which is latent in the amber exists in everything else, and will be found there if given the appropriate conditions necessary for its liberation. There is one error which is commonly made, than which there can be no greater error in the views of an occultist. A division is made between what you call animate and inanimate objects, as if there could be such a thing as a perfectly inanimate object on earth!

In reality, even that which you call a dead man is more alive than ever. From one point of view, the distinguishing mark between what is called the organic and the inorganic is the function of nutrition, but if there were no nutrition how could those bodies which are called inorganic undergo change? Even crystals undergo a process of accretion, which for them answers the function of nutrition. In reality, as Occult philosophy teaches us, everything which changes is organic; it has the life principle in it, and it has all the potentiality of the higher lives. If, as we say, all in nature is an aspect of the one element, and life is universal, how can there be such a thing as an inorganic atom!

Collected Writings VOLUME X

January, February, March, 1889

IX

Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on March 7th, 1889; MR. W. KINGSLAND in the chair.

*Sloka (10). FATHER-MOTHER SPIN A WEB WHOSE UPPER END IS FASTENED TO SPIRIT (Purusha), THE LIGHT OF THE ONE DARKNESS, AND THE LOWER ONE TO MATTER (Prakriti), ITS (the Spirit's) SHADOWY END; AND THIS WEB IS THE UNIVERSE SPUN OUT OF THE TWO SUBSTANCES MADE IN ONE, WHICH IS SVABHAVAT. **

Q. Spirit and matter are the opposite ends of the same web; light and darkness, heat and cold, void or space and fulness of all that exists are also opposites. In what sense are these three pairs of opposites associated with Spirit and Matter?

A. In the sense in which everything in the universe is associated with either Spirit or Matter, one of these being taken as the permanent element or both. Pure Matter is pure Spirit and cannot be understood even if admitted by our finite intellects. Neither light nor

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. 1, p. 83.

darkness as optical effects, are matter, nor are they spirit, but they are the qualities of the former (matter).

Q. In what relation does Ether stand to Spirit and Matter?

A. Make a difference between Æther and Ether, the former being divine, the latter physical and *infernal*. Ether is the lowest of the septenate division of Akâsa-Pradhâna, primordial Fire-Substance. Æther-Akâsa is the fifth and sixth principles of the body of Kosmos—thus corresponding to Buddhi-Manas, in Man; *Ether* is its Kosmic sediment mingling with the highest layer of the Astral Light. Beginning with the fifth root-race, it will develop fully only at the beginning of the fifth round. Æther is Akâsa in its higher aspect, and *Ether* Akâsa, in its lowest. In one sense it is equivalent to the Father-Creator, Zeus, Pater Æther; on the other to the infernal Serpent-Tempter, the Astral Light of the Kabalists. In the latter case it is fully differentiated matter, in the former only rudimentally

differentiated. In other words, Spirit becomes objective matter; and objective matter rebecomes subjective Spirit, when it eludes our metaphysical senses. Æther has the same relation to the Cosmos and our little Earth, as Manas to the Monad and body. Therefore, Ether has nought to do with Spirit, but a good deal, with subjective matter and our Earth.

Q. "Brahma, as the 'germ of unknown Darkness,' is the material from which all evolves and develops." It is one of the axioms of logic that it is impossible for the mind to believe anything of that of which it comprehends nothing. Now if this "material" which is Brahma be formless, then no idea concerning it can enter the mind for the mind can conceive nothing where there is no form. It is the garment or manifestation in the form of "God" which we can perceive, and it is by this and this alone that we can know anything of him. What, therefore, is the first form of this material which human consciousness can recognise?

A. Your axioms of logic can be applied to the *lower Manas* only and it is from the perceptions of *Kama-Manas* alone that you argue. But Occultism teaches only that which it derives from the cognition of the Higher



COUNTESS CONSTANCE WACHTMEISTER

1838-1910

Ego or the *Buddhi-Manas*. But, I will try to answer you on your own familiar lines. The first and only form of the *prima materia* our brain-consciousness can cognise, is a circle. Train your thought first of all to a thorough acquaintance with a limited circle, and expand it gradually. You will soon come to a point when without its ceasing to be a circle in thought, it yet becomes infinite and limitless even to the inner perceptions. It is this circle which we call Brahmâ, the germ, atom or *anu*: a latent atom embracing infinitude and

boundless Eternity during Pralaya, an active one during the life-cycles; but one which has neither circumference nor plane, only limitless expansion. Therefore the Circle is the first geometrical figure and symbol in the subjective world, and it becomes a Triangle in the objective. The Triangle is the next figure after the Circle. The first figure, the Circle with the Point, is really no figure; it is simply a primeval germ, the first thing you can imagine at the beginning of differentiation; the Triangle must be conceived of once that matter has passed the zero point, or *Laya*. Brahmâ is called an atom, because we have to imagine it as a mathematical point, which, however, can be extended into absoluteness. *Nota bene*, it is the divine germ and not the atom of the chemists. But beware of the illusion of form. Once you drag down your Deity into human form you limit and condition it, and behold, you have created an anthropomorphic god.

Sloka (11). IT (*the Web*) EXPANDS WHEN THE BREATH OF FIRE (*the Father*) IS UPON IT; IT CONTRACTS WHEN THE BREATH OF THE MOTHER (*the root of Matter*) TOUCHES IT. THEN THE SONS (*the Elements with their respective Powers, or Intelligences*) DISSOCIATE AND SCATTER, TO RETURN INTO THEIR MOTHER'S BOSOM AT THE END OF THE "GREAT DAY" AND REBECOME ONE WITH HER. WHEN IT (*the Web*) IS COOLING, IT BECOMES RADIANT, ITS SONS EXPAND AND CONTRACT THROUGH THEIR OWN SELVES AND HEARTS; THEY EMBRACE INFINITUDE.*

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 83.

Q. Is the word "expand" here used in the sense of differentiating or evolving, and "contract" in that of involution, or do these terms refer to Manvantara and Pralaya; or again to a constant vibrating motion of the world-stuff or atoms? Is this expansion and contraction simultaneous or successive?

A. The Web is the ever-existent primordial substance—pure spirit to our conception—the material from which the objective universe or universes are evolved. When the breath of fire or Father is upon it, it expands; that is to say, as subjective material it is limitless, eternal, indestructible. When the breath of the Mother touches it, that is when the time of manifestation arrives and it has to come into objectivity of form; it contracts, for there is no such thing as an objective material form which is limitless. Though Newton's proposition that every particle of matter has the property of attraction for every other particle is on the whole correct, and though Leibnitz's proposition that every atom is a universe in itself, and acts through its own inherent force, is also true; yet both are incomplete. For man is also an atom, possessing attraction and repulsion, and is the Microcosm of the Macrocosm. But would it be also true to say that because of the force and intelligence in him, he moves independently of every other human unit, or could act and move, unless there were a greater force and intelligence than his own to allow him to

live and move in that higher element of Force and Intelligence?

One of the objects of *The Secret Doctrine* is to prove that planetary movements cannot be satisfactorily accounted for by the theory of gravitation alone. Besides the force acting *in* matter there is also a force acting *on* matter.

When we speak of the modified conditions of Spirit-Matter (which is in reality Force), and call them by various names, such as heat, cold, light and darkness, attraction and repulsion, electricity and magnetism, etc., etc., to the occultist they are simple names, expressions of difference in manifestations of one and the same Force (always dual in differentiation), but not any specific difference of forces. For all such differences in the objective world result only from the peculiarities

of differentiation of matter on which the one free force acts, helped in this by that portion of its essence which we call imprisoned force, or material molecules. The worker within, the inherent force, ever tends to unite with its parent essence without; and thus, the Mother acting within, causes the Web to contract; and the Father acting without, to expand. Science calls this gravitation; Occultists, the work of the universal Life-Force, which radiates from that Absolute and Unknowable FORCE which is outside of all Space and Time. This is the work of Eternal evolution and involution, or expansion and contraction.

Q. What is the meaning of the phrase “the Web cooling,” and when does this take place?

A. Evidently it is itself which is cooling, and not anything outside of itself. When? We are told that it begins when the imprisoned force and intelligence inherent in every atom of differentiated as well as of homogeneous matter arrives at a point when both become the slaves of a higher intelligent Force whose mission it is to guide and shape it. It is the Force which we call the divine Free-Will, represented by the Dhyani-Buddhas. When the centripetal and centrifugal forces of life and being are subjected by the one nameless Force which brings order in disorder, and establishes harmony in Chaos—then it begins cooling. It is impossible to give the exact time in a process the duration of which is unknown.

Q. Is form the result of the interaction of the centrifugal and centripetal forces in matter and nature?

A. Every form, we are told, is built in accordance with the model traced for it in the Eternity and reflected in the DIVINE MIND. There are hierarchies of “Builders of form,” and series of forms and degrees, from the highest to the lowest. While the former are shaped under the guidance of the “Builders,” the gods “Cosmocratores,” the latter are fashioned by the Elementals or Nature Spirits. As an example of this, look at the strange insects and at some reptiles and non-vertebrate creatures, which so closely imitate, not only in their colour but by their

outward shape, leaves, flowers, moss-covered branches and other so-called “inanimate” things. Shall we take “natural selection” and the explanations of Darwinists as a solution? I trust not. The theory of natural selection is not only utterly inadequate to explain this mysterious faculty of imitation in the realm of being, but gives also an entirely false conception of the importance of such imitative faculty, as a “potent weapon in the struggle for life.” And if this imitative faculty is once proved—as it can easily be—an absolute *misfit* for the Darwinian frame; *i.e.*, if its alleged use, in connection with the so-called “survival of the fittest” is shown to be a speculation which cannot stand close analysis, to what then can the fact of this faculty be attributed? All of you have seen insects which copy with almost a mirror-like fidelity the colour and even outward form of plants, leaves, flowers, pieces of dead twigs, etc. Nor is this a law but rather a frequent exception. What then but an invisible intelligence *outside* the insect can copy with such accuracy from larger originals?

Q. But does not Mr. Wallace show that such imitation has its object in nature? That it is just this which proves the “natural selection” theory, and the innate instinct in the weaker creatures to seek security behind the borrowed garb of certain objects? The insectivora which do not feed upon plants and leaves, will thus leave a leaf-like or moss-like insect safe from attack. This seems very plausible.

A. Very plausible, indeed, if, besides negative facts, there were no very positive evidence to show the unfitness of the natural selection theory to account for the phenomena of imitation. A fact to hold good, must be shown to apply if not universally, then, at any rate, always under the same conditions, *e.g.*, the correspondence and identity of colour between the animals of one and the same locality and the soil of that region would be a general manifestation. But how about the camel of the desert with his coat of the same “protecting” colour as the plains he lives in, and the zebra whose intense, dark stripes *cannot* protect him on the open plains of South Africa, as Mr. Darwin himself admitted.

We are assured by Science that this imitation of the colour of the soil is invariably found in the weaker animals, and yet we find the lion—who need fear no stronger enemies than himself in the desert—with a coat that can hardly be distinguished from the rocks and sandy plains he inhabits! We are asked to believe that this “imitation of protecting colours is caused by the use and *benefit* it offers the imitator,” as a “potent weapon in the struggle for life”; and yet, daily experience shows to us quite the reverse. Thus, it points to a number of animals in which the most pronounced forms of the imitative faculty are entirely useless, or, worse than that, pernicious and often self-destructive. What good, I ask, is the imitation of human speech to the magpie and parrot—except leading them to be

shut up in a cage? Of what use to the monkey its mimicking faculty which brings so many of them to grief and occasionally to great bodily harm and self-destruction; or to a herd of idiotic sheep, in blindly following their leader, even if he happens to tumble down a precipice? This irrepressible desire (also of *imitating* their leaders) has led more than one unlucky Darwinist, while seeking to prove his favourite hobby, into the most absurdly incongruous statements. Thus, our Haeckelian friend, Mr. Grant Allen, in his work upon the subject under discussion, speaks of a certain Indian lizard blessed with three large parasites of different kinds. Each of these three imitates to perfection the colour of the scales of that part of the body it dwells on: the parasite on the stomach of the creature, is yellow like its stomach; the second parasite having chosen its abode on the back, is as variegated in colour as the dorsal scales; while the third having selected its hermitage on the lizard's brown head, is almost indistinguishable from it in colour. This careful copy of the respective colours, we are told by Mr. G. Allen, is for the purpose of preserving the parasites from the lizard itself. But surely this doughty champion of natural selection does not mean to tell his public that the lizard can see the parasite *on its own heed!* Finally, of what use is its brilliant red colour to the fish which

lives amidst coral reefs, or to the tiny Birds of Paradise, *colibri*, the rainbow hues of their plumage imitating all the radiant colours of the tropical fauna and flora—except to make them the more noticeable?

Q. To what causes would occultism attribute this imitative faculty?

A. To several things. In the case of such rare tropical birds and leaf-like insects to early intermediate links, in the former case between the lizard and the *colibri*, and in the latter between certain vegetations and the insect kind. There was a time, millions of years ago, when such “missing links” were numerous, and on every point of the globe where life was. But now they are becoming with every cycle and generation more rare; they are found at present, only in a limited number of localities, as all such links are relics of the Past.

Q. Will you give us some explanation from the occult standpoint of what is called the “Law of Gravitation”?

A. Science insists that between bodies attraction is directly as the mass and inversely as the square of the distance. Occultists, however, doubt whether this law holds good with regard to the entirety of planetary rotation. Take the first and second laws of Kepler included in the Newtonian law as given by Herschel:

. . . . under the influence of such an attractive force mutually urging two spherical gravitating bodies towards each other, they will each, when moving in each other's neighbourhood, be deflected into an orbit concave towards the other, and describe, one about the other regarded as fixed, or both round their common centre of gravity, curves whose forms are limited to those figures known in geometry by the general name of conic sections. It will depend upon the particular circumstances of velocity, distance, and direction, *which* of these curves shall be described,—whether an ellipse, a circle, a parabola, or an hyperbola; but one or other it *must* be . . . *

Science says that the phenomena of planetary motion result from the action of two forces, one centripetal,

* [Sir John F.W. Herschel, *Treatise on Astronomy*. New ed., London, 1851; chap. VII, pp. —237-38.—*Compiler*.]

the other centrifugal, and that a body falling to the ground in a line perpendicular to still water does so owing to the law of gravity or of centripetal force. Among others, the following objections brought forward by a learned occultist, may be stated.

[1] That the path of a circle is impossible in planetary motion.

[2] That the argument in the third law of Kepler, namely that “the squares of the periodic times of any two planets are to each other, in the same proportion as the cubes of their mean distances from the Sun,” gives rise to the curious result of a permitted libration in the eccentricities of planets. Now the said forces remaining unchanged in their nature, this can only arise, as he says, “from the interference of an extraneous cause.”

[3] That the phenomenon of gravitation or “falling” does not exist, except as the result of a conflict of forces. It can only be considered as an isolated force by way of mental analysis or separation. He asserts, moreover, that the planets, atoms, or particles of matter are not *attracted* towards each other in the direction of right lines connecting their centres, but are forced towards each other in the curves of spirals closing upon the centre of each other. Also that the tidal wave is not the result of attraction. All this, as he shows, results from the conflict of imprisoned and free force; antagonism apparently, but really affinity and harmony.

“... Fohat gathering a few of the clusters of Cosmic matter (nebulae) will, by giving it an impulse, set it in motion anew, develop the required heat, and then leave it to follow its own new growth.” *

Q. Is Fohat to be understood as synonymous with force, or that which causes the changing manifestation of matter? If so, how can Fohat be said to “leave it to follow its own new growth,” when all growth depends upon the indwelling force?

A. All growth depends upon the indwelling force, because on this plane of ours it is this force alone which

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 84.

acts consciously. The universal force cannot be regarded as a conscious force as we understand the word consciousness, because it would immediately become a personal god. It is only that which is enclosed in form, a limitation of matter, which is conscious of itself on this plane. This Free Force or Will, which is limitless and absolute, cannot be said to act understandingly, but it is the one and sole immutable Law of Life and Being.

Fohat, therefore, is spoken of as the synthetic motor power of all the imprisoned life-forces and the medium between the absolute and conditioned Force. It is a link, just as Manas is the connecting link between the gross matter of the physical body and the divine Monad which animates it, but is powerless to act upon the former directly.

Q. If Force is a unity or One, manifesting in an unlimited variety of ways, it is difficult to understand the statement in the Commentary that: "There is heat internal and heat external in every atom"; i.e., latent and active heat or dynamic and kinetic heat. Heat is the phenomenon of a perception of matter actuated by force in a peculiar manner. Heat, therefore, on the physical plane is simply matter in motion. If there is heat in a more interior and occult sense than physical heat, it must be perceived by some higher and more interior senses by virtue of its activities on whatever plane it manifests. For this perception three conditions are necessary, an actuating force, a form which is actuated and that which perceives the form in motion. The terms "latent," "potential" or "dynamic" heat are misnomers, because heat, whether on the first or the seventh plane of consciousness, is the perception of matter or substance in motion.

Is the discrepancy between the above statement and the teaching of the "Secret Doctrine" apparent or real?

A. Why should heat on any other plane than ours be the perception of matter or substance in motion? Why should an occultist accept the condition of [1] the actuating force; [2] the form which is actuated; [3] that which perceives the form in motion, as those of heat?

As with every ascending plane heterogeneity tends more and more to homogeneity, so on the seventh plane the form will disappear, there being nothing to be

actuated, the acting Force will remain in solitary grandeur, to perceive but itself; or in Spencer's phraseology, it will have become both "subject and object, the perceiver and the perceived." The terms used are not contradictory, but symbols borrowed from physical science in order to render occult action and processes more clear to the minds of those who are trained in that science. In fact, each of these specifications of heat and force, corresponds to one of the principles in man.

The "heat centres," from the physical standpoint, would be the zero-point, because they are spiritual.

The word "perceived" is somewhat erroneous, it should rather be "sensed." Fohat is the agent of the law, its representative, the representative of the Manasaputras, whose

collectivity is—the eternal mind.

Q. In the passage of a globe into Pralaya does it remain in situ, i.e., still forming part of a planetary chain and maintaining its proper position in relation to the other globes? Does the dissociation by means of heat play any part in the passage of a globe into Pralaya?

A. This is explained in *Esoteric Buddhism*. When a globe of a planetary chain goes into “obscuration” every quality, including heat, retires from it and it remains *in statu quo*, like the “sleeping Beauty,” until Fohat, the “Prince Charmant,” awakens it with a kiss.

Q. The sons are spoken of as dissociating and scattering. This appears to be opposed to the action of returning to their “mother’s bosom” at the end of the “Great Day.” Does the dissociating and scattering refer to the formation of the globe from the universally diffused world-stuff, in other words emerging from Pralaya?

A. The dissociating and scattering refers to Nitya Pralaya. This is an eternal and perpetual Pralaya which is taking place ever since there were globes and differentiated matter. It is simply atomic change.

Q. What is meant by the expression expanding and contracting through their own “selves and hearts” and how is this connected with the last line of the sloka, “They embrace Infinitude.”

A. This has already been explained. Through their own inherent and imprisoned force they strive collectively

to join the one universal or free force, that is to say embrace infinitude, this free force being infinite.

Q. What is the relation between electricity and physical or animal magnetism and hypnotism?

A. If by electricity, you mean the science which unfolds on this plane, and under a dozen various qualifications the phenomena and laws of the electric fluid—then I answer, none at all. But if you refer to the electricity we call *Fohatic*, or *intra-cosmic*, then I will say that all these forms of phenomena are based on it.

Collected Writings VOLUME X

January, February, March, 1889

X.

Meeting held at 17, Lansdowne Road, London, W., on March 14th, 1889; MR. W. KINGSLAND in the chair.

STANZA IV.

Sloka (1). LISTEN, YE SONS OF THE EARTH, TO YOUR INSTRUCTORS—THE SONS OF THE FIRE. LEARN THERE IS NEITHER FIRST NOR LAST; FOR ALL IS ONE NUMBER, ISSUED FROM NO NUMBER.

Q. Are the sons of the Fire the Rays of the Third Logos?

A. The “Rays” are the “Sons of the Fire-mist,” produced by the *Third Creation*, or Logos. The actual “Sons of the Fire” of the Fifth Race and Sub-races are so called simply because they by their wisdom belong, or are nearer to, the hierarchy of the divine “Sons of the Fire-Mist,” the highest of the planetary Chohans or Angels. But the Sons of the Fire here spoken of as addressing the Sons of the Earth are, in this case, the King-Instructors who incarnated on this earth to teach nascent Humanity. As “Kings” they belong to the divine dynasties of which every nation, India, Chaldea, Egypt, Homeric Greece, etc., has preserved a tradition or record in some form or other. The name “Sons of the Fire-Mist” was also given to the Hierophants of

old. They are certainly sub-divisions of the Third Logos. They are the Fire-Chohans or Angels, the Ether Angels, the Air and Water Angels, and the Angels of the Earth. The seven lower Sephiroth are the earthly angels and correspond to the seven hierarchies of the seven elements, five of which are known, and two unknown.

Q. Do they, then, correspond to the Races?

A. They do. Otherwise where would be the intellectual Races with brains and thought, if it were not for these hierarchies that incarnated in them?

Q. What is the distinction between these various Hierarchies?

A. In reality these fires are not separate, any more than are the souls or monads to him who sees beyond the veil of matter or illusion.

He who would be an occultist must not separate either himself or anything else from the rest of creation or *non-creation*. For, the moment he distinguishes himself from even a vessel of dishonour, he will not be able to join himself to any vessel of honour. He must think of himself as an infinitesimal something, not even as an individual atom, but as a part of the world-atoms as a whole, or become an illusion, a nobody, and vanish like a breath, leaving no trace behind. As illusions, we are separate distinct bodies, living in masks furnished by Maya. Can we claim one single atom in our body as distinctly our own? Everything, from spirit to the tiniest particle, is part of the whole, at best a link. Break a single link and all passes into annihilation; but this is impossible. There is a series of vehicles becoming more and more gross, from spirit to the densest matter, so that with each step downward and outward we get more and more the sense of separateness developed in us. Yet this is illusory, for if there were a real and complete separation between any two human beings, they could not communicate with, or understand each other in any way.

Thus with these hierarchies. Why should we separate their classes in our mind, except for purposes of distinction in *practical* Occultism, which is but

the lowest form of applied Metaphysics. But if you seek to separate them on this plane of illusion, then all I can say is, that there exists between these Hierarchies the same abysses of distinction as between the “principles” of the Universe or those of man, if you like, and the same “principles” in a bacillus.

“There is a passage in the *Bhagavad-Gitâ* (ch. viii) wherein Krishna, speaking symbolically and *esoterically*, says: ‘I will state the times (conditions) . . . at which devotees departing (from this life) do so never to return (be reborn), or to return (to incarnate again). The Fire, the Flame, the day, the bright (lucky) fortnight, the six months of the Northern solstice, departing (dying) in these, those who know the Brahman (Yogis) go to the Brahman. Smoke, night, the dark (unlucky) fortnight, the six months of the Southern solstice, (dying) in these, the devotee goes to the lunar light (or mansion, the astral light also) and returns (is reborn).’* ”

Q. What is the explanation of this passage?

A. It means that the devotees are divided into two classes, those who reach Nirvana on Earth, and either accept or refuse it (though never to be born again, in this *Mahakalpa*, or age of Brahman); and those who do not reach this state of bliss as Buddha and others did.

“The Fire, the Flame, the day, the bright fortnight of the moon,” are all symbols of the highest absolute deity. Those who die in such a state of absolute purity, go to Brahman, *i.e.*, have a right to Moksha or Nirvana. On the other hand “Smoke, night, the dark fortnight, etc., are all symbolical of matter, the darkness of ignorance. Those who die in such a state of incomplete purification, must of course be reborn. Only the homogeneous, the absolutely purified, unalloyed spirit, can be re-united to the Deity or go to Brahman.

Sloka (2). LEARN WHAT WE, WHO DESCEND FROM THE PRIMORDIAL SEVEN, WE, WHO ARE BORN FROM THE PRIMORDIAL FLAME, HAVE LEARNED FROM OUR FATHERS.

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 86.

“The first ‘Primordial’ are the highest Beings on the Scale of Existence. . . . The ‘Primordial’ proceed from ‘Father-Mother.’” *

Q. Is Father-Mother here synonymous with the Third Logos?

A. The first primordial seven are born from the Third Logos. This is before it is differentiated into the Mother, when it becomes pure primordial matter in its first primitive essence, Father-Mother potentially. Mother becomes the immaculate mother only when the differentiation of spirit and matter is complete. Otherwise there would exist no such qualification. No one would speak of pure spirit as immaculate, for it cannot be otherwise. The mother is, therefore, the immaculate matter before it is differentiated under the breath of the pre-cosmic Fohat, when it becomes the “immaculate mother” of the “Son” or the manifested Universe, in form. It is the latter which begins the hierarchy that will end with Humanity or man.

Sloka (3). FROM THE EFFULGENCE OF LIGHT—THE RAY OF THE EVER-DARKNESS—SPRUNG IN SPACE THE RE-AWAKENED ENERGIES (*Dhyan-Chohans*): THE ONE FROM THE EGG, THE SIX AND THE FIVE; THEN THE THREE, THE ONE, THE FOUR, THE ONE, THE FIVE—THE TWICE SEVEN, THE SUM TOTAL. AND THESE ARE: THE ESSENCES, THE FLAMES, THE ELEMENTS, THE BUILDERS, THE NUMBERS, THE ARUPA (*formless*), THE RUPA (*with bodies*), AND THE FORCE OF DIVINE MAN—THE SUM TOTAL. AND FROM THE DIVINE MAN EMANATED THE FORMS, THE SPARKS, THE SACRED ANIMALS, AND THE MESSENGERS OF THE SACRED FATHERS (*the Pitris*) WITHIN THE HOLY FOUR.

Q. Can you explain these numbers and give their meaning?

A. As said in the Commentary, we are not at present concerned in the process, that is to say, it cannot at

* *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 88.

present he made public. Some few hints, however, may be given. The Rabbis call the Circle (or as some say, the first point in it) Echod, the ONE, or Ain-Soph. On a lower plane, the fourth, it becomes Adam Kadmon, the manifested seven and the unmanifested ten, or the complete Sephirothal Tree. The Sephiroth, therefore, are the same as the Elohim. Now the name of the latter written in Hebrew, Alhim, is composed of five letters; and these letters in their values in numerals, being placed round a circle, Can be transmuted at will, as they could not be were they applied to any other geometrical figure. The circle is endless, that is to say, has neither beginning nor end. Now the literal Kabala is divided into three parts or methods, the third of which is called Temura or permutation. According to Certain rules one letter or numeral is substituted for another. The Kabalistic alphabet is divided into two equal parts, each letter or numeral of one part corresponding to a like number or letter in the other part. By changing the letters alternately, twenty-two permutations or combinations are produced, which process is called Tziruph.

The footnote on pages 90 and 91 (Vol. I, *Secret Doctrine*) makes my meaning quite clear.

Sloka (4). THIS WAS THE ARMY OF THE VOICE—THE DIVINE SEPTENARY. THE SPARKS OF THE SEVEN ARE SUBJECT TO, AND THE SERVANTS OF, THE FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH, FIFTH, SIXTH AND THE SEVENTH OF THE SEVEN. THESE (“sparks”) ARE CALLED SPHERES, TRIANGLES, CUBES, LINES, AND MODELLERS: FOR THUS STANDS THE ETERNAL NIDANA—THE OI-HA-HOU (*the permutation of Oeaoahoo*).

Q. What are the “Life-Winds” in the commentary [p. 96]?

A. The Life-winds are the various modes of out-breathing and in-breathing, changing thereby the polarity of the body and States of Consciousness. It is Yoga practice, but beware of taking the exoteric works on Yoga literally. They all require a key.

Q. What is the meaning of the sentence beginning “The sparks, etc.” (*vide supra*)?

A. The sparks mean the Rays as well to the lower intelligence as to the human sparks or Monads. It relates to the circle and the digits, and is equivalent to saying that the figures 31415 as given on pages 90 and 91, are all subject to the circumference and diameter of the circle.

Q. Why is Sarasvati (*the goddess of speech*) also called the goddess of esoteric wisdom? If the explanation lies in the meaning of the word Logos, why is there a distinction between the immovable mind and movable speech? Is mind equivalent to Mahat, or to the Higher and Lower Manas?

A. The question is rather a complicated one. Sarasvati, the Hindu goddess, is the same as Vâch, whose name means Speech and who is the female Logos, esoterically. The second question seems rather involved. I believe it is because the Logos or Word is called the incarnate wisdom, “Light shining in darkness.” The distinction lies between the immovable or eternal immutable ALL, and the movable Speech or Logos, *i.e.*, the

periodical and the manifested. It can relate to the Universal and to the individual mind, to Mahat, or to the Higher Manas, or even to the lower, the Kama-Manas or Brain-Mind. Because that which is desire, instinctive impulse in the lower, becomes thought in the Higher. The former finds expression in acts, the latter in words. Esoterically, thought is more responsible and punishable than act. But exoterically it is the reverse. Therefore, in ordinary human law, an assault is more severely punished than the thought or intention, i.e., the threat, whereas *Karmically* it is the contrary

Q. "God geometrizes," says Plato, but seeing that there is no personal God, how is it that the process of formation is by Dots, Lines, Triangles, Cubes Circles, and finally Spheres? And how, when the sphere leaves the static state, does the inherent force of Breath set it whirling?

A. The term "God"—unless referring to the Unknown Deity or *Absoluteness*, which can hardly be supposed *acting* in any way—has always meant in ancient philosophies the collectivity of the working and intelligent Forces in nature. The word "Forest" is singular,

yet it is the term to express the idea of thousands or even millions of trees of different kinds. Materialists have the option of saying "Nature," or still better—"Law geometrizes" if they so prefer. But in the days of Plato, the average reader would hardly have understood the metaphysical distinction and real meaning. The truth, however, of Nature ever "geometrizing" is easily ascertained. Here is an instance: Heat is the modification of the motions or particles of matter. Now, it is a physical and mechanical law that particles or bodies in motion on themselves, assume a spheroidal form—this, from a globular planet down to a drop of rain. Observe the snowflakes, which along with crystals exhibit to you all the geometrical forms existing in nature. As soon as motion ceases, the spheroidal shape alters; or, as Tyndall tells us, it becomes a flat drop, then the drop forms an equilateral triangle, a hexagon and so on. In observing the breaking up of ice-particles in a large mass, through which he passed heat rays, he observed that the first shape the particles assumed was triangular or pyramidal, then cubical and finally hexagonal, etc. Thus, even modern physical science corroborates Plato and justifies his proposition.

Q. When Tyndall took a large block of ice and threw a powerful ray upon it and thence on to a screen, there were to be seen the forms of ferns and plants in it. What is the reason of this?

A. This question ought really to be addressed first to Professor Tyndall, who would give a scientific explanation of it—and perhaps he has already done so. But Occultism would explain it by saying either that the ray helped to show the astral shapes which were preparing to form future ferns and plants, or that the ice had preserved the reflection of actual ferns and plants that had been reflected in it. Ice is a great magician, whose occult properties are as little known as those of Ether. It is occultly connected with the astral light, and may under certain conditions reflect certain images from the invisible astral region, just as light and a sensitised plate may be made to reflect stars that cannot be

perceived even by the telescope. This

is well known to learned Yogis who dwell on the eternal ice of Badrinath and the Himalayas. At any rate, ice has certainly the property of retaining images of things impressed on its surface under certain conditions of light, images which it preserves invisibly until it is melted. Fine steel has the same property, though it is of a less occult nature. Were you to observe the ice from the surface, these forms would not be seen. But once that in decomposing the ice with heat you deal with the forces and the things that were impressed on it, then you find that it throws off these images and the forms appear. It is but one link leading to another link. All this is not modern science of course, yet it is fact and truth.

Q. Do numbers and geometrical figures represent to human consciousness the laws of action in the Divine Mind?

A. They do, most assuredly. There is no chance evolution or formation, nor is any so-called abnormal appearance or cosmic phenomenon due to haphazard circumstances.

Sloka (5). "DARKNESS," THE BOUNDLESS OR THE NO-NUMBER, ADI-NIDANA SVABHAVAT: THE O (for x, unknown quantity):

I. THE ADI-SANAT, THE NUMBER, FOR HE IS ONE.

II. THE VOICE OF THE WORD, SVABHAVAT, THE NUMBERS, FOR HE IS ONE AND NINE.

III. THE "FORMLESS SQUARE." (Arupa.)

AND THESE THREE ENCLOSED WITHIN THE O (*boundless circle*), ARE THE SACRED FOUR, AND THE TEN ARE THE ARUPA (*subjective, formless*) UNIVERSE; THEN COME THE "SONS," THE SEVEN FIGHTERS, THE ONE, THE EIGHTH LEFT OUT, AND HIS BREATH WHICH IS THE LIGHT-MAKER (*Bhâskara*).

Q. The "One Rejected" is the sun of our system. Astronomically is there any explanation of Mârttanda's rejection?

A. The sun is older than any of its planets—though younger than the moon. Its "rejection" means that when bodies or planets began to form, helped by its rays, magnetic radiance or heat, and especially by its magnetic attraction, it had to be stopped, otherwise it would have

swallowed all the younger bodies like Saturn is fabled to have treated his progeny. This does not mean that all the planets are thrown out from the sun, as modern Science teaches,

but simply that under the Rays of the sun they acquire their growth. Aditi is the ever-equilibrizing mother-nature on the purely spiritual and subjective plane. She is the $\text{\textcircled{A}}$ akti, the female power or potency of the fecundating spirit; and it is for her to regulate the behaviour of sons born in her bosom. The Vedic allegory is very suggestive.

Q. Were all the planets in our solar system first comets and then suns?

A. They were not suns in our, or their present solar systems, but comets in space. All began life as wanderers over the face of the infinite Kosmos. They detached themselves from the common storehouse of already prepared material, the Milky Way (which is nothing more or less than the quite developed world-stuff, all the rest in space being the crude material, as yet invisible to us); then, starting on their long journey they first settled in life where conditions were prepared for them by Fohat, and gradually became suns. Then each sun, when its Pralaya arrived, was resolved into millions and millions of fragments. Each of these fragments moved to and fro in space collecting fresh materials, as it rolled on, like an avalanche, until it came to a stop through the laws of attraction and repulsion, and became a planet in our own, as in other systems, beyond our telescopes. The sun's fragments will become just such planets after the Solar pralaya. It was a comet once upon a time, in the beginning of Brahmâ's Age. Then it came to its present position, whence it will burst asunder, and its atoms will be whirled into space for aeons and aeons like all other comets and meteors, until each, guided by Karma, is caught in the vortex of the two forces, and fixed in some higher and better system.

Thus the Sun will live in his children as a portion of the parents lives in their offspring. When that day comes, the semblance or reflection of the Sun which we see, will first fall off like a veil from the face of the

true Sun. No mortal will see it, for no mortal eye could bear its radiance. Were this veil once removed for even a second, all the planets of its system would be instantaneously reduced to ashes, as the sixty thousand of King Sagara's Sons *were destroyed by a glance* of Kapila's eye.

Sloka (6). THEN THE SECOND SEVEN, WHO ARE THE LIPIKA, PRODUCED BY THE THREE (*Word, Voice and Spirit*). THE REJECTED SON IS ONE, THE "SON-SUNS ARE COUNTLESS.

Q. What is the relation of the Lipika, the "Second Seven" to the "primordial Seven" end to the first "Sacred Four"?

A. If you believe that any, save the highest Initiates, can explain this to your satisfaction, then you are greatly mistaken. The relation can be better understood, or rather, shown to be above all understanding, by first studying the Gnostic systems of the early centuries of Christianity, from that of Simon Magus down to the highest and noblest of them, the so-called PISTIS-SOPHIA. All these systems are derived from the East. That which we call the "Primordial Seven" and the "Second Seven" are called by Simon Magus

the Æons, the primeval, the second and the third series of Syzygies. They are the graduated emanations, ever descending lower and lower into matter, from that primordial principle which he calls Fire, and we, Svabhavat. Behind that Fire, the manifested but silent Deity, stands with him as it does with us, that “which is, was, and ever will be.” Let us compare his system with ours.

In a passage quoted from his works by the author of *Philosophumena*, we read:—”From this permanent Stability and Immortality of this first manifested principle ‘Fire’ (the third Logos) which immutability does not preclude activity, as the second from it is endowed with intelligence and reason (Mahat), it (the Fire) passed from the potentiality of action to action itself. From this series of evolutions were formed six beings, or the emanation from the infinite potency; they were formed in Syzygies, *i.e.*, they radiated out of the flame two by

two, one being active, the other the passive principle.” These Simon named Nous and Epinoia, or Spirit and Thought, Phônê and Onoma, Voice and Name, and Logismos and Enthumêsis, Reasoning and Reflection. And again:—“In each of these six primitive Beings the Infinite Potency was in its totality; but it was there in potentiality and not in act. It had to be established therein through an image (that of the paradigm), in order that it should appear in all its essence, virtue, grandeur and effects; for only then could it become like unto the Parent Potency infinite and eternal. If, on the contrary, it was not conformed by or through the Image, that Potentiality could never become Potency or pass into action, but was lost for lack of use, as it happens to a man who having an aptitude for grammar or geometry does not exercise it; it gets lost for him just as if he never had it” (*Philosophumena*, p. 250).*

* [These passages are from Book VI, 12, of the *Philosophumena* or *Refutation of All Heresies*, ascribed now to St. Hippolytus, but formerly included in the works of Origen. H. P. B. has apparently translated into English either the Greek or the Latin text as published, one under the other, in an edition prepared from the Paris Codex by Patricius Cruice (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1860). The Latin text, which is reproduced below, occurs on pages 249-51 of that volume:

“Omnes enim partes, ut ait, invisibiles ignis existimavit intelligentiae et mentis esse consortes. Natus est igitur mundus aeternus ab aeterno igne. Coepit autem fieri, ut ait, sex radices primas principii generationis assumens aeternus ille mundus ex illius ignis principio. Natas autem affirmat per conjugationes fuisse has radices ex igne, quas quidem radices vocat Mentem [Mentem] et Cogitationem [Cogitationem], Vocem [Vocem] et Nomen [Nomen], Rationem [Rationem] et Conceptionem [Conceptionem]; inesse autem in istis sex radicibus omnem simul infinitam potestatem, virtute autem sola, non actu; quam quidem infinitam potestatem act esse illum qui stetit, stat, stabit; qui, si imagine effingatur, in sex illis potestatibus apparebat essentia, virtute, magnitudine, effectu, una etiam (potestas) et similis illi aeternae et infinitae potestati, neque ullo modo inferior illa aeterna et immutabili et infinita potestate. Quod si maneat virtute tantum in sex potestatibus neque

He shows that whether these Æons belong to the superior, middle or lower world, they are all one, except in material density, which determines their outward manifestations and the result produced, not their real essence which is one, or their mutual relations which, as he says, are established from eternity by immutable laws.

Now the first, the second, third or primordial seven or Lipika, are all one. When they emanate from one plane to another, it is a repetition of—"as above, so below." They are all differentiated in matter or density, not in qualities; the same qualities descend onto the last plane, our own, where man is endowed with the same potentiality, if he but knew how to develop it, as the highest Dhyan-Chohans.

In the hierarchies of Æons, Simon gives three pairs of two each, the seventh being the fourth which descends from one plane to another.

The Lipika proceed from Mahat and are called in the Kabala the four Recording Angels; in India, the four Maharajas, those who record every thought and deed of man; they are called by St. John in the *Revelation*, the Book of Life. They are directly connected with Karma and what the Christians call the Day of Judgment; in the East it was called the Day after Mahamanvantara, or the "Day-Be-With-Us." Then everything becomes one, all individualities are merged into one, yet each knowing itself, a mysterious teaching indeed. But then, that which to us now is non-consciousness or the unconscious, will then be absolute consciousness.

Q. What relation have the Lipika to Mahat?

A. They are a division, four taken from one of the Septenates that emanates from Mahat. Mahat corresponds with the Fire of Simon Magus, the secret and

imagine effingatur, evanescit, ait, et perit sicut facultas grammaticae vel geometricae in hominis animo. Facultas enim adjuta arte fit lumen omnium rerum; non adjutavero, imperita et tenebrosa et, velut quum non erat, cum homine moriente perit."

—*Compiler.*]

the manifested Divine Ideation, made to witness to itself in this objective Universe through the intelligent forms we see around us, in what is called creation. Like all other emanations, they are "Wheels within Wheels." The Lipika are on the plane corresponding to the highest plane of our chain of globes.

Q. What is the difference between Spirit, Voice and Word?

A. The same as between Atma, Buddhi and Manas, in one sense. Spirit emanates from the unknown Darkness, the mystery into which none of us can penetrate. That Spirit—call it the “Spirit of God” or Primordial Substance—mirrors itself in the Waters of Space— or the still undifferentiated matter of the future Universe —and produces thereby the first flutter of differentiation in the homogeneity of primordial matter. This is the Voice, pioneer of the “Word” or the first manifestation; and from that Voice emanates the Word or Logos, that is to say, the definite and objective expression of that which has hitherto remained in the depths of the Concealed Thought. That which mirrors itself in Space is the Third Logos. We may express this Trinity also by the terms Colour, Sound, and Numbers.

END OF VOLUME X

Collected Writings VOLUME X

xxiv

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY

OF THE CHIEF EVENTS IN THE LIFE OF H. P. BLAVATSKY AND COL.
HENRY S. OLCOTT, FROM JULY, 1888, TO JANUARY, 1889, INCLUSIVE.

(The period to which the material in the present volume belongs)

1888

July—Executive Council of the T. S. requests H. S. Olcott to go to Europe and organize an European Section of the General Council (*Theos.*, IX, Suppl. to August, 1888, p. xcix).

July—Strong Editorial in *Le Lotus* (Paris) from the pen of F. K. Gaboriau, concerning troubles in the Isis Branch of the T. S. in Paris (*Le Lotus*).

July 13—The Isis Branch meets at Salle Richefeu, Paris; endorses H. P. B.'s action in the troublesome matters which had arisen. Col. Olcott confirms by letter the nomination of Gaboriau as President of the Branch, and approves in the name of the Council at Adyar the action of H. P. B. (*Le Lotus*, III, Aug., 1888, p. 318). .

July—Fred C. Judge, brother of Wm. Q. Judge, dies at Calcutta of cirrhosis of the liver, age 32 (*Theos.*, IX, Suppl. to July, 1888, p. xlvi).

July—Mohini M. Chatterji returns to India and settles at Calcutta after five years absence (*Theos.*, IX, Suppl. to July, 1888, p. xlvii)

Fall—The Sinnetts tour Switzerland, and go to Elberfeld to see the Gebhards; return to London about end of September (*Autobiography*).

August 4—H. S. Olcott sails for Europe; goes first to Bombay, leaving from there on the 7th in the P. & O. Mail steamer *SS Shannon*; he is to land in Brindisi, Italy (*Theos.*, IX, Suppl. to Sept., 1888, p. ciii; *Ransom*, 248).

August 22—Important letter from K. H. to Col. Olcott, received on board the *SS Shannon*, the day before reaching Brindisi. (According to the records of Lloyd's of London, the steamer arrived there August 23rd, at 7:30 a.m, leaving for London an hour later.) (*LMW* I, No. 19, for text of Letter; *Ransom*, 248, where wrong date is given).

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY

xxv

It would appear that prior to the receipt of this important Letter from the Teacher, H. P. B. had intimated to H. S. O. that she might form an entirely independent T. S. in Europe, if he insists on his objections against the formation of the Esoteric Section (*Ransom*, 251).

August 23—H. S. Olcott proceeds overland from Italy to London, arriving there the 26th; he stops for a few hours in Bologna, to see about Count Mattei's medicines; being unable to contact the Count, makes arrangements to visit there again on his trip home. Finds H. P. B. quite sick, but working very hard (*Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Oct., 1888, pp. xvii-xviii; *Ransom*, 248).

When H. S. Olcott arrived in London, some 330 pages of each of the two volumes of *The Secret Doctrine* were already printed (*Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Oct., 1888, p. xviii).

August—Vera Vladimirovna de Zhelihovsky, daughter of Madame Vera Petrovna de Zhelihovsky, H. P. B.'s sister, marries Charles Johnston, at H. P. B.'s home, 17, Lansdowne Road, London. H.S.O. represents her mother and the rest of the family at the civil marriage at the registrar's office (*ODL*, IV, 68).

September 16—H. S. Olcott and Richard Harte arrive in Paris, to try and settle troubles in the Isis Branch (*Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Dec. 1888, p. xxvi).

September 17—Formal decision rendered by Col. Olcott in regard to the above-mentioned troubles. New Charter granted to the "Hermes" Branch; Arthur Arnould elected President; Encausse (*pseud.*: Papius), Corre.sp. Sec'y. Gaboriau apparently left out, which leads to some friction between Olcott and H. P. B. Old Charter of the Isis Branch is rescinded. Gaboriau becomes rather abusive in the pages of *Le Lotus* (*ODL*, IV, 57; *Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Dec., 1888; p. xxvi; *Ransom*, 249-50; *Blech*, 171 *et seq.*).

September 24—H. S. Olcott leaves Paris (*Ransom*, 248). Has small surgical operation in London; stays indoors for ten days (*Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Dec., 1888, p. xxvi).

September 27—General Convention called to meet in London for the purpose of confederating the European Branches into one Council. Richard Harte, who had been in London for some time, represents the American T. S., but with no power to vote (*Path*, III, Oct., 1888, p. 236).

September—New Theosophical Hdqtrs. opened at Room 45, Nassau St., New York City (*Path*, III, Sept., 1888, p. 203).

xxvi

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

September—October—H. S. Olcott visits Glasgow; Liverpool; Oxford, where he has a long talk with Prof. F. Max Müller. Forms a Branch of the T. S. at Cambridge (Oct. 6). (*Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Dec., 1888, p. xxvi; *ODL*, IV, 57-60; *Lucifer*, III, Oct., 1888, p. 105).

October—Notice from H. P. B. announcing that owing to the severe illness of Mabel Collins, she will take over the sole editorship of *Lucifer* (Vol. III, Oct., 1888, p. 136).

October 8—Meeting of Fellows of the T. S. in England summoned by H. S. O., to consider proposals for the formation of a British Section, T. S., held at No. 9, Conduit St., London; adjourned to the 19th (*Lucifer*, III, Nov., 1888, p. 260).

October 9—Col. H. S. O. issues an "Order in Council" forming the Esoteric Section; attested by H. P. Blavatsky. A. P. Sinnett declines to participate in this work; relations between him and H. P. B. are rather strained (*ODL*, IV, 60; *Ransom*, 251-52).

October 19—Organization of the British Section of the T. S.; Constitution prepared by Col. Olcott is passed,

with only Sinnett voting against it. The Lodges forming the Section are: Blavatsky, Scottish T. S., Dublin, Cambridge, Glasgow. The London Lodge, headed by Sinnett, remains outside the organizational set up of the British Section. Dr. Archibald Keightley is President *pro tem.* of the Section (*Ransom*, 251; *Hist. Retr.*, 15; *Lucifer*, III, Nov., 1888, pp. 260-63) .

October 20—Date when the First Volume of *The Secret Doctrine* came off the Press. First printing of 500 copies exhausted before date of publication (*Ransom*, 254). Second Volume out towards the end of the year.

On the same day, Col. Olcott and Richard Harte leave for India. According to a pencil notation in R. Harte's own copy of Vol. I of the *S.D.*, "This is the first copy ever issued. I got it from Printer by special Messenger on the morning of the 20 Oct. '88 as I was leaving the house 17 Lansdowne Road, with Col. Olcott for India (Col. went personally via Naples). The Second Vol. followed me to India.-R.H."

Charles, Johnston and his wife Vera leave for India on same steamer (*Path*, III, p. 236).

H. S. O. goes by the Tidal Service Train en route for Paris (*Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Nov., 1888, p. xxi, and Dec., 1888, p. xxvii).

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY

xxxvii

October 28—Col. Olcott sails from Naples on board the SS. Arcadia, where he lectures on board while on the journey. On his way down from Paris, he had stopped at Bologna to see Count Mattei at his castle "Rochetta," near Rioli; also in Rome where he visited St. Peter's (*ODL*, IV, 63-65; 66-68; *Ransom*, 252; *Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Dec., 1888, p. xxvii).

October—Prior to the Colonel's departure, H. P. B. and H. S. O. issue a Joint Notice to the effect that there is no rift between them; this is done to counter all sorts of current rumours about an impending split (*ODL*, IV, 62-63).

October—Approximate time when Papus (*pseud.* of Gerard A. V. Encausse) starts his journal *L'Initiation* in Paris (*Le Lotus*, III, Oct.-Nov., 1888, p. 509). It becomes the official organ of his new Branch *Hermes* formed with the dissident members of the Isis Branch.

November 10—H. S. O. lands in Bombay. The party includes Baroness Kroummess, Charles and Vera V. Johnston, and Richard Harte (*ODL*, IV, 68; *Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Dec., 1888, p. xxvii; *Ransom*, 252).

November 13—H. S. O. and party leave for Madras; reach Adyar the 15th (*ODL*, IV, 70; *Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Dec., 1888, p. xxvii).

November 27—W. Q. Judge and Archibald Keightley visit Dublin Lodge, judge being in Europe on E. S. matters; great impetus given to Dublin Lodge (*Irish Theosophist*, III, Feb., 1895, pp. 79-81).

November 30—Bombay Branch sends H. S. O. a resolution recommending that T. Subba Row be asked to come back. H. S. O. refuses (*ODL*, IV, 71; *Ransom*, 252-53).

December—Approx. time when Richard Harte becomes closely associated with the Editorial work on *The Theosophist* (H. S. O. in *Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Dec., 1888, pp. xxvii-xxviii).

December—*Le Lotus* states that Volume II of *The Secret Doctrine* is to be published in the first days of

December (Vol. III, Oct.-Nov., 1888, p. 512).

December—William Q. Judge is in Dublin, while on his trip to England to confer with H. P. B. about the Esoteric Section; helps her to draft the Rules of that body. Dr. Archibald Keightley is in Dublin also (*Path*, III, March, 1889, p. 393).

December 3—Zensiro Noguchi, representative of the Committee of patriotic Japanese, arrives at Adyar, with invitation to H. S. O. to visit Japan in the service of Buddhism (*ODL*, IV, 71).

xxviii

BLAVATSKY: COLLECTED WRITINGS

December—Council meeting at Adyar at which a resolution is unanimously passed to convert itself into an Advisory body and to restore to H. S. O. the full executive powers which, in 1885, he had consented to have curtailed, to satisfy some critical minds (*ODL*, IV, 72).

December 27, 28, 29—Convention at Adyar Headquarters. The Political Congress held at Allâhâbâd, as well as “soreness” on the part of the Bombay Branch, affect the attendance (*ODL*, IV, 74; *Ransom*, 252). Convention abolishes entrance fee and annual dues; this is strongly objected to by both H. P. B. and W. Q. Judge soon after. Convention adopts policy of reorganizing the T. S. work on the line of autonomous sections (*ODL*, IV, 74-83). William Quan Judge is elected Vice-President of the T. S. (*Path*, III, Feb., 1889, p. 362; *Ransom*, 253). Convention decides that the President of the T. S. shall be the custodian of all the Archives and Records of the T. S., and hold office for a period of seven years (*Ransom*, 254).

December—Col. H. S. O., before leaving for Japan, appoints the following persons to exercise all Executive functions on his behalf during his absence: Dewan Bahadur R. Raghunath Row, Dewan Bahadur P. Sreenavasa Row, Richard Harte (librarian). (*Ransom*, 254.)

1889

January 6—Council at Adyar decides to make two Sections in India, in regard to the administration of the Society; Tookaram Tatyâ and Judge D. N. Gadgil are to be General Secretaries (*Ransom*, 258).

January 10—H. S. O. leaves for Japan, going first to Ceylon; he is accompanied by Zensiro Noguchi; Dharmapâla left on the 1st (*ODL*, IV, 89; *Ransom*, 258 *et seq.*; *Theos.*, X, Feb., 1889, pp. 262-66, and Suppl. to Feb., 1889, p. xxxvii).

January 17—H. S. O. embarks on the, SS *Djinnah*, sailing for Japan; Mr. Noguchi and Dharmapâla go with him; the Captain dies before reaching Singapore; H. S. O. organizes a Branch at Singapore, Jan. 23rd; reaches Saigon, 27th; sails the 28th for Hong Kong (*ODL*, IV, 92-93; *Theos.*, X, Suppl. to Feb., 1889, p. xxxvii, and Suppl. to March, 1889, p. 1).

January—The Aryan T. S. in New York, re-elects Wm. Q. Judge as President, during his absence in Europe (*Path*, III, Jan., 1889, p. 331).

January—William Kingsland elected President of the Blavatsky Lodge in London (*Lucifer*, IV, April, 1889, p. 169).

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

Autobiography—Unpublished MS autobiographical sketch written by A. P. Sinnett, dated June 3rd, 1912, with some later additions; original in the Archives of the Mahatma Letters Trust in London, England.

Blech—Contribution à L'histoire de la Société Théosophique en France, Charles Blech. Paris: Éditions Adyar, 1933.

Hist. Retr. —*A Historical Retrospect-1875-1896-of The Theosophical Society*. Extract from the Twenty-first Anniversary Address of the President-Founder of the Society [H. S. Olcott]. Published by the Society, 1896.

Le Lotus—Revue de Hautes Études Théosophiques. F. Krishna Gaboriau, Editor. Paris, Vols. I-III, March, 1887-March, 1889.

LMW—*Letters from the Masters of the Wisdom*. Transcribed and Annotated by C. Jinarâjadâsa. With a Foreword by Annie Besant. 1st Series, Adyar, Madras: Theos. Publ. House, 1919. 124 pp.; 4th ed., with new and additional Letters (1870-1900), 1948. viii, 220 pp.-2nd Series, *ibid.*, 1925; and Chicago: Theosophical Press, 1926.

Lucifer—Journal started by H. P. B. in London, 1887.

ODL—*Old Diary Leaves*, Henry Steel Olcott, Fourth Series, 1887-1892. London: Theos. Publ. Society; Adyar: Office of *The Theosophist*, 1910.

Path—*The Path.*. Published and Edited in New York by William Quan Judge. Vols I-X, April, 1886-March, 1896, incl. Superseded by *Theosophy*.

Ransom—*A Short History of The Theosophical Society*. Compiled by Josephine Ransom. With a Preface by G. S. Arundale. Adyar, Madras: Theos. Publ. House, 1938. xii, 591 pp.

Theos.—*The Theosophist*, published first at Bombay and later in Madras, India, beginning with October, 1879. In progress

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**



HELENA PETROVNA BLAVATSKY

Photograph take by Enrico Resta in London, January 8, 1889. Originally printed in *The Path*, New York, Vol. IV, February, 1890. Reproduced here from the original glassplate in the Archives of the Theosophical Society in England.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**



WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE


Originally published in *Theosophy*, New York, Vol. XI, June, 1896

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**



H.P. BLAVATSKY AND COL. H.S. OLCOTT IN LONDON
Last photograph taken of them together. H.P. B.'s tobacco-basket is now
In the possession of Geoffrey Watkins, London.

Collected Writings VOLUME X



FACIMILE OF DOCUMENT APPOINTING WILLIAM QUAN JUDGE
SOLE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ESOTERIC SECTRION IN AMERICA

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**



ANNIE BESANT

Photograph taken in London in 1888

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**




COLONEL HENRY STEEL OLCOTT
Originally published in *The Word*, Vol. XXII, October, 1915.

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**



COUNTESS CONSTANCE WACHTMEISTER
1838-1910

Collected Writings **VOLUME X**



WILLIAM KINGSLAND
1855-1936
President, Blavatsky Lodge, London, England

Collected Writings VOLUME X



Facsimile of a page from the MS of *The Secret Doctrine*,
Containing an early version of the text.